

9:01 a.m.

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll declare the meeting open.
Tom, a special welcome to you.

MR. BIGGS: Thank you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are looking forward to your comments and the comments of other former commission members to give us some assistance in this difficult process. Tom, it's my understanding that you would prefer we have our discussions in camera?

MR. BIGGS: That's correct, sir. Yes.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd make a motion to that effect, that we go in camera.

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

[The committee met in camera from 9:02 a.m. to 10:09 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll reconvene.

Shirley, welcome to our committee. As you know, we've been meeting with various civic leaders and MLAs to gain their input; we're also meeting with former members of the commission. We're delighted that you are able to come in and share your thoughts and ideas with us. Unless you request otherwise, the meeting will stay open, and *Hansard* is here recording. That's agreeable?

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So we'll proceed if you have some comments you'd like to make, and then we'll move into a general question-and-answer session. I might mention just before you proceed that Stockwell was here this morning for the presentation by Tom but unfortunately had to leave. He may or may not get back before the end of your presentation. Please go ahead.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, thank you, Bob, for letting me have this opportunity to talk to the committee. I knew when we did either the initial report or the final report that the legislative members would have to take a look at the report and decide what to do with it.

I have to say at the outset that working on the Electoral Boundaries Commission was the most frustrating and difficult task I think I've ever undertaken in terms of trying to balance the interests of all Albertans and provide effective representation. I guess that's the aspect that I come from: the first consideration must be effective representation, and I think the right to vote is also the right to effective representation. Effective representation to me means the ability of an MLA to be available to the people and the ability of constituents to talk to their MLA on a face-to-face basis certainly on occasion and often if necessary. I think time and distance are a key factor. When your MLA is in Edmonton you can certainly contact him by phone. Some people said that because of faxes and phones, time and distance didn't mean anything. Time and distance do mean something, because talking to someone on a phone – it's very easy to give a negative answer and not get the whole aspect of the situation. It's not the same at all as being there and talking to people on a face-to-face basis.

I don't think it's a question of rural/urban, and that's what it came down to a lot of times when we were talking about the right to vote

and the equality of the vote. It's not a rural/urban issue. It's the issue of density of population.

I remember sitting beside Neil Crawford at a policy conference one time – in fact it was before I was ever elected – and he said, "Well, how big's your constituency?" I said, "Three thousand some-odd square miles." I said, "How big's yours?" He said, "Oh, two square miles." Two square miles. I mean, anyone in that constituency could come to meet with their MLA on almost an ad hoc basis, because it's not a major distance factor in meeting with the MLA. Because of our names, Crawford and Cripps, I sat beside Neil quite often in caucus and at functions – we sat in alphabetical order – and we talked about the difference between representation. If I went to a meeting in one area of the constituency, it was maybe an hour and a half to another area of the constituency for the next meeting. So you're taking an hour and a half to get there, an hour for the meeting, an hour and a half back. We're talking about four and a half or five hours, whereas someone in a constituency that's two miles in area can maybe get to the next meeting in 15, 20 minutes. So your effective use of time is essentially very, very important.

Access to government is the second key factor. In Edmonton and Calgary there are major offices of every department of government, every department. There are head offices in either of the cities, and then there are branch offices all over the city. So access to government is not a problem to someone living in Edmonton and Calgary. Again your time and your distance is a factor. If you live in High Level and need to meet with someone in government or a department of government, it takes you all day to get to Edmonton to make that meeting, even if it's a one-hour meeting, and it takes you all night or all the next day to get back. The same if you live in Taber or Pincher Creek; it's a two-day or 24-hour day making that commitment to go to meet with somebody in government. So the access to government from someone who is in a rural constituency is often via their MLA, and I think many of these people pay long-distance phone calls to talk to someone in government. Mind you, the RITE numbers help considerably, but invariably when you phone, you get put on hold, and then you're transferred.

The next thing is the three communities of interest. In Alberta it seems to me that when you're looking at the overall electoral boundaries, there are essentially three communities of interest. There's Edmonton, Calgary, and the rest of Alberta. The reason I say that is because any one of those communities is self-contained. If you look at Edmonton, essentially the community of interest is self-contained, and in Calgary, again the community of interest is self-contained, but if you look at the community of interest of the rest of the province, they are totally dependent on outside influences and each other. Red Deer and Lethbridge and Grande Prairie are essentially urban ridings and urban centres, but their communities of interest are totally entwined with the surrounding communities. If you look at Lethbridge, for instance, they are dependent on and involved with the irrigation and what happens in southern Alberta to a large degree; the same with Medicine Hat, Red Deer. So their community of interest is broader than just the city because it isn't big enough to stand alone without the surrounding areas.

With electoral boundaries I think you have to look at those three communities of interest. Certainly when we met with people in the hearings, there was overwhelming opposition to infringing around Edmonton and Calgary on this community of interest. What surprised me was the fact that people in the cities and in the rural areas were equally afraid as well as opposed to being in this kind of constituency. They felt that their best interests could not be effectively represented. Even when they had an overwhelming majority – and I go back to the interim report: Chestermere, those people in the city of Calgary, had an overwhelming majority of the number of voters. The people within the city were as afraid of that

kind of mix as the people outside the city, and I believe it's because MLAs must be perceived to be able to present an unbiased or totally affirmative point of view in terms of their constituents. The people must be sure that their MLA isn't in a conflict of interest and doesn't have to sit on the fence. They want their position made to the government. Now, once that position is made, I believe they all expect the government to make a fair and just decision. It may not be a decision they like, but they want to know that their point of view was expressed effectively.

10:19

I think there was a responsibility of the commission to give you a report and to give you alternatives, something you could work with. That's why we tried so hard in the final report to provide some maps which give the committee and the Legislative Assembly some alternatives. I think we had discussions about whether you could make recommendations outside the legislation. I recognize that you have to live within the legislation, and that's why there were alternatives given which can be used either within the legislation or which give you a broad enough option to combine them and go beyond the legislation.

It's most unfortunate that the native communities were not included, and as I look at the census, again they are not. In the Ponoka-Rimbey constituency, for instance, I think there are about 10,000 people not counted. At least that was our figure in the hearings, and I believe it's probably fairly accurate: 10,000 people on the four bands reserve at Hobbema not counted. I think 700 of them are; I believe one band is counted.

I felt that you had to have reasonable choices. The ultimate decision responsibility lies with the Legislative Assembly, and I think a good look at the final report will give you some options that maybe you can work with.

I'd just like to look at the three communities of interest briefly in terms of a general outline. If you look at the Edmonton constituencies, you'll find that they vary 50 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which page are you on, please?

MRS. CRIPPS: Page 39. Yesterday I penned in the 1991 figures underneath. You've got Edmonton-Mill Woods at 55,886 and Edmonton-Norwood still at 24,016. So within that community of interest you have an incredible discrepancy in itself which must be addressed. I was actually surprised that the last time there was an Electoral Boundaries Commission was in 1984. Then the census came out in 1986, and you had discrepancies from 43,000 to 24,000, which surprised me. Actually, when Jean McBean and I worked on these Edmonton maps, we tried to get the constituencies to a fairly close ratio all the way through. If you look at pages 50 and 51, you'll find that the 1990 figures range on the 17 electoral map from 33,000 to 37,000 and on the 18 electoral division map from 33,000 to 35,907, which I believe, if you look at the 1991 census, will bring you very, very close to the average and will not vary very much, because we were using the latest information available. So our range on those maps is very close to a ratio of probably . . . Oh, I'm sorry; there's one at 30,000, Edmonton-Mill Woods North. The reason that Edmonton-Mill Woods North and Edmonton-Clareview are that low is because there's high growth since the 1990 census, and we would expect those to be on the high end. Edmonton-Mill Woods South is the same thing. Then go to Calgary, and you'll find the same thing is true of that community of interest.

The range is from 23,000 in 1986 to 25,000 in 1991 in Calgary-Elbow to 59,000 in Calgary-Fish Creek, which is probably a 110 or 120 percent difference between the two constituencies even within the city of Calgary. Therefore, if you're looking at equity in voter

populations, I think you have to look at that in context. The reason I say that I think you have to look particularly at those two voter populations in context is because they're a similar, homogeneous community of interest, even though people who live in north Calgary will say they're totally different from south Calgary. But the fact of the matter is that it's one total community of interest, so therefore the voters should have relative parity. There certainly shouldn't be constituencies, I would say, that are 110 percent higher than other constituencies within the city of Calgary. That's partially the reason that we recommended an extra seat for Calgary and an extra one for Edmonton in the final report; I did, at least, and Tom.

We felt that if you put that extra one in, you can come within – I think the average for Edmonton would be 34,263 or plus 14 percent in 1991 – that's 1991, not 1990 – which is 14.43 above. I think that given the density of population, the closeness to the Legislature, and the ease with which a constituent and an MLA can get together, that's certainly not unfair. In Calgary, at 20 it's 35,533, which is plus 18 percent above the average, and because it's farther from the capital, maybe there's room for consideration there of what you want to do. Certainly I don't think that would be something that an MLA couldn't handle, because again you've got a dense population.

If that were done, then in the rest of Alberta the average is 25,918, which is minus 13 percent on average. So your range is from plus 18 to minus 13.48, and I don't think, given the diversity of the province and the ability of an MLA to meet with their constituents and to represent their constituents, that's unfair.

10:29

If you look at the rest of the province, looking at page 43, I divided the province into areas because there seem some natural boundaries that affect representation. Southern Alberta is one area, and there are eight constituencies which would average 18,655. If you go to seven, as I had done – actually, one extra rural seat must go to Calgary according to the legislation – then you've got 20,155, but if you take 1991 figures, you're looking at 21,559. There actually was an increase in rural population in southern Alberta of about 4,000.

If you look at east-central Alberta, which is another area that I took as a major area, you have more of a problem because the population has decreased there from the last census. You've got eight constituencies again, some with vast areas.

Then if you go to west-central Alberta, you've got an increase in population. In 1991 they would average 27,591. I didn't work out the average, but that's probably about 10 percent below. Northern Alberta has 800 more than it had in 1986, and those are huge constituencies with high populations – the average is 27,342 – and huge areas.

Overall, I think you have to look at those three constituencies: Edmonton, Calgary, and the rest of Alberta. I think that relatively they should be as equal as possible, taking into consideration the distance from the Legislature and the numbers of communities that the MLAs have to meet with. I think if your native statistics are added into rural Alberta, then you'll probably take off at least 2 percentage points in terms of the difference between the rural and urban, because there are a lot of natives. Ponoka alone, I know, is 10,000. There are 2,500 in Banff-Cochrane that aren't included. I looked at the new statistics, and they're not in there either.

I wish you well in your deliberations. I know that it's a difficult job, having gone through it a couple of times. I guess my major concern is that people understand that representation has to be the key, and effective representation means access and ability to contact and meet with your MLA. You've heard over and over again that there are so many communities and so many community organizations to meet with in rural Alberta that it's almost a dog's

breakfast. The fact of the matter is that in Edmonton you have 17 MLAs who meet with one city council, maybe two hospital boards, two school boards, so you've got 17 people working on the same issues. In rural Alberta you've got one MLA who meets with five or six hospital boards and three or four counties and maybe four or five schools boards in a constituency, and each one of these school boards and counties has responsibilities directly dealing with the provincial government. Therefore, it's essential that they have access to their MLA, absolutely essential. While a school board that operates in Edmonton may say that they're smaller, with smaller numbers of pupils, and therefore don't have the same effect, the difference is that you've got 17 people working with two school boards in Edmonton, 17 people working on your problem as opposed to one working on the problems of five school boards. So it's a difficult situation.

I went back to the references in the B.C. court and in the Supreme Court, and effective representation seemed to me to be an acceptable key to the electoral boundary issue in both of those decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Shirley.
Questions or comments? Pat.

MRS. BLACK: Well, I appreciate your candid comments, Shirley. A lot of the ideas of the differences between communities are things that we as a committee had heard as we toured Alberta when we were on the first select committee. I think in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, with the representations that have come in now on the second Electoral Boundaries Committee, that feeling is still there.

I'm not too sure, Shirley, how you make people realize that there is a tremendous amount of difference that MLAs have to experience with representation within their own communities. I look at Calgary, at my own riding, which is a large riding. While I have a small geographical area, I have a high density of population with the variety of concerns that come with a large population. My riding, even within that community of interest, would be substantially different from the concerns of, say, Calgary-Millican or even Calgary-Buffer or Calgary-Mountain View, where it's an older, established community. Mine is a growing, growing, growing community with young families, et cetera, in there. Every riding is unique. I think your identification of the three communities of interest – like, there's no semblance of commonality between Edmonton and Calgary; I can tell you that.

MRS. CRIPPS: They keep telling us that.

MRS. BLACK: Well, there isn't. The interests, again, within the community are substantially different. So I think it's an interesting concept, with the three communities of interest. Certainly I know, being a city person, that the biggest rude awakening of my life, living all my life here in Alberta, was to travel that circuit and go out into rural Alberta and realize just how different the different areas of the province really are one from the other, even within the cities. So to me those communities of interests and recognizing them are fundamental to what you call effective representation. I couldn't agree with you more, but then to resolve it, the problem we have is also to try and bring some form of equity between voting powers within the ridings. That's the difficult part.

10:39

One of the things that I looked at when we first started on the first select committee, and you recognize it as well, is what a difference there was, say within the city of Calgary, between Calgary-Elbow and Calgary-North West or Calgary-Fish Creek. Clearly, you could see that in the centre of Calgary were the well-established

communities with very little growth potential and that the perimeter ridings were the massive growth ridings within Calgary. There really wasn't anyplace for the centre core ridings to grow. Certainly we've experienced tremendous growth in Calgary over the last five or six years, and again it's in the perimeter areas of the city.

I guess I'm wondering: did you think in your discussions that since there wouldn't necessarily be a growth factor coming into the centre of the riding, those centre ridings could logically be at the upper end of the variance, and you would leave the lower end of the city ridings at the lower end, as close to the mean as possible, to allow for the future growth within those ridings? It certainly would have a reverse difference from what you have now, where you would have the perimeter ridings at a lower percentage and the city centre ridings at a higher percentage to accommodate future growth. Did you get into that kind of a discussion?

MRS. CRIPPS: We certainly did, and we were much more able to do that in – I'm talking the final report now, the report that we worked on. This basically is the map that's in the final report, which is within the city boundaries, because of course the overlapping boundaries were totally . . .

MRS. BLACK: A disaster.

MRS. CRIPPS: . . . a disaster. Everybody that made a presentation, with the exception of about three people, was opposed to that.

So in Edmonton I think we effectively looked at Edmonton-Mill Woods North, Edmonton-Mill Woods South, and Edmonton-Willowdale, and those are at 30,000, 31,000, and 32,000, whereas some of them are at 34,000 and 35,000. For instance, in Edmonton-Glenora and Edmonton-Gold Bar we went the absolute maximum in terms of 1986 statistics, because that's what we were governed by, the legislation which said we had to use the 1986 census. So we went the absolute maximum in the 1986 census, but if you look at the 1990 figures, they're back down to 17 and 9 percent respectively, because the population is stable and you couldn't go any further. Actually, the population in Edmonton-Gold Bar I believe is dropping and maybe in Edmonton-Glenora too, so the population's actually going down in the centre of the city. There was an argument made that a couple of the city centre ridings in both Calgary and Edmonton – Edmonton-Highlands I think is one, and I'm trying to think which one it was in Calgary; maybe Calgary-Currie or Calgary-Buffer. Calgary-Buffer, probably, has a difficult population in the city centre core, so we left that a little bit lower. Those kinds of considerations were made.

In Calgary, with the 19 electoral divisions, it was pretty tough to make the kind of differentiations we felt were important. You'll note that only the 1986 statistics are available, and Calgary-Shaw, for instance, is minus 3.69, but we know that Calgary-Shaw in 1990 is much, much higher than that. It probably would exceed the limit. I'm not sure, because we didn't have those statistics and didn't have time to go into them.

If you look at the 20 electoral divisions, you'll see that Calgary-Lake Bonaville, Calgary-Bow, and Calgary-McCall are quite low. The reason is that we know that there was quite a bit of expansion in there between '90 and '91, if I remember right. We tried to put Calgary-Forest Lawn, the centre ones that weren't growing . . . Calgary-Egmont, for instance, I think is – where are we? Calgary-Egmont: it's not even called that; they've changed the names. I'm not sure which one it is. I'd have to look at the map. The ones in the centre of the city – Calgary-Elbow right up there at 35,000 – there's no growth.

MRS. BLACK: There's no potential for growth.

MRS. CRIPPS: And no potential for growth. So it's right up there, whereas Calgary-Fish Creek in 1986 terms is way down at minus 5.66 but in 1990 terms was up at 17.75-plus.

Now, 1991 statistics would be even higher. If the Alberta Bureau of Statistics did the '91 figures for the old constituencies, if you're thinking about using these, you might want to have them do the maps that are here and see where we're at with those maps. Basically, they've got the right number of constituencies. A lot of work went on in developing them with Jean McBean and the staff at the Chief Electoral Office, getting the information that was available on where communities of interest lay and the latest figures that we had in terms of Calgary, which were the 1990 statistics.

MRS. BLACK: Of course, I'm sort of, if you'll bear with me, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MRS. BLACK: . . . looking at the two major urban centres. I've been looking at some of the distributions within the same boundaries, the municipal bodies.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, I looked at that too.

MRS. BLACK: I'm still baffled as to why the centre core wards would be the smallest wards within the city and the outlying or perimeter wards the large ones. It seems to be the reverse of what you would logically do to provide for the growth. I don't know if you had discussions with the municipal administrators as to why they would do that.

MRS. CRIPPS: We didn't, but we did look at the ward boundaries and found that even within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary they verge on the maximum 25 percent plus and minus.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. Well, here in Edmonton there's a 26 percent variance in their new ward boundaries.

MRS. CRIPPS: Plus 26 and minus 26 or total?

MRS. BLACK: No, no; 26 variance between the lows and the highs. The centre of the city has the lowest population.

MRS. CRIPPS: You're right. The growth is incredible in the outlying areas. We had a boundary drawn; I forget what we used. Anyway, when we got over to mapping, they said, "But this is going to be a major road." They'd checked with transportation, and this road in northwest Calgary is going to go right on up practically to Airdrie, it looks like. It's proposed. So he said that if we draw the boundary where you have got it, you'll cross this major road and you'll have this little point out. I said: "I don't care. There's no people, virtually, in the area now, so it doesn't matter where we put the boundary." So we put it up the proposed road allowance instead of up some creek, I think. Those kinds of things are in the planning and are happening and show the kind of future growth that's expected.

MRS. BLACK: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thanks, Pat.
Mike.

10:49

MR. CARDINAL: Yeah, just briefly. Shirley, throughout the public hearings you had, concerns kept coming up of some of the things we should consider when drawing boundaries. The idea of using trading patterns and municipal boundaries seems to be quite important. What do you think would be the priority of the two if you have an option, using trading patterns first or municipal boundaries?

MRS. CRIPPS: I think it came across quite clearly that municipal boundaries would be preferential to any other boundaries. I say that because most of the organizations that the MLAs deal with in the context of government services cross or are confined to municipal boundaries, particularly rurally I'm talking now, and that's what we attempted to do in our maps. If you take a look at the maps, you can see that the municipal boundaries are followed wherever possible. We talked about school boundaries; we talked about hospital boundaries. School boundaries generally are coterminous with municipal boundaries, so they're not a problem. Hospital boundaries cross municipal boundaries and sometimes cross three or four municipal boundaries. Their dealings are not generally with the public but the municipalities they serve.

I felt that the trading boundaries are really important in terms of access to an MLA. I know some of the MLAs have more than one office or something so that that access is available to the constituent, but in terms of government services your basic dealing with the MLA is on a municipal basis. Now, quite often there are many municipalities within the counties and MDs and IDs, and each one of them again has to deal with the MLA, but overall it seemed to me from the hearings that the municipal boundaries were the most acceptable form of boundary lines. It's not easy to draw on a map, but everybody knows where their municipal boundaries are and which municipality they reside in. So while it may be more difficult for mapping, once those boundaries are drawn, it's usually easy for the people to understand the constituency they're in. I found that you'll have a couple of miles of another county or MD. Those people don't usually relate to the MLA that's on the other side; they go to the MLA whose county or MD they're in. So I think the municipal boundaries are the most important, but access must be kept to communities of interest.

MR. CARDINAL: I have just one quick additional comment. Shirley, you mentioned that the Indian bands and other aboriginal people of course were not counted in the process, and you felt that it's quite important that they be included. I think, looking back now, you know our legislation definitely provided for the commission to be innovative, to look at including some of the ridings that have considerably lower standards of living, which are generally native communities, northern areas, and Indian reserves in southern Alberta. Out of the potential of having four constituencies of up to 50 percent variance, the commission came up with two, Chinook at minus 28.89 percent variance and Lesser Slave Lake-Athabasca at minus 25.38 percent, even though we allowed for four and we also allowed for them to go into up to 50 percent variance. I know you submitted in your independent report an outline showing an extra riding in northern Alberta, the Wood Buffalo riding, which I guess would really have no limit on what the variance would be. Is the reason behind it because the people continue to live in poverty in those areas and really need extra representation?

MRS. CRIPPS: I touched briefly on the north when I talked about the areas in the whole province that I divided the province into in terms of thinking of how you resolve this problem of equality throughout the province. I guess the most difficult aspect of this whole process, of course, is the shattering of current constituencies

and current boundaries. In my own mind I had to look at the whole province and see where the largest inequities were in terms of trying to resolve the problems with the least amount of disruption. I think that's a major factor that has to be considered. If you look at the principles that we developed, the first one was to make the least changes possible in terms of the constituencies. Therefore, you have to look at the whole problem and see where you've really got a problem.

MR. CARDINAL: So, Shirley, I guess what you would say, then, is that in the areas where we do have Indian reserves and Metis populations that are poor, you would think that making the ridings geographically a lot smaller for a period of time and trying to utilize the 50 percent variance would be something that should be considered seriously?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. When you go to northern Alberta, the ridings are a huge mass in area, and they also have fairly large populations, particularly Peace River and Fort McMurray. Initially, we talked about a northern riding, and we looked at the road systems, the access to the northern ridings, and decided that maybe it would work. After going to the hearings and looking at the whole issue again, Tom and I thought that if you're ever going to effectively develop the north – and it's a horrendous job to try and represent the north. I've talked to people up there who can't get over how effective Boomer Adair has been in his constituency in terms of getting out to Red Earth Creek and all of those little areas way up north. Boomer's not going to run again, and someone's going to have a huge pair of shoes to fill, literally and otherwise. It's a huge, massive area, so no matter how you try to represent that area, we felt that maybe a new constituency up there is warranted. Certainly anyone who's ever been up north, and anywhere in the rest of the province of Alberta, I don't think would have any qualms about recommending that.

The only area of question was Fort Chipewyan. Fort Chipewyan still wanted to be with Fort McMurray. The reason is that their access is to Fort McMurray. It doesn't matter where you put Fort Chipewyan, they have to go through Fort McMurray and go by air, and the air link is directly from Edmonton. It's Edmonton, Fort McMurray, Fort Chip, and back again. If my understanding is correct, it's on a daily basis or every-other-day basis.

MR. CARDINAL: Uh huh.

MRS. CRIPPS: Therefore, we felt that Fort Chip would get just as effective representation being with the rest of the north as it would with Fort McMurray; probably better because if someone has that whole north to contend with, they don't have to worry about the rest of the Peace Rivers and the Fort McMurrays who by their very size of population are going to demand a great deal of attention. So someone would have the time and commitment, I think, to effectively represent the whole north. We didn't actually look at the income of any areas, while we took into consideration that certainly there's a lot of unemployment and probably a need for more concentrated efforts in those areas.

10:59

MR. CARDINAL: Okay. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Shirley, the only question I'd have to ask is really a supplement to an answer you gave to Mike. I believe you said that it might be

more difficult for mapping to follow municipal lines than to do what they've traditionally done. Can you elaborate on that?

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, that was a contention that we followed in the first interim report, but when we actually got over to mapping, it was a snap because they have all of the county boundaries on their mapping. It was easy for them. When we drew it in and showed which lines were county lines, then all they had to do was pick it up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because they've got all that recorded now.

MRS. CRIPPS: All that recorded. Our mapping in the final report on the alternatives that we presented took much less time than we anticipated, and they were happy with the lines because they did have them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thanks very much.
Anything else, Pat or Mike?

MR. CARDINAL: No.

MRS. BLACK: I was just going to ask, Shirley. You talked in your opening comments about 10,000 natives . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Four bands.

MRS. BLACK: . . . four bands in Ponoka not being included in – was that the 1990 census or '91?

MRS. CRIPPS: There is no census.

MRS. BLACK: No, but is there a community of Ponoka census at all? Or you're just talking about the federal census?

MRS. CRIPPS: No. The 10,000 came from Roy Lewis, who made a presentation to us in terms of the overall hearings that we had.

MRS. BLACK: Are you aware of other bands?

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, yeah; I've got a whole list of them.

MRS. BLACK: Could you leave that?

MRS. CRIPPS: I may have to send it to you, because I may have to find it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for your information, in a brief yesterday Halvar Jonson gave us figures based on information he had obtained from Canada native affairs, which, according to Halvar, have been taking a monthly count on the reserves. They have figures: Ermineskin, 2,241; Samson, 4,283; and Montana, 573. In Louis Bull there was some question as to the accuracy, but it did have 1,112. That's 8,000.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. That's shy of the number.

MRS. CRIPPS: Shy of the number. If you look at page 49 of the report . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I saw that.

MRS. CRIPPS: . . . I've listed the bands that we knew at the time were missing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're working very hard to ensure that those native people who were not counted for census purposes for whatever reason are not missed. I'm sure part of our recommendation back to the Assembly will be that in addition to the recognized census figure there be some flexibility to count native Canadians who are counted by some other recognized means, whether it's Canadian native affairs or Municipal Affairs or some such process.

MRS. BLACK: I guess my comment was that this is unenumerated, and I was looking for full population on the natives.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh. See, that's the only thing we have to go by. That's what Roy Lewis told us when he was making his presentation.

MRS. BLACK: So that number logically would be quite a bit higher then?

MRS. CRIPPS: Actually, I think the number I used in my report is the last number that we have, which is the 1981 census.

MRS. BLACK: Oh, okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think that's the last number.

MRS. BLACK: There could be a substantial difference then.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, yes. I would imagine that there's a substantial difference.

The other comment I want to make is that I think that the principles we used in terms of developing the constituencies are worth thinking about overall. I think that those hold true no matter where you are in the province and will make for effective representation and minimal disturbance of the constituencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. It's obvious that you've put a great deal of effort into this. We appreciate it.

[The committee adjourned at 11:05 a.m.]