

**Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings
Edmonton****2:00 p.m.**

[Chairman: Chief Judge Edward R. Wachowich]

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, please be seated as we would like to start these hearings. I want to welcome you and to say good afternoon. I would also like to make a few introductory remarks.

My name is Edward Wachowich, and I am chairman of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'm also the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of Alberta. I feel certain that my other job in the court is much easier than my work with the commission. Hopefully, before this second round of hearings is concluded, I shall be able to decide which job is more difficult.

Let me introduce you to the other members of the commission. Robert Grbavac of Raymond, Alberta, is on my immediate left, Joe Lehan of Innisfail is on my immediate right, John McCarthy of Calgary is on my far right, and Wally Worth of Edmonton is on my far left. The five people you see before you make up the commission. I want to say that we are very happy to be here to receive your comments and your criticisms and to consider your thinking with respect to the proposals that we have made in our report, released in January.

Why are we here? The commission is here to listen to your comments on the proposals made with respect to the electoral boundaries in Alberta in our first report, which I believe received very wide circulation throughout the province of Alberta. The commission is charged by law to examine the areas, the boundaries, and the names of electoral divisions in Alberta and to make recommendations with respect to them.

As I have said, we made the preliminary recommendations in January. These recommendations were given wide publicity, and more than 3,000 copies of our report have been circulated throughout the province. We feel that on the second round of hearings we need only listen to your reactions, evaluate your comments and critiques, and move on to our final conclusion with respect to our mandate.

I want to assure you that every member of the commission has reviewed the law and the literature which has been recently written concerning electoral boundaries in Alberta. I want to tell you that we have reached preliminary conclusions with respect to our mandate, but I also want to tell you that our minds are not closed, nor have we reached any final conclusion. Every member of this commission has given these matters a lot of thought, and in reviewing the law, the work of previous commissions and committees which have studied boundaries in Alberta and in reviewing what the courts have said about electoral boundaries in the province of Alberta and in Canada, we've attempted to craft a preliminary proposal that will assure that all of the citizens of Alberta and all of the regions of Alberta are adequately represented in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

In order to put our second round of hearings in perspective, I want to present a brief summary of the electoral boundaries law. One, our function is to review the existing electoral boundaries and to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly about the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions in Alberta.

Two, we have a very limited time to accomplish this task. We submitted a report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in late January and must now, after a second round of public hearings, submit our concluding report to the Speaker before the end of June of this year.

Three, as I have said, the commission is required to hold two sets of public hearings. The first set of hearings was completed last year in November. This second set of hearings will be completed in April of this year, and after we have considered the input from the hearings, we will craft our final report for submission to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Four, we are required to hold public hearings to enable representations to be made to us by any person or organization in Alberta about the area, the boundaries, and the names of electoral divisions that we have set out in our first report. I believe we have given reasonable notice of the times and places for this second round of hearings.

Five, the commission has the power to change its mind with respect to its preliminary proposal. When the second round of hearings is completed, we will also complete our deliberations and lay before the Speaker our final proposals with respect to electoral boundaries. The Speaker shall make the report public. It shall be published in the *Alberta Gazette*.

Six, if more than one report is submitted from among the members of the commission, the report of the majority is the report of the commission, but if there is no majority, my report, or the report of the chair, shall be the report of the commission.

Seven, the final report of the commission is then laid at the earliest opportunity before the Legislative Assembly, immediately if it is then sitting or within seven days after the beginning of the next sitting.

Eight, then it is up to the Legislative Assembly by resolution to approve or to approve with alterations the proposals of the commission and to introduce a Bill to establish new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution. This law would then come into force when proclaimed before the holding of the next general election.

Population rules. Population means the most recent populations set out in the most recent decennial census of the population of Alberta as provided by Statistics Canada. We are also required to add the population of Indian reserves that were not included in the census as provided by the federal department of Indian and northern affairs. But if the commission believes there is another provincewide census more recent than the decennial census compiled by Statistics Canada which provides the population for the proposed electoral divisions, then the commission may use this data.

Number of electoral divisions. The second rule is that the commission is required to divide Alberta into 83 proposed electoral divisions. The commission may take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but it must and shall take into consideration the following.

Relevant considerations: one, the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; two, sparsity and density of population; three, common community interests and community organizations including those of Indian reserves and Métis settlements; four, whenever possible existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary; five, the existing municipal boundaries; six, the number of municipalities and other local authorities; seven, geographical features including existing road systems; eight, the desirability of

understandable and clear boundaries.

Population of electoral divisions. The population rule is that a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 percent above or below the average population for all 83 electoral divisions. There is an exception to the 25 percent rule. In the case of not more than four proposed electoral divisions, the commission may have a population that is as much as 50 percent below the average population of the electoral divisions in Alberta if three of the following five criteria are met: one, the area exceeds 20,000 square kilometres or the surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15,000 square kilometres; two, the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of any proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres; three, there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people; four, the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Métis settlement; five, the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the province of Alberta.

Crowsnest Pass. For our purposes the boundaries Act instructs us that the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town.

This is a very general overview of the legislation, but we must also turn to the guidance that has been provided by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Supreme Court of Alberta. The commission wishes to note that many persons may not agree with our interpretation of these decisions. Be that as it may, we are certainly prepared to hear argument on the various points and to reconsider our position.

What have the Supreme Courts said? The Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal have agreed that the right to vote under the Charter includes, one, the right to vote; two, the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; three, the right to effective representation; four, the right to have the parity of the votes of others diluted but not unduly in order to gain effective representation or as a matter of practical necessity.

The rulings of the Supreme Courts as well as the electoral boundaries Act must guide our decisions and ultimately the proposals that we make to the Legislature.

Our focus. The commission clearly stated in its report that it wishes to merge a number of rural electoral divisions and to add one electoral division to Calgary and one electoral division to Edmonton. We invite you to comment on these proposals in their particulars. We have put before the people of Alberta our preliminary conclusions with respect to this matter. We have not reached any final conclusions.

The commission now wishes to hear the views of Albertans with respect to our first report and the focus I have described. Please let me assure you that our deliberations are preliminary at this point and that no final conclusions have been reached. The commission shall not move to the consideration of final proposals without the benefit of input from individuals and organizations in Alberta. Indeed, this is the whole purpose of the second round of public hearings.

I also want to say that without public input the work of the commission will be seriously impaired. We want to hear the arguments and reasoning of all organizations and individuals in Alberta with respect to the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions.

I now call upon the first presenter, who is Mr. Albert Opstad.

2:10

MR. OPSTAD: Thanks very much. It's nice to meet with you again. I was near one of the first speakers last time, and here I am again, and here you are.

I just wanted to mention my credentials, whatever they are. I come here as an individual, but I am also the past president of the Confederation of Regions Party of Alberta, so I have a little bit of knowledge of the goings-on. I've prepared a written presentation there, which I believe you may have gotten copies of just today.

I'm glad that I listened to all that you had to say. You've obviously got a lot of rules there to comply with and weighting factors to consider. You indicated that your minds were not closed, and that's good. That gives me an option, I hope.

I'll just go along here with what I've written for now. As I've indicated, thank you to you, the members of the commission, for agreeing to listen to me today and also to members of the chief electoral office, other presenters, and the general public who have come here to listen. My presentation is in the form of two parts. Part 1 deals with the number of Members of the Legislative Assembly, and part 2 deals with constituency boundaries. I'm presenting mainly concepts here.

In your report I commend you for mentioning the focus on the reduction of the number of members presently comprising the Legislative Assembly of Alberta even though the issue was entirely out of your commission's mandate. A reduction here is necessary, at least in my opinion, because we have entirely too much bureaucracy and too much duplication of government. We must have increased governmental efficiency.

As an example, let us take an overall look at Canada as it is with 10 provinces. This means that in every area of provincial jurisdiction where the provinces need to make their own laws, we are making 10 separate laws, all being very similar except for some differences. We have 10 laws for education, as an example. At least, I assume we have pretty close to that. If we merge the 10 provinces down into four, then we would require only four laws, thus reducing duplication. We want to reduce interprovincial barriers to trade – and we've heard about that in the news many times – and duplication of provincial laws are of the nature of provincial barriers, because you get all these duplicate things to read about. We want much more universality. This is the reason that the federal government frequently gets into provincial matters and passes laws. We've heard that in education, health, and all sorts of things because of the excessive duplication now existing. In line with what I have said, I recommend a reduction in the number of Members of the Legislative Assembly to 65 from the present 83. This will to a certain extent lobby the government in the direction of less duplication and to work more co-operatively with other provincial governments.

Now to part 2. Here, as I've said before, I also commend you for proposing changes that in my opinion are in the right direction, but I would recommend you go further. I recommend that boundaries be strictly on the basis of a random tolerance of plus or minus 5 percent. This is what I recommended before. We must not only be equal before the law but we must be equal in lawmaking, and for this reason we need a small tolerance.

Although I've recommended that the number of electoral divisions be reduced to 65, I will discuss my concepts at the level of the 83 of your mandate – so we're talking of apples to apples – the mandate that you were required to maintain. You chose to reduce some areas by two and to take these two seats to increase the Edmonton and Calgary ones by the amount of two, being one more to Edmonton

and one more to Calgary, as you've stated. Here I recommend that you reduce others by five and give two more to Edmonton instead of the present one proposed and three more to Calgary instead of the present one you have proposed. If you do not wish to go this far, at least at this time you may go to four, but in that four I'm suggesting you give Calgary only the two more and still stick with two more for Edmonton. There's another factor to be taken into consideration. Urban areas are growing much faster than rural areas, and so an extra amount could be credited to urban areas to allow for this.

I again commend you for what you've done so far, but I suggest that it is only a very good start – I don't want to say that negatively; I'm saying it positively – and that you go to two more for Edmonton instead of the present one as you propose, as an example, and more towards three more for Calgary instead of your present one.

Thank you for having listened attentively to me to this end, and with that I conclude. If you have any . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Opstad, I'll just ask the commission members whether they have any questions of you. We'll start on the right.

MR. McCARTHY: No questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank you for coming. I think you agree that we should have given Edmonton and Calgary one each at least, but you'd like to see us do a little more.

MR. OPSTAD: Absolutely. One hundred percent.
Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next presenter is Professor Ron Fritz.

2:20

MR. FRITZ: I'd like to start off by thanking the commission for agreeing to hear me today. For those who are not members of the commission, I should state that I'm not a resident of Alberta; I am a resident of Saskatchewan. My research interests for the last five years, at least, have been in the area of the constitutional requirements with respect to drawing of electoral boundaries. My comments today are directed simply to the requirements as they were enunciated in the Supreme Court of Canada decision and also the two decisions of the Alberta Court of Appeal.

You have had a copy of my submission for a little over a month, so I'm not going to do more than just highlight elements in this submission. I think it would be more worth while, if you have any questions, that we address the questions.

The basic thrust of my submission is that it is my view that if the commission goes forward with these recommended boundaries and they are implemented by the Alberta Legislature, they would be unlikely to pass constitutional muster before the Alberta Court of Appeal. Just to take you through my paper very quickly, I believe the commission has operated with what I might consider to be several fundamental errors in how they are reading the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal.

The first concern that I have. I must say that the way in which I believe the commission has read the decisions is one which a number have done, primarily politicians, where they seem to be breaking up the issue of parity of voting power as being something separate and distinct from effective representation, which the Supreme Court of Canada has said is a Charter-protected right. The difficulty is that you have to recognize that legislators have two functions. They have a legislative function, and they have what is described as an ombuds function. What happens is that many tend to allocate the parity of voting power issue to the legislative function and the concept of effective representation to the ombuds function. But as I point out in my submission on page 2, Justice McLachlin made it very clear that parity of voting power is of prime importance in terms of the concept of effective representation.

Since writing this submission, I have had the opportunity to reread Justice McLachlin's decision in the Dixon case, where she explains more clearly why parity of voting power is so important in terms of the concept of effective representation. If you want to have me pursue that, I can do that a little bit later, but I suggest to you that her judgment in the Dixon case has a lot of the same elements that she developed in the Supreme Court of Canada decision when she was dealing with the matter after her elevation to the Supreme Court.

The question that you really have to ask yourself is: if you look at members of the public, what is it that they look for in a representative? For most, it is the legislative role that MLAs perform. It is not so much the ombuds role, because very few people – if you look at the number of people who cast votes and the number of people who actually contact their MLA, there's a significant disparity between the two. People cast ballots but not many people actually turn to their representatives in the ombuds function.

The other concern that I had related to what I perceived in the commission's interim report as suggesting that it is to be the urban areas solely who are to experience the dilution of voting power. I believe that is an unfortunate statement on behalf of the commission, because I believe that one could justify rural constituencies being above the electoral quotient, depending upon the circumstances.

I know from my own experience, having drawn electoral boundaries in the province of Saskatchewan at the federal level, that we created a number of primarily rural constituencies above the electoral quotient because we have a particular problem in Saskatchewan, and that is to say the rural depopulation that has been taking place since the Depression and unfortunately continues to this day. We did so with the recognition that probably by the first time they're used, the rural constituencies would be at the quotient or close to the quotient, and clearly by the end of the period during which the new boundaries would be in place, they would likely be at or below the electoral quotient.

The next thing that I want to turn to is the attempt by the commission to develop their matrix relating to the difficulty of representing various areas in the province. I had a number of criticisms with respect to the matrix that you developed. The first is that it makes population simply one factor of 10 and apparently an equal factor, and it didn't seem to me that that accorded with the requirements of the Supreme Court of Canada decision, which indicated that parity of voting power is of prime importance.

My second criticism related to the criteria from the perspective that the criteria you adopted were criteria that have been used over the years to justify overrepresentation of rural constituencies. The job of a representative of an urban constituency I would suggest is a different task than what many MLAs and MPs of rural

constituencies have to perform. The urban MLAs and MPs are often faced with individuals who often have recourse to governmental bodies that are in the bureaucracy; I would suggest on an individual basis much more so than residents of rural constituencies. These include the aged, the handicapped, immigrants, single-parent families, and so on. The job of the urban MLA is a different job than that of the rural MLA.

In my paper I do refer to the only study that I've been able to come across in Canada that attempted to measure the workload. Now, this is federal MPs, from the perspective of workload and their representation obligations. I'll just take you to page 5, at the top, which is the conclusion that Alan Frizzell came to as a result of his study. That is:

There is little, if anything, in the survey results, to suggest that the sparsely populated areas require overrepresentation to be effectively serviced. In fact, it could be argued, given these results, that the urban constituents are the ones who suffer a lesser level of service from their members.

2:30

The last criticism I had related to the relevance of a number of the criteria. I raised questions about a number of them. I'm not sure that I do find many of them relevant to the determination as to what is necessary to ensure effective representation. I would suggest to you that in the province of Alberta it would likely be difficult to justify on the basis of the ombudsman function deviations from the electoral quotient in areas at least south of the Yellowhead. It's a bit ironic when you look at what federal MPs of Alberta have to service. The constituency that has the lowest population in the new electoral boundaries for Alberta has over 79,000 residents. If an MP can be said to be servicing that area effectively – I don't think there's any question that the MP is going to be able to effectively represent that area – it becomes a little bit hard to justify in my mind deviations on service grounds for rural constituencies in the province of Alberta when you're talking about an electoral quotient a little more than one-third of the electoral quotient for the federal constituencies.

Another observation that I would make – and I can embellish a bit upon something I said on page 5 of my submission – is that electoral boundaries were redrawn provincially in the province of Saskatchewan. Under the provincial legislation the commission was constrained by a plus or minus 5 percent deviation, but one has to recognize that they had discretion within that plus or minus 5 percent. This is for the southern constituencies. There are two northern constituencies that fall outside that constraint. They brought in 45 of the 56 southern constituencies within plus or minus 1 percent. In terms of servicing, I would suggest that there probably is little justification for deviations to the extent that one finds in your interim report for rural constituencies at least to the south of the Yellowhead, and you can probably carry that line up farther north.

The next part of my paper relates to the balance between the representation of urban and rural residents. I don't intend to say too much about that. I'll leave that for your reading. Just let me say that as an outsider I really have some concerns about the number of additional seats allocated to the city of Calgary. I think that is probably the most vulnerable part of your report, from a constitutional perspective.

The next part deals with the pace of change. I believe that you are misreading the second decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal where you seem to be suggesting that the courts are in effect approving of a go-slow process in moving towards a greater equality in the number of electors in each of the constituencies. As I point

out on page 8 – I've got a lengthy quote there – the Court of Appeal makes it very clear that this was really a justification that they gave themselves for not overturning the boundaries in the first referenced case. I'll just read the passage that I highlighted in that lengthy quote.

We accepted that reasoning, but only as a reason for judicial restraint in the face of error, not as a valid consideration for a boundary-writer.

As I say, I've quoted a passage from your interim report that seems to suggest that you view it as being mandated by the Court of Appeal, and I would suggest otherwise.

The last aspect in this part relates to some dicta that you refer to in the Alberta Court of Appeal decision in 1994 and your unwillingness to move significantly in that direction. I believe, by way of conclusion, that the patience of the Court of Appeal is running out and that the proposals that I see in the interim report, in my view, if implemented, will simply spawn further litigation and that the patience of the Court of Appeal has run out. I don't believe you have done enough to meet the expectations of the Court of Appeal.

It's unfortunate that the issue isn't laid to rest. This is a problem that has been festering in this province – I would like to say only in the last decade, but I think it goes back much farther. Part of the problem relates to a constraint that was imposed way back in the '60s on Alberta electoral boundaries commissions which divided the province into urban seats and rural seats. You are the only province that has that in your legislation. You do not have it now. That is not a constraint that you are faced with in carrying out your function. I think it had the unfortunate effect of creating ill will and animosity between urban and rural voters.

I could say as someone who has lived in a mixed riding at the federal level for a number of years – when I first moved to Saskatchewan in 1974, I was in the constituency of Saskatoon-Biggar; I am now in the constituency of Saskatoon-Humboldt – there's an assumption, it seems, from this province that MLAs cannot represent both interests. That has not been my experience, nor has it been my experience that if you have mixed ridings, you will necessarily have representatives from the urban part of the constituency. When I went to Saskatoon, as I said, I was in Saskatoon-Biggar, and it was represented by an individual who was a rural resident. In the last election my residence in Saskatoon-Humboldt likewise was represented by a rural resident. I think the tensions that are said to exist in Alberta are probably overblown, and the fears that some residents of Alberta seem to have in my view are quite unfounded. I think that MLAs can balance their representational roles and the representational needs of constituents, be they urban or rural and be they in the same constituency.

So I would close with this plea. As I say, let's put the issue to rest in Alberta. I don't believe that if you go forward with your recommendations, you will put it to rest. You simply will be inviting further litigation if you continue in this direction and the Legislature adopts what you are proposing.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fritz.

We'll start the questioning with Dr. Worth, Wally Worth.

MR. WORTH: Professor Fritz, I very much value your critique of our conceptual model and of the matrix that it's spawned. I wonder if you would care to move from the critique side to providing us with

perhaps some suggestions or at least your point of view with respect to a couple of things. You have suggested to us that our matrix or our model undervalues population. So if you were going to adjust that matrix in some way, what kind of weighting would you suggest we apply to population? That's question one.

2:40

MR. FRITZ: I would start off by saying that I view the drawing of boundaries as an art and not a science, so I don't garner a great deal of enthusiasm for the approach that you took. If you, however, are asking me if I subscribe to your approach, I would have to ask: how many criteria are you going to include in your matrix? I would have to think that at least 30 percent weighting – at least – to population if you're going to go with anywhere near 10. I could leave it at that. I think you're going to go on to perhaps what other would you put in the matrix, but I'll leave it at that.

MR. WORTH: That is the next series of questions. You also, I think, suggested to us that the matrix overvalues, if you like, activities or factors that relate to the ombudsman function, and you pointed out that very many of the urban conditions such as cultural diversity, mobility of population, and things of that sort were not taken account of. Again, if you subscribe to our approach, could you suggest some indicators we might use or some factors we might use to get at the urban condition?

MR. FRITZ: In my paper I refer to Graham Price's submission to the commission. I said I didn't have a copy of it. I have since talked to Graham about the nature of the submission, and he indicated that it was simply the material that was put forth to the Alberta Court of Appeal in the second reference case. I'm not sure if you're aware of who was responsible for developing that material, but it was Professor Dale Gibson here at the University of Alberta law school who did the work. You are familiar with the materials that were submitted. I would work a lot of those criteria into your matrix. If that's the direction you want to go, they are quantifiable. There were, you know, extensive tables that were developed by Professor Gibson for the purposes of argument in that particular reference case. I mean, I would simply say that I would subscribe to inclusion of a lot of those in the matrix, and I would drop, I was going to say, a number that you have included. I really have difficulty fathoming the relevance of a number of them.

MR. WORTH: Thank you.

MR. GRBAVAC: Professor, just one comment. In my reading of the Alberta Court of Appeal's ruling, certainly there was a reference to incremental change. I wonder if that would tend to skew your point of view with respect to a successful court challenge in opposition to what it is we're trying to do and that we have recognized that small and incremental change is a desirable approach to resolving this problem.

MR. FRITZ: Well, as I say, I believe that you are grossly misreading the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal. I mean, I've read the sentence to you, and I can read it to you again. They do not believe that is a relevant consideration for those who draw electoral boundaries. They could not have said it any plainer. You are reading it in a way which I think flies in the face of the actual words used by the Court of Appeal.

MR. GRBAVAC: Could you be specific?

MR. FRITZ: Well, you'll find it on page 8 of my submission.

MR. GRBAVAC: It's obvious that we have a different interpretation.

MR. FRITZ: Well, you can call it interpretation, but I would suggest that the language of the passage is clear. If you want me to read it again:

We accepted that reasoning, but only as a reason for judicial restraint in the face of error, not as a valid consideration for a boundary-writer. We saw "gradual . . ."

Okay? But that was in terms of the way in which the court was wanting to defer to the provincial Legislature.

There's no question that in this area the courts are going to be loath to interfere more than is necessary in an issue which is so politically charged as this one is. We have seen in this country that the electoral boundaries in British Columbia were struck down by the B.C. Supreme Court. The electoral boundaries in Prince Edward Island were struck down by the Prince Edward Island Supreme Court. The Court of Appeal in Alberta has been attempting to prod the development towards a more equal allocation of seats and closer to the electoral quotient, but it's my view in reading their judgment that their patience has run out.

If you just pick up at the bottom of that quoted material there:

In the result, we again have decided to withhold any Charter condemnation. We do, however, wish to say more precisely what we meant by "gradual and steady" change. We think that a new and proper review is essential before the constitutional mandate of the present government expires, and, we hope, before the next general election.

And in picking up above that, they recognize that "massive surgery" is necessary in the context of the concept of effective representation in this province. So you can say that it's interpretation. I think it's better to put it in terms of: who has the better crystal ball? Whether you have a better crystal ball or I have a better crystal ball, what's in the mind of the Court of Appeal if they are faced with a third case on this matter? My sense is that they have reached the end of the road on this matter, but you may disagree.

MR. GRBAVAC: Thank you.

MR. LEHANE: Professor Fritz, I want to thank you for your paper, which you sent us some time ago, and your attendance today. Any analysis and submission to this commission of course is a source to us in terms of improving our report and the methodology that we use. But your critical analysis to some extent concerns me because it makes me think that perhaps some of the deliberations and thinking of this commission haven't been communicated as clearly as they may have been in terms of the report. I guess in particular I have some problem with your position that we haven't recognized that parity of voting is of prime importance in determining electoral boundaries. I think this commission has recognized that parity of voting is of prime importance in determining those boundaries and that the matrix we created was an attempt – and one of the first attempts, I might add – to quantitatively determine and measure what variances could be justified from the parity of voting.

To move strictly to the matrix and the various elements of the matrix and then indicate that that is indicative of ignoring the fact that parity of voting is of prime importance I think is not a proper

interpretation.

2:50

MR. FRITZ: Well, excuse me. Would you suggest a matrix that has population as one of 10 equal factors as recognizing as prime importance?

MR. LEHANE: Well, it depends how you interpret those factors, you know, and I don't want to get into the debate about whether sparsity and density is a population element or geography is either.

MR. FRITZ: Okay.

MR. LEHANE: Leaving that aside for the moment, the point I'm making is this: that matrix is a second step after the recognition of and prime importance of the parity. What we're saying is that the court has indicated to us that the Charter guarantees effective representation, and to have effective representation will require that there be some variance from parity of voting power. So to determine when that's justified, we've attempted to create a methodology to do that, but that in no way reduces our recognition of the prime importance of parity of voting.

MR. FRITZ: Well, you said yourself just a second ago that you had the matrix as a second step. My position would be that there is only one step, that the matrix in terms of effective representation must include, if you're going in that direction, a significant component of census population. You just do not have it. It is one of 10, and I'm sorry, but that does not strike me as giving it the kind of weight that Justice McLachlin was suggesting in the Saskatchewan reference case.

I could read you the part of her judgment in the Dixon case from British Columbia which I would suggest puts her position in an even clearer way as to why they are one issue and not two.

MR. LEHANE: Well, sir, I think the commission is quite familiar with Justice McLachlin's decisions, and as indicated earlier, perhaps our interpretation of those decisions is somewhat different.

I think we'll leave that for now. I'd like to indicate to you as well that in the 17 communities in which we held public hearings in the first round, we had over 200 presenters and over 250 written submissions. Your observation that people casting ballots is the most significant political interaction is certainly not what we heard. Your indication that few turn to an MLA in an ombudsman role is probably completely the opposite of what we heard throughout those hearings. And I think in terms of our matrix and in terms of recognizing what's required for effective representation, the presentations made at those hearings had a significant influence. I'll just pass that along to you. That's all my comments here.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: Yes, I have a couple of comments here. You've indicated at page 8 of your submission, you've read that final paragraph, and I just want to go through that with you again. The court said as follows in its concluding remarks:

In the result, we again have decided to withhold any Charter condemnation. We do, however, wish to say more precisely what we meant by "gradual and steady" change. We think that a new and proper review is essential before the constitutional mandate of the present government expires, and, we hope, before the next general

election. We reject any suggestion that the present divisions may rest until after the 2001 census.

Now, Professor, I take it we could agree that a new review is now under way.

MR. FRITZ: Certainly.

MR. McCARTHY: And it's before the next general election.

MR. FRITZ: Certainly.

MR. McCARTHY: And there is no proposal that the divisions rest until after the 2001 census, because we're proposing change. We can agree at least on that much.

MR. FRITZ: Oh, yes.

MR. McCARTHY: Now, the question is: what do they mean by "gradual and steady" change? I think your view is that it's going to have to be more significant than what we've proposed. I just wonder if . . .

MR. FRITZ: Excuse me. If I might add – I mean, you've recognized yourself that the Court of Appeal had suggested significantly more seats for Edmonton and Calgary than you yourself are allocating to them. I think they've given some indication as to what they thought was a reasonable allocation, and you fall far short of that.

MR. McCARTHY: No, we didn't fall far short of it. Far short?

MR. FRITZ: No. Fell short of it; that's fine.

MR. McCARTHY: Fell short. That's what I wanted to discuss with you. I think the Court of Appeal does give some specific comment, and that's at the seventh paragraph of its judgment. They set out a table where it showed 38 seats for Calgary and Edmonton and 41 elsewhere. In looking at those two numbers, the court said:

A more equal distribution for 1992 would have reversed the distribution, and offered 41 seats to Edmonton and Calgary and 38 to the remainder of the province.

So it appears to me that they weren't as extreme as you might want to suggest.

MR. FRITZ: Well, no. But you also have to recognize that there were four special constituencies in their totals and you're only allocating two, so I would suggest further that the number would be a greater digression because it was put in the context of four special constituencies and not the two that you are operating with within your own proposals.

MR. McCARTHY: My point was that what our proposal indicates is 40; the court suggested 41 for the cities. But you're saying in the context of four special constituencies.

MR. FRITZ: That's right.

The other aspect you have to recognize as well is that the issue is a moving target. It is my belief that most electoral boundaries commissions are not paying enough attention to the issue of rate of growth. They tend to focus on a point in time. I would suggest to you that the comments made by the Court of Appeal are cast in

terms of the population numbers that they were aware of; that is to say, 1991. You have become aware of more current numbers. You can actually plot what that growth has been between 1991 and the federal census, and some numbers you have from 1995 in a number of localities. You could see where that growth is taking place. I think you should recognize within the drawing of your boundaries that concept of rate of growth.

One of the points I made in terms of the criteria you identified was that you didn't identify rate of growth as one of the criteria in the Supreme Court of Canada decision, yet it is one that Justice McLachlin did identify as something that should be taken into account in drawing electoral boundaries. So, yes, you have to put the comments in the context of the population numbers that the Court of Appeal was dealing with at the time, but you've got a more current set of numbers.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Professor Fritz, I want to thank you for coming, for your learned dissertation. It's obvious you've had quite a bit of experience in this field, and we thank you for imparting your knowledge in this limited time.

We are aware of the fact that our matrix has some problems, because we've been discussing them. You're saying population is one factor, and I think somebody is going to come here today and tell us that three factors are population and that we're giving too much credit to population in this matrix. So that just gives you an idea of the conflicting views we can get. I think they're going to say that density of the area is another way of referring to population and things like this.

I just want to assure you that in Alberta we have quite a few constituencies that are rural and urban that are working very well, but we seem to have a problem between rural and urban when it comes to Edmonton and Calgary versus the people around Edmonton and Calgary.

Thanks for coming.

3:00

MR. FRITZ: You're welcome. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter listed is Ken Robb, and I'm told that he may not be here. He's not here?

We'll then call upon Frans Slatter to make her presentation, which I think . . . [interjection] Or his. Sorry; I mistook you.

MR. SLATTER: That's happened before, sir. I've been on a number of women's curling teams in my time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry about that, but go ahead.

MR. SLATTER: Thank you very much for this opportunity to address you, commissioners. I'm appearing on behalf of the Edmonton-Glenora Progressive Conservative Association, which is a constituency association in the city of Edmonton. The constituency association struck a small committee to discuss boundary issues, and then the entire board adopted some submissions we'd like to make to you.

First of all, the association would like to thank all the commissioners for all the hard work that's obviously gone into this exercise. I'm sure there are moments when you wonder why you accepted the assignment, but notwithstanding that we all may snipe

at your recommendations, we do appreciate your hard work.

The association would like to confine its comments to two points. The first point has to do with the urban/rural split, about which I'm sure you've heard a great deal. There has long been an imbalance between the urban and the rural voters in the province, and the constituency association strongly believes that we should be moving towards greater equality. We note that you have added an extra seat in Calgary and Edmonton, and we fully support that move. We do note that in order to get a total parity, you would have had to have three more seats in Calgary and two more in Edmonton, but in light of the policy of slow and gradual change towards better boundaries, our association is prepared to support the recommendation that there be one new seat for Calgary and one for Edmonton. We are aware that there are some constituencies that do not support any change. We would suggest to you that given the findings of the Court of Appeal and the kind of guidance they have given and also the constitutional imperatives that face us, the status quo is not an option. I think you have to move towards more urban representation, and we would submit that you should not back away from your recommendation to create more urban seats.

The second item we'd like to address is the particular changes that were made to the Edmonton-Glenora constituency. The Edmonton-Glenora constituency has existed in its present configuration since at least 1967. At that time it was called Edmonton West. In 1971 it was called Edmonton-Glenora, and it has been Edmonton-Glenora ever since. The basic configuration whereby it sort of wraps around that curve in the river has been the same throughout. There have been slight variations on the east and west sides, a little bit of tinkering here and there, but by and large we have almost 30 years of tradition with those approximate boundaries.

Our association was quite distressed to see that the commission is recommending some radical surgery on that constituency. Over the years we have developed a strong sense of community. We have formed many good friendships and political alliances within our constituency, and quite frankly we are very disturbed that that might be coming to an end. We would accordingly ask you in your final report to abandon your recommendation that the Edmonton-Glenora constituency be carved up. We understand that our Liberal friends in Edmonton-Glenora share our opposition to this solution. We also understand that those in the university area are opposed to being severed from their traditional links to the Strathcona area. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of anybody who finds favour with this new proposal, and we would respectfully submit that if nobody likes it, there's probably something wrong with it. We would accordingly ask that the commission go back to the more traditional Edmonton-Glenora boundaries.

Now, that will obviously require juggling of the whole north and indeed south side of the river, and that is unfortunate. It will create some work. But it's our submission that if you look at the northeast of the city, those constituencies tend to be a little bigger than they should be. We would submit that you should create a new riding in the northeast to balance those ones out a bit more and spread the change down through the north side of the city so that the Edmonton-Glenora constituency will be roughly the same, although it will be a bit smaller, of course, because there's a new seat.

We have had some experience with cross-river constituencies. One of the city wards crosses the river, and indeed the federal riding that includes much of Glenora crosses the river. Those of our directors and members who have been involved in elections in those political divisions have reported that they are quite unsatisfactory.

It's almost like you're running two campaigns, one north of the river and one south. It seems like for some reason there's always one side of the river that ends up dominating the constituency association, and it creates a certain amount of tension within the constituency and, quite frankly, has not been a very happy experience for us.

We couldn't help but note the irony of this constituency being named Riverview. It seems to infer that the river is some kind of unifying factor in this new constituency you've recommended, whereas in fact the river is the most significant natural boundary in the city. It is respected by people in the city in all areas. Everybody knows if they're a northsider or a southsider. Their schooling is directed that way. Their residence is often dictated by where they work and so on. Indeed, the Act itself calls on the commission to have regard for natural boundaries, and there can be no bigger natural boundary than the river.

So at the end of the day and to avoid repeating myself and repeating our written submission, we would ask you in your final report to please give consideration to retaining this historic riding, this cohesive community that we've developed over the last almost 30 years, and not to create any cross-river constituencies as recommended in your draft report.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those are all the submissions I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, Mr. Slatter.

We'll start the questioning with Wally Worth.

MR. WORTH: Thank you, Mr. Slatter. I think we are well aware that there is some dissatisfaction, in fact a great deal of dissatisfaction, amongst the residents of the Glenora area with respect to this matter.

One of the things we were trying to accommodate here – and I want to refer specifically to your concern about northeastern Edmonton – was that two of the constituencies with the largest amount of population were on the south side, Edmonton-Rutherford and Edmonton-Strathcona. The other constituencies that were beginning to push the 25 percent envelope were over in the west end in the Edmonton-Glenora area, in Edmonton-McClung, Edmonton-Mayfield, and so on. So we tried to find a solution that would in fact try to take account of these four or five constituencies that were at the upper end of the population quotient in Edmonton, and the one that seemed to work the best for us was the one that we proposed. The proposal we made would keep in the new Glenora constituency about 75 percent of the population that had formerly or has presently been in that – no, wait a minute. Sorry. Let me back up. About 40 percent of the population that would be in the new Riverview constituency would be from Edmonton-Glenora, and about an equal number would be from the Edmonton-Strathcona area. That way we were able, we thought, to try to get some kind of balance.

If we are to accede to your request, we are going to have to then make some substantial changes in the south side, where perhaps we don't have the population to handle it as well in terms of its distribution as we faced in the Edmonton-Glenora situation. That's why we created the Riverview constituency. Have you any alternatives to what we have done that might help us with this problem?

3:10

MR. SLATTER: We analyzed the numbers as well, and we recognize that there's a price to be paid if you don't jump the river. The constituencies on the south side will be slightly larger and the ones on the north side slightly smaller than the perfect average, but

for our own constituency that's a price we're prepared to pay, and we understand that those on the south side are also prepared to pay that price for retaining their historic alliances.

I can only say that in other areas, both inside and outside the major cities and indeed within the city ridings, the commission seems to be prepared to tolerate quite a variance in population, and the variance that our recommendation will trigger is really no worse than in many other variances that exist. So, quite frankly, we would suggest the commission should not be slavishly bound to population on this particular issue when on many other issues you have seen fit to depart from it for good reasons. We quite recognize that what you did is mathematically pure, but we think this is an appropriate case to back away from that.

MR. WORTH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. MCCARTHY: No questions, thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there are no questions from me, but we want to thank you for coming, Mr. Slatter, and making the views of Edmonton-Glenora known. We have a problem in respect to how we add a constituency to Edmonton.

MR. SLATTER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we took the easiest solution. Your suggestion is that we not concern ourselves too much with figures, but we were able to get the average in Edmonton down from 24 and 25 percent to roughly 15 percent, which we thought was a considerable improvement. We've had quite a few people complain to us about a constituency on both sides of the river, but basically the people on both sides of the river here come from the same social status, I want to say. You take Edmonton-Centre. That constituency, even though it's all on one side of the river, I think has a greater variety of people and is a more difficult constituency to represent than what would be Riverview.

Anyway, we will take your comments and decide how we can solve the problem. The name of Riverview is a name that we came up with because the river went through the constituency. If you've got a better name, we'd like to hear it.

MR. SLATTER: Well, we have from time to time discussed the name Edmonton-Glenora. Because of course Glenora is only a small part of the constituency, I think our constituency association would not be opposed to the commission selecting a more inclusive name, but retain the basic boundaries that we had before. We're not stuck on the name.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next presenter is Doug Main.

MR. MAIN: Well, gentlemen, I am a former member of the Legislature from a constituency that no longer exists, Edmonton-Parkallen. During the final year or so of my representing that area in the Legislature, the whole issue of boundaries redistribution came before a boundaries commission, then subsequently a Legislature committee, and then subsequently what turned out to be what I'll refer to as the Bogle committee, which was in essence a committee made up of government MLAs, in an effort to try to deal with the same kinds of issues that you are dealing with.

We said often in caucus and in cabinet and in the Legislature that drawing boundaries was a thankless job, and I'm sure it still is. So on behalf of all those people that haven't thanked you, I will. Thank you very much for doing this. I know it's an absolute bearcat.

I probably more correctly should have made my submission prior to the drawing of this report because I want to give you some broad brushstrokes about representation issues, but I can give you some specifics with regard to this map as well as I move through my remarks.

I'm sure you've also heard from a number of rural MLAs and others who have explained how much more difficult, how more taxing, and how different it is to be a rural MLA as opposed to one from the big city. I'm sure you've heard from city MLAs and others from the city saying that there should be more representation, that we've got more people, we've got bigger issues, so we need to have more representation. I'm sure you've heard all that. I'm not sure that you've heard a city MLA or a former city MLA plead the case for his former rural colleagues. That's what I'm going to attempt to do today.

I think the overriding objective of a boundaries review must be fairness. How can we create a Legislature that represents the interests of the population of the province in a fair fashion? As you well know, absolute equality of representation is impossible. If you get it and somebody moves or dies, you've lost it, so you need to seek a number of compromises and have to adjust and modify solutions to take in a number of factors. I think the discussions, the court rulings, the debates, and the news releases have focused an awful lot on voting power and I think to the detriment of the exercise of drawing boundaries, because voting power, actually being in the Legislature and representing a group of people in the Legislature and voting on a Bill or a motion or some such thing, is just one tiny component of the job that a Member of the Legislative Assembly performs, important but a long way from the core job. As a matter of fact, any given MLA may or may not show up for a vote on any given Bill or motion on a particular day, and certainly civilization doesn't end. In fact, probably his or her constituents don't really know or care. So to go through an entire exercise to try to redress some perceived wrong in terms of voting power, that the cities have all the people and the rural people dominate voting in the Legislature – this old saw I think is just wrong.

My old constituency, Edmonton-Parkallen, incorporates pieces of what are now Edmonton-Rutherford, Edmonton-Whitemud, and Edmonton-Strathcona. It was a diverse population going from the mega wealthy on the riverbanks at the far west end of Riverbend – and if I mentioned the gentleman's name, you'd know it – all the way to welfare single moms, to struggling students living on foamies in Michener Park, to regular working folks who lived in Malmo. We had the upper-crust folks in Grandview and in Lansdowne, and it was interesting. Unless you were the MLA or unless you lived in Grandview or Lansdowne or you were somehow connected to the university, you wouldn't be aware of the big issue in that

constituency, which was the west 240, or that piece of farmland that was at the west end on the riverbanks, owned by the University of Alberta. A lot of concern about that.

I met many, many times with residents of both Grandview and Lansdowne and the university trying to seek some sort of solution if there was a problem there. The Bogle redistribution carved Grandview out of what is now Edmonton-Whitemud and put it in Edmonton-Strathcona. There was absolutely no community connection between Grandview and Belgravia or Grandview and Windsor Park at all, yet that decision was made based on reasons that I tried, obviously in vain, to explain to Mr. Bogle. I hope that this group is more august and more astute and will pick that up in passing.

I want to review some of what I learned and some of what the last review missed. In my mind, of primary importance is an understanding of what an MLA does, and I touched on that just a couple of minutes ago. The member's job involves engaging in debates, drafting and writing legislation, committee work in the Legislature if he or she should be appointed to a committee such as Private Bills or the estimates committee and so forth, providing service to constituents – obviously that's a big job – voting on those Bills and motions in the Legislature, administering a constituency office and a Legislature office, hiring staff and so forth, attending official functions. As a member of the Legislature you're invited to Canada Day things and so forth. Attending social functions: you've got people in the constituency who have birthdays, anniversaries; somebody turns 100; there's a graduation and so forth. Dealing with other levels of government: I met often with members of city council, members of the school board, and in communities outside of major centres this goes on at length. Handling internal political needs. You've heard from different constituency associations: Glenora PCs, somebody else from the Liberals, somebody else from the New Democrats if they still exist, he said, adding just a little bit of political whimsy to his conversation today.

Those are all the realities that you have to face, and you've got to travel. In my own case, going from my office in the Legislature to my home, which was in the south part of what is now Edmonton-Whitemud, was about a 15-minute trip. I could go home, shower, shave, change, eat, have a nap, and be back at the Legislature in under an hour and a half. I could go from one end of my constituency to the other in five minutes.

3:20

So of all those jobs, a number are impacted by the size and the kind of constituency and the location of the constituency. Those are: service to constituents, attending those functions, administering offices. Some rural colleagues had three, four, five, six, 10 constituency offices.

Dealing with other levels of government. I dealt with a city council and a couple of school boards occasionally, but some communities have three, five, eight, 10, 12, 15 school boards – at least they used to – and similar numbers of town councils.

Internal political needs. You've already heard a member of the Edmonton-Glenora constituency association talk about political dealings on either side of the river.

Traveling. Fred Bradley lived in Crowsnest Pass, and that had to be a six-, seven-hour trip every week. He'd spend 12 to 15 hours a week just getting to and from work, and I would spend 12 to 15 minutes getting to and from work. So in order to address the issues of fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness, I believe the committee should take, must take into account these views.

Scheduling appointments for constituency work, meeting with constituents. I would schedule every Friday for these types of appointments to meet with my constituents, and I would have three or four, more often one or two appointments per week.

Dealing with my colleagues. I remember dealing with one colleague who represented a riding just north of Edmonton. That constituency office would receive 20 to 30 requests for appointments per day, and I wouldn't get that in a month.

For most city residents, certainly in Edmonton, the issues that you want to deal with – and you see them in the paper every day. I want to get a bicycle path. I want a stop sign. I want those traffic lights co-ordinated. Fix my potholes. Clean my streets. Where are my school taxes going? All dealt with either by the alderman or by the school trustee in the area. In the rural parts of the province it's water, agriculture, roads. It's all issues that are dealt with by and large at a provincial level, so there's a much, much greater demand on the rural MLA to deal with these types of issues.

I would urge the commission to understand fully the difference between urban and rural representation: the town councils, travel time, multiple school boards, dealing with other governments, seeking co-operative solutions to problems with people in the constituency. This is the work, the important work that an MLA does. Whether he's from the deep south in a large, vast constituency in the foothills or whether he's from a compact, dense constituency in the middle of Edmonton, this is the work that's done. This is the important work that's done, and this is where the representation gets done, and it is impossible – it's impossible – to compare the time required to do that level of work for a city MLA and a country MLA. I mean, in the city it's really kind of easy. It really is. We used to wonder, if you didn't have a cabinet portfolio, what you did all day. You can do lots of things as a city MLA. Some people maintain other jobs. Some even run for mayor; they've got so much time on their hands. So I think it's important that the commission understands and acknowledges that there is a different job here.

I've heard other presenters make that case, but it is very, very true. And to be swept away by previous judicial decisions with regard to population and being fixated on that I think does a disservice to the people of Alberta, despite the fact that they would argue that we need to have more representation where there are more people.

So I say all of that, and I offer this one final thought – and I know you've had other presentations on this as well – that Edmonton and Calgary both have more MLAs than they can ever hope to use. You're contemplating adding another. I know the legislation is written with the number 83 in it, but I believe it's well within your purview to suggest another number to the Legislature. I attempted to suggest in a caucus meeting while we were discussing this a couple of years ago that we reduce, as we were reducing lots of things by 10 percent, the number of the members of the Legislature by 10 percent, bringing it to 75. That suggestion landed with a thud because I think most sitting MLAs view their constituencies as their own, that if there is another election this is, and it was often referred to as, Bob's or Joan's or Shirley's or Frank's constituency. Well, it is not. It's the people's constituency, and there's no guarantee beyond the next election that anybody's going to get re-elected. Ask me.

So I think the notion of the MLA owning the constituency indicates why they are reluctant to bring about these dramatic changes, but the advantage of having an impartial body outside the Legislature making these decisions is that you can impose that decision. I would recommend and I would urge you to look – if you haven't already, and I'm sure you have – again at a smaller

Legislature. You could put 13, 14, 15 MLAs from Edmonton and Calgary in there and an appropriate balance of rural MLAs, make some of the constituencies larger in the country. They do now have mixed urban-rural constituencies, and I know it's not an issue in Medicine Hat, in Red Deer, in Lethbridge, and elsewhere. I think it's a good idea, but I certainly think that to add more representation to Edmonton just because there are lots of people here doesn't give the folks what they really want, which is good representation across the whole spectrum of work that needs to be done.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Main.

We will start the questioning with John McCarthy.

MR. MCCARTHY: Just one comment. I think that Red Deer and Lethbridge are basically totally urban constituencies. The mix of urban-rural is located in Medicine Hat and Grande Prairie where they have two that are 'rurban,' so to speak. That was just a comment further to your last comment. Other than that I don't have anything further.

MR. LEHANE: We appreciate your coming out, Mr. Main. We found throughout the first set of these hearings that the real-life experiences of MLAs, particularly ones that are now out of the Legislature and come before us perhaps really in a more impartial role at this particular point in time, are very helpful to this commission in trying to determine what exactly is required for effective representation. If you were here earlier this afternoon, Professor Fritz presented his position and paper to us, which was based on a number of premises including one that there is little if anything in survey results – this comes from another paper by someone else – to suggest that the sparsely populated areas require overrepresentation to be effectively serviced. That's a premise that certainly isn't upheld by what we've heard in our travels throughout the province.

The other one: people cast ballots but few turn to their MLAs in their ombudsman role. Well, we've heard quite the opposite, and I think that's what we're hearing from you today.

MR. MAIN: It's exactly the opposite. I guess you could make a mechanical, mathematical, arithmetical, logical argument that X number of people need X number of MLAs, but real life's not like that. X number of people may live within 10 square blocks or they may live within 3,000 square miles, and it's a different job. People do look to their MLAs, especially in the country. I was staggered to find out, talking just in casual coffee conversation with some of our colleagues from constituencies not far from Edmonton, that the guy was going to three weddings that afternoon, that this coming weekend he had a rodeo, an anniversary, and something else. He had to buy, out of his own jeans, wedding gifts for all of these folks. I mean, in four years I didn't get a sniff of a wedding invitation, and this guy might have had 40 or 50 of them. It's completely and utterly different.

I bumped into Bob Dowling, the former MLA for the area out west of town here. This was long before I contemplated seeking a seat in the Legislature. I asked him what it was like now that he was retired. He was just thrilled to be out. It was at the golf course that I happened to meet him. He said: you know, it's such a job. This is a quote, and I remember it as if it was yesterday: they want your legs under their kitchen table. That's the story. That's what it's like out

there. I didn't have anybody in town looking for me to be at their kitchen table at all.

MR. GRBAVAC: Well, Doug, I've been an elected member of a municipal council for 15 years, and my rural municipality, including the urban municipalities within it, approaches about 7,000 people. We have in excess of 40 elected municipal officials, not speaking of school boards, the old hospital boards, now the regional authorities. I wouldn't even hazard a guess in terms of how many elected people we have outside of the municipal government, but we have in excess of 40 of them for 7,000 people in not an overly great area: the county of Warner, to be specific. I think that says something about the nature of the problem as opposed to the nature of representation. I don't envy an MLA because every one of those 40 elected municipal officials wants their MLA to listen to their concern and their residents' concerns.

I think you've touched on something that maybe is a bigger problem than in fact representation. I have some real concerns about why rural MLAs go to weddings and 50th wedding anniversaries. Where do you draw the line? Is a seventh birthday in, or is a 25th anniversary out? What is representation and what isn't? But I appreciate those people want them there. They want them there, and it's a function of re-election as much as anything, and it's part of the job. If they want to get re-elected, they'd better go to somebody's seventh birthday. You know, if they want to get the support of those 47 municipal councillors, they'd better go to their council meeting. I think you've touched on something that maybe is in fact beyond our mandate, but it's interesting that you alluded to it. I frankly feel that there's something seriously wrong with government in rural Alberta, but that we'll leave to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

3:30

MR. MAIN: Well, I had that conversation with his predecessor and his predecessor as well. There's just way, way too much government, and there's an opportunity for somebody – some organization, some body, this body – to begin the process. I mean, the government's already done something on hospital boards, and they're looking at doing something on school boards, but the big decision-makers, the Legislature – wouldn't that send just a great signal to the people of Alberta that in fact we are going to downsize the number of people who govern you? People want less government. What better show could there be of less government than fewer MLAs?

MR. GRBAVAC: But you appreciate our hands are tied in that respect.

MR. MAIN: I do, but you know, there's an opportunity to put addenda, indexes, letters, minority reports, views, television interviews.

MR. GRBAVAC: You're suggesting we do that in other words?

MR. MAIN: Sure. I think it'd be wonderful to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you just dealt with the thing that I was going to deal with. It's not within our mandate to reduce the number

of constituencies, and I think you appreciate that, but you're saying that we should still do something about it.

MR. MAIN: Well, I think you're in a position now of great influence. People are looking to this body to make some extraordinarily difficult decisions, and you will do that obviously, but once that's done, you still have the opportunity to make some observations that may make the job easier for the next guys that come along.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thanks for coming.

MR. MAIN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next presenter is Don Kuchelyma.

MR. KUCHELYMA: Good afternoon. I'm here on behalf of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, which is the umbrella organization for 140 member community leagues in the city of Edmonton. I'm going to deviate somewhat from the written presentation in that I'm sure that you can read it and you've read numerous submissions in the past.

One of the things our organization is is that we are the grassroots volunteers in the community. We're the ones that organize the sporting events. We're the ones that do the coaching. We're the ones that get to sit on the committees. We're the ones that hound the councillors. We're the ones that the politicians, the city comes to look for in regards to the information and how it should get back to the grassroots individuals in the community. Because of this our members serve this wide spectrum of expertise in the community.

One of the difficulties we do have with the proposal that's been made by this commission is that community organizations to some degree have been a body as a whole. Some of these organizations have been in existence for 75 years, and because of this our organizations are the greatest volunteer group in North America. The unfortunate part is that through some of the boundary proposals their community leagues are being split. In the attached maps in the west end there's one community that's split in half. In the next community there's a one-block strip that's taken out of it and in the adjoining community another half split. The unfortunate part about this is that it takes and disrupts the community, the organization within the community, and how they can access the elected politicians in the provincial government.

There's another area in the south, on the south side of the river, and there are three communities as well that are affected by this. The Riverview proposal, the new boundary area, in essence, being that it crosses the river, affects five community organizations. There are five community leagues that are split by the proposal being given for Riverview.

In the commission's Act it stated that in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary consideration should be given for the community leagues and their boundaries and their common interest. I guess we're somewhat unique in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary because of this organization, and it has been going on for a number of years. It's not something that just transpired a few years ago.

There's also some concern over the Riverview boundary in that it does take and transgress some geographical boundaries, but it also transcends some of the historical boundaries. The west end of the city for all intents and purposes was a small community prior to being expropriated into the city of Edmonton. Because of this there

are some common interests even though there is a common interest of people on both sides of the river, and it is felt that they should be maintained to some degree.

With that, I'll end my submission. One of the proposals some of the community members have made is that any of the new boundaries for an electoral division should be included on the north side of the river rather than a north-south split because of the expansion in the population of Edmonton being on the north side of the river rather than on the south. With that, it would have the least impact today and the least impact in the future if there's any redistribution or realignment in regards to the boundaries.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll start questioning with you, Wally.

MR. WORTH: Thank you very much. I appreciate very much your concern about the community boundaries, and as I read your submission and listened to your comments, I got the impression we'd done pretty well. You said that there were 140 communities and there are only six that we sort of missed on in terms of realigning the boundaries. I think that's pretty good. Nonetheless, what you've said I think warrants our close attention and to accommodate your suggestions will not take a great deal of change in some boundaries.

The other observation I wanted to make is just an observation. To reiterate what I said earlier, the problem we faced as a commission was on the south side in terms of large constituencies and constituencies with potential growth, and trying to accommodate those two concerns resulted in us going the way we did, crossing over the river. But that's something we're going to have to look at again.

MR. KUCHELYMA: The growth factor seems to be in the majority on the north side of the river, at least through the civic census and where the communities seem to be going. Now, I don't know how that impacts the '91 census and where the numbers come from, but if there's impact today, is there going to be impact the next time the boundaries are looked at again with the increase in population? I guess that becomes a concern. You don't want to have an impact today and then a realignment happens again and then impact happening again. In the past the boundaries seemed to follow some of the historical community boundaries. I don't know if the commission does have a community map, but I did bring one to leave with the commission so they could have a look at the community boundaries and exactly where the impact is.

MR. WORTH: We would very much like to have that map just to double-check against the ones we have. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe.

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John.

MR. MCCARTHY: No questions, thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you for coming, Don, and if you'd leave the map with the ladies at the back, please.

MR. KUCHELYMA: Yes, I will. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

The next presenter is John MacGillivray.

MR. MacGILLIVRAY: I want to thank the members of the commission for hearing me out. Some of it is beyond your scope. I thank you for adding one member, if it goes through, to Edmonton and one to Calgary. At the recent Conservative convention the southern Alberta MLAs were after Mr. Klein to veto or change the situation.

I believe the boundaries should be set to reflect one man, one vote – nothing else, nothing more. My vote shouldn't be watered down or cut in half so some special interest groups in southern or rural Alberta can have more say or more power in the Alberta government. To me it's a question of power, nothing more and nothing less. The old worn-out argument that MLAs come forward with – they have to keep in touch with their constituency; they have to go to a wedding – as Doug Main said, is for the birds. In today's modern society we have the telephone, we have the fax, and there is no reason why anybody can't keep in touch with their MLA. How many people actually keep in touch with their MLA?

3:40

Alberta – here's a thing beyond your scope – has too many MLAs: 83. B.C. has a million more people and 75 MLAs.

Politicians are afraid, whether Liberal or Conservative, to come out and stand up for fair play. They are afraid of becoming antirural. They're afraid to stand up for democracy, so they let certain politicians rig the voting system by giving the rural areas more voting power than the cities.

Here's an example. The hospital is a perfect example of that, of rural Alberta with the power. Rural hospital budgets were cut 18 to 19 percent, while Edmonton and Calgary's hospital budgets were cut a whopping 35 percent. A third of all people in the Edmonton hospitals are from the rural areas.

The courts are right in a sense to stand up. People should not have to take politicians to court to come up with a 25 percent leeway so that the people can be represented. Again to me the courts are wrong. They should be looking at 5 or 10 percent. The courts should be guarding democracy, not undermining it.

Finally, the commission should not yield to any pressure group that wants to set or rig the boundaries so that they can have more to say or more voting power because their vote is special, it counts more. Again I believe that one man, one vote is what democracy is all about.

That's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacGillivray.

We'll start the questioning with John McCarthy.

MR. MCCARTHY: No questions. Thank you for your submission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe Lehane.

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions in particular, but I'd like to thank you on the brevity of your report and the conciseness of your message. It leaves me with no question, but it does leave me with an impression. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally.

MR. WORTH: No questions.

MR. MacGILLVIRAY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank you for coming, Mr. MacGillivray. You made your point.

The next presenter is Jim Acton.

MR. ACTON: Thank you very much. It's really a pleasure to be here today and thanks for the opportunity. I really don't have very much. I appeared here the first time and I indicated to you people as a group that we were still happy and we'll give it one more try. You people came out of nowhere, and you really have made me happy. You've removed three communities – Mayfield, Britannia, and Youngstown – and added our neighbours to the south, Prince Charles and Sherbrooke. That was just excellent, and I thank you for that.

I have one small request – and that's why my submission is going to be very, very short – and that is the name. Mayfield now has disappeared from the new boundaries, and I'd like to recommend to you people that you consider the name Calder. Calder just celebrated their 75th anniversary. It's well known and people relate to it. Also the other name that could be considered is Westmount. I would not hesitate to recommend Calder-Westmount because that is what people relate to.

So with that, I would just request once more your consideration to change the name from Mayfield to either Calder or Calder-Westmount. It will then reflect the area.

Thank you very much, and I really feel happy today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you, Jim. I don't know if there are any questions.

MR. McCARTHY: No questions, thanks.

MR. LEHANE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No; other than on the name Calder. Is that an individual?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. It's an area.

MR. GRBAVAC: It's the area. Okay.

MR. ACTON: It's the area. Actually, for your benefit – as you know, you're either on the right side of the tracks or the wrong side. We happen to be on the right side when we are in the north end. Calder has been there for so many years that it's very significant in terms of name.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you from Calder?

MR. ACTON: I'm from Kensington, just north of there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh. You're from the wrong side of the tracks too?

MR. ACTON: No, no. The right side.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Jim.

MR. ACTON: You're welcome.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the next presenter is Marcel Dalton, but I gather he's not here yet. Is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll then call on Andrew Tschetter.

MR. TSCHETTER: Good afternoon, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Andrew Tschetter. I'm an engineer, and I'm a lifetime resident of Alberta. Today I have simply a copy of my submission to the committee, and it's been recommended to me that I just read it. It's a short letter, fairly brief. I make four main points and one secondary point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. TSCHETTER: Reading the commission's January '96 report, I was disappointed that the agricultural, commercial, industrial, and tourist concerns of electoral divisions were not considered as primary criteria for setting boundaries or even specified. As an illustration, it makes little sense for a quartet of rig, mining, and sawmill towns to have one town reassigned to an agriculture-dominated division. On that tangent, it is unfortunate to see a tourist and parks town or two assigned to divisions whose other towns' interests are primarily governed by commercial and industrial interests when alternatives exist to make allowances for a unity of commerce for electoral divisions. I'm referring to Jasper and Banff, which have always, as far as I can remember, been in different electoral divisions, and I don't understand why they can't be in the same division.

My second point. Perhaps the emphasis of traveling distance to the Legislature could be reduced, and in its place a regional commerce consideration could specifically be considered. Traveling is not so much of a hardship now compared to when the province was founded. Railroad and air travel is available in most all areas of Alberta, and people travel today in five hours what it took days in 1905.

Three. The number of households were tabulated from the commission's report to show Edmonton at 236,130 households, Calgary at 262,365 households, and the rest of Alberta at 411,900 households. I think I got that right. Together, Calgary and the rest of Alberta total 674,265 households. Residential services at Edmonton Telephones was contacted by myself, and they approximated that they were currently servicing 268,000 residential units in Edmonton. AGT customer services released to me a figure of 887,000, plus or minus a thousand residential units currently being serviced in the rest of Alberta. It is apparent that companies like Ed Tel, AGT, Calgary Power, Northwestern Utilities, and others can and should be consulted for data by the government when

decisions on important issues are being made.

Four. As it is noted that many have voiced concerns over the practice of representing bulk numbers of population instead of representing eligible voting age populations, this submission offers that the percent of voting age population in an electoral division become a consideration so as to ensure that voting power is not being overly diluted and, rather, that concrete evidence of minimum voting power dilution is offered to the public.

3:50

Five and last. Although it is pointed out that reducing the number of electoral divisions is outside the scope of the commission's mandate, one must ask why the criteria for determining the number of divisions is not outlined. No historic precedent, no formulaic approach, no comparison to other Canadian governments is offered. Indeed, a rough comparison to Canada's Commons shows that MPs each represent – 27 million divided by 285 – approximately 94,737. This sort of representation would give Alberta 27 MLAs, which may be too few. However, if each MLA in Alberta was willing to burden themselves with approximately one-half of an MP's representative voice, we would require about 54 MLAs.

Surely in this computerized age each MLA can do more in less time more efficiently and should be expected to do so so that less of them will be required. Considering the fact of current government emphasis on cutting back on spending, on productivity, on less waste, and on increased savings, MLAs should not be exempt from job deletion due to computerization, automation, and technological advances. Having to face the same realities as the rest of the labour force will give the MLAs a common link with the people they represent.

Also, as a supplemental, the AGT residential business office gave me a call back on the 11th of this month and stated that they had looked into the matter some more. They gave me another figure for Calgary and the rest of Alberta: 801,000 households, plus or minus a thousand. It appears that I caught them short when I called them up. They had to get hold of the accounting department or whoever handles this, and they had to do some counting themselves. I think it is a good point I've brought up about the number of households and current data that is available to the commission. It shouldn't be that hard in this day of computers for them to run some sort of program. To begin with, each town has its own little area code number, so they should be able to tell you.

Now, I've give you a pretty good, close idea today of, you know, a lot of information that you may be looking at. I also had a couple, two, I think, or three questions to ask the commission myself, if I can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. TSCHETTER: I wanted to know if you were using a computer for your matrix. Are you running a software program?

THE CHAIRMAN: You'd have to ask the people over there.

MR. WHELAN: Yes. It's called MapInfo.

MR. TSCHETTER: Okay. That was my question. So your 10 formulas, your 10 factors, are run into this, and then you map information from the province. Okay; that was my question. That should well cover it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

We'll start with you, John.

MR. McCARTHY: Do you have any data on how many households do not have telephone service?

MR. TSCHETTER: No, I'm afraid I do not.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to make one point that you brought up, and that's in respect to the number of MLAs. As you appreciate, the Act says that Alberta shall be divided into 83 constituencies. That's our job. We don't have the authority to go back to the government and say that you've got too many or not enough constituencies. We did mention in our interim report that a lot of people talked to us about this.

You came up with the suggestion of equating them to federal representatives. I just want to let you know that my understanding is that Ontario's proposal, if it isn't in effect, is two provincial MPPs for each federal riding. So that's somewhat similar to what you're suggesting. I'm just telling you this so that you can keep track of it. I don't want you to give up on your thinking about them having too many MLAs. Maybe Alberta could look at adopting what Ontario is looking at adopting. Maybe we could ask Derm: where is Ontario with respect to the provincial MPPs being equated to federal MPs?

MR. WHELAN: The legislation is being prepared, Mr. Chairman, and the government certainly intends to go forward with it, as far as I can determine. It's going to reduce Ontario by 27 seats, from 130 to 103.

MR. McCARTHY: That would be on a one-to-one basis then, the same as the federal government.

MR. WHELAN: Precisely, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to let you know that.

MR. TSCHETTER: If I may, I just want to be sure that you understand my point, sir. Is it Mr. McCarthy?

MR. McCARTHY: Yes.

MR. TSCHETTER: My point about the number of households was not just the telephone companies' lists. I mentioned Ed Tel, AGT, Calgary Power, Northwestern Utilities, and others. To begin with, the two companies that I contacted to answer, you know, my

curiosity gave me figures that were higher than the ones the commission is using. So that left some question in my mind as to the currency of your data, if you were really pursuing all avenues. I think that between the provincial utility companies, you people should be able to get a really good idea of how many dwelling units are being occupied in the province, but not just the telephone companies.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay; thanks.

MR. TSCHETTER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming, Mr. Tschetter.

The next presenter is Joan Duiker. I gather from my information, Mrs. Duiker, that you're representing Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont PC Association, Brian Hlus, yourself, and Julius Yankowsky.

MRS. DUIKER: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MRS. DUIKER: Okay. The first one I have is from the Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont Progressive Conservative Association.

At its meeting of March 18, 1996, [they] passed a resolution supporting the name of the current Edmonton Electoral Division of Beverly Belmont be changed. The name should be Beverly Clareview and not Belmont as recommended in the January 1996 Report entitled "Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries and Names for Alberta."

The reason we are proposing the name change to Beverly Clareview is twofold. First, Beverly has a long history in east Edmonton as it was a Town until its annexation . . . in 1961. It would be unfortunate if the name was excluded from the Provincial Electoral Divisions. Secondly, Clareview more accurately describes the area north of the Yellowhead Trail and east of the Light Rail Transit (CNR).

The length of the above recommendation is not extensive, but we feel that to better reflect the name of the Electoral Division, the new name should be Beverly Clareview.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to the above recommendation.

This one is from the PC association.

I have a letter from Brian Hlus, and he is speaking as a resident of northeast Edmonton.

Dear Commission Members:

As a lifetime resident of north east Edmonton, I would like to make the following comments as it refers to the proposed name change of the current Edmonton Electoral Division of Beverly Belmont.

The Town of Beverly and its name have a very long history. As I have been told, my grandfather, after immigrating to Canada worked in the coal mines in Beverly. The Town of Beverly was annexed [to the city] in 1961 and continues to be an identifiable area in the City of Edmonton.

Edmonton developed in the north east (north of the current Yellowhead Trail and east of the CNR tracks). The area was always called Clareview. Whenever anyone currently refers to Clareview, they know where it is.

I would agree with the recommendation that the Commission review your January 1996 report and change the current Edmonton

Electoral Division of Beverly Belmont to Beverly Clareview.

Thank you for considering my comments.

It's signed Brian Hlus.

4:00

Now I have my submission. Actually I'm making this on behalf of my family, the Beverly community, and Julius Yankowsky, the MLA for Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont.

Good afternoon. My name is Joan Duiker, and I am a resident of the city of Edmonton and specifically the community of Beverly. My husband, Hans, and our three children have lived in Beverly for 29 years, and I have lived in northeast Edmonton all my life. The comments I am about to make to you are on behalf of my family, the Beverly community, and Julius Yankowsky, who because of his duties in the Legislature regrets he could not be here personally. I am here to ask you, hon. members of the boundaries commission, to reconsider the name change you have proposed for the constituency of Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont.

Firstly, I would like to suggest that you reconsider dropping the name Beverly, which now appears on two constituency names; namely, Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont and Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly. The name should be retained because the name of Beverly is historic. I would just like to make a comment also about Jasper Place. Jasper Place was also annexed to the city of Edmonton – I think it was in 1961 – and as far as I'm concerned, I think that the name of Jasper Place should be brought back.

The town of Beverly was in existence until 1961, and then it was annexed to the city of Edmonton. Beverly has a colourful and historic past. The town of Beverly was located over a number of coal mines. They were mined for their rich coal deposits. Many stories still abound of the coal mining days. There are many stories of cave-ins, underground floods, and stories of miners and their families. Today a community league facility is located at 121st Avenue and 43rd Street. It's in Beacon Heights, and the park is called Jubilee park. This community league facility is located on one of the larger mine tip sites, and the mine owner's son lives nearby. Wop May, a famous bush pilot, was well known around Beverly as he would launch his airplane from a cliff overlooking the North Saskatchewan River. The town administration building, or town hall as it was known, was located on the north side of 118th Avenue and 38th Street. Incidentally, all of the above were located in what is now the constituency of Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont. Therefore, if the name will be preserved anywhere, it should probably be here.

Beverly still exists and will continue to exist physically and in the annals of history. The community of Beverly still has a small-town atmosphere. If anybody asks me, "Where do you live?" I say Beverly, and everybody knows where I live. I'm sure if some people said, "I live in Duggan," well, I wouldn't have a clue where that is, but I think that people know where Beverly is. On the other hand, the community of Belmont never consisted of anything more than farmland, a drive-in theatre, and a jail, which is long gone. All of the above have been replaced by a community that is generally known as Clareview, which is composed of a number of communities. The name Clareview has become known Edmonton-wide and beyond.

My plea is on behalf of those aforementioned in that if there is going to be any change to our constituency, the name should be changed to Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview. This name is clear and concise in its identification of where the constituency is located.

I want to thank you, Judge Wachowich and esteemed members of

the commission, for hearing my plea to preserve a part of history and ensure that a constituency is properly and easily identified. Please reconsider and consider the name Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview if change of name must indeed occur.

In closing, I would like to bring up a point of concern that proper notification has not been given in regard to this round of electoral hearings to the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, area councils, and all the community leagues in the city of Edmonton. Through these organizations there is a great deal of information flow and exchange.

I would also like to state that the community of Beverly did not find out about these proposed name changes until about a week ago. The neighbourhoods of Beverly are Beverly-Beacon, Abbotsfield-Rundle, and Bergman. Because the residents of Beverly Heights did not have sufficient time, they would also like to request that the name of Beverly-Highlands also remain.

Thank you again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you suggesting we use the name Beverly in two constituencies then?

MRS. DUIKER: Yes. On January 21, 1993, I think it was, I did a presentation to the Electoral Boundaries Commission. At that time there was a constituency of Edmonton-Beverly. The boundaries of Edmonton-Beverly were up to the Yellowhead freeway. Now Edmonton-Beverly goes from 118 Avenue north over the freeway and into Clareview, and Edmonton-Beverly-Highlands takes in part of Beverly and goes also into the Highlands area. There is a dividing line right down 118 Avenue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want you to know the thinking of the constituency. They haven't put much thought into this, but we had presentations made to us that people would like shorter names. Now you're coming here today stating "Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview," which is not a short name; it's a long name.

MRS. DUIKER: Well, we would like to keep it because Beverly is very historic, and it means a lot to the people that live in the area. It means a lot to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: But why Edmonton?

MRS. DUIKER: Well, you can leave Edmonton out if you want. Just put Beverly-Clareview.

MR. LEHANE: Why Clareview?

MRS. DUIKER: Because people identify with the name Clareview. They do not identify with the name Belmont. As I stated in the presentation, all I can remember of Belmont, even when growing up, is the Belmont correctional institute and the Belmont drive-in. So why would you ever want to name a constituency after a jail?

MR. WORTH: How would the Clareview people react just to Beverly?

MRS. DUIKER: To Beverly? I really don't know. I would like to see it come back, but I think that because of the way the boundaries commission divided the community in 1993, it's really important for the communities to be identified and for the neighbourhoods to be

identified.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.
Any questions, John?

MR. McCARTHY: No. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

4:10

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No, thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're listening to you with respect to this name, and we will look at it, but one of the problems here is we try to simplify names so that they're not confusing. My first reaction is I don't like two constituencies with the word "Beverly" in them. If you look at that map – and I grew up in Edmonton – half of Beverly is in Highlands and half of Beverly is in Belmont right now.

MRS. DUIKER: Well, if the boundaries commission would have listened to us to begin with in 1993, we would have still had a constituency of Edmonton-Beverly, but they decided to change it. At that time, if I can go back and maybe recall some of the things that happened, what the Electoral Boundaries Commission tried to do in 1993 was to put – are you familiar with the whole city of Edmonton? Anyway, what they wanted to do was put the Montrose area, which is about 60-some Street and about 119th Avenue, in with Edmonton-Belmont. They had everything so screwed up. We tried to realign to the best – you know, using the population as the basis for the boundaries.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine. We'll take into consideration your comments. I'm not making any promises today.

MRS. DUIKER: Well, remember the name Beverly, because I live in Beverly.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming.

I think we've gone through all the presenters, so we're going to adjourn till 4:30.

[The hearing adjourned from 4:12 p.m. to 4:29 p.m.]

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we want to reconvene our hearings today. We now have with us our 4:30 presenter, Mr. Ross Harvey, so he can proceed.

MR. HARVEY: Thank you very much, Your Honour, esteemed members of the commission. Perhaps I can just open by saying that you ought not to be too disheartened by the turnout here this afternoon. Believe it or not, I've been at commission hearings – in fact, I've been a panel member at commission hearings – where the

turnout has been even worse than this. So be of good cheer. The work you're doing is nonetheless valuable.

I guess to cut to the chase here, if I could just direct your attention to the bottom of page 4 of the submission of the Alberta New Democrats, where if I may briefly read the conclusion, it notes:

New Democrats strongly favour, and urge the Commission strongly to recommend, the implementation of a system of "blended" proportional representation in Alberta. Such a system should feature a provincial Legislative Assembly in which two-thirds of the seats are filled by candidates winning election in "first past the post" contests in geographically discrete constituencies, and one-third of the seats are filled by candidates selected on the basis of party popular vote from among lists supplied by the registered political parties.

We believe such a recommendation to be within the bounds of the Commission's mandate, and urge its adoption and support on grounds of achieving a better democracy for all Albertans.

The one problem that we foresaw in presenting you with this recommendation or, I suppose, a major and a couple of minor recommendations here today is the question of there being required 83 constituencies. We solved that, to our satisfaction at least, by recommending that the province be divided into 56 geographically discrete constituencies and 27 geographically identical constituencies, those 27 being coterminous with the boundaries of the province of Alberta, and that the proportional representation representatives be drawn from those 27 constituencies.

We further recommend – and this is a constriction on the provisions set out in the Act from which you derive your authority as a commission – that the variance in populations of electors as among the 56 geographically discrete constituencies be a factor of plus or minus 10 percent, but that is in a real sense incidental to the body of the submission before you this afternoon.

If you have any questions, I'd be delighted to attempt to answer them. I would just conclude by noting that the electoral history of Alberta and of Canada and of virtually all other jurisdictions in which the first past the post, single-member constituency is the sole feature of their electoral system is one in which minorities come to power and from time to time exercise that power with, let us say, a carefree abandon that is nowise warranted by the reality of their electoral mandates.

The single great benefit of proportional representation is that it acts as a positive brake on such enthusiasm. We believe that, especially in light of recent history both in Alberta, where we've had three years of many would argue wrenching change brought in at the hands of a government which received less than 44 percent of the votes cast at the last election, or at the national level, where in 1988 the one major party campaigning in favour of free trade won a mandate with I believe it was 41 percent of the vote as opposed to the other two main parties, both of which campaigned vigorously against free trade and between them got 52 percent of the vote. In that instance, 100 percent of Canadians got free trade with the United States.

So the problem is obvious. The solution proposed here is one that is – I don't think it's an overstatement to say it is sweeping the globe, the most recent major convert being New Zealand, which by the way adopted a blended system like that recommended here. We commend it to the attention and we hope enthusiastic support of the commission.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Harvey.

We'll start the questioning with Wally Worth.

MR. WORTH: I want to ask first a question that isn't related to your central theme. Is that all right?

MR. HARVEY: Certainly.

MR. WORTH: Okay. Because I know you've had a good deal of experience in the inner city here in Edmonton, are there some characteristics of urban constituencies, particularly inner-city constituencies, that increase or decrease, if you like, the difficulty that an MLA faces in trying to represent that constituency? Putting it another way: are there some factors in the urban situation that we as a commission ought to take account of as we try to work through this matrix that we've developed where we're trying to identify factors that influence the level of difficulty of representation?

MR. HARVEY: Well, you're right. That is quite beyond the scope of our submission and a question that necessarily I can only answer right off the top of my head. I mean, that's an extremely important caveat. Any answer I may give to that question is preliminary at best.

I would suggest to you that especially as regards inner-city constituencies, the two principal problems involving effective representation and service of constituents are in the first instance poverty and in the second instance in many cases lack of facility with the language, and of course I mean English. Those two conditions of course are not unique to inner-city ridings, but they are, to the extent they can be said to be prevalent anywhere, prevalent in inner-city ridings for all sorts of easily grasped sociological reasons. Those do contribute to difficulty in representation, especially in terms of soliciting the advice and opinions of constituents.

One of the things that poverty and lack of facility with the language most often and most effectively breed is a sort of self-disenfranchisement born from a variety of different roots, everything ranging from a sort of resigned "It doesn't matter what I do; nothing will change regardless" to facts like you don't have a telephone. Or if you do have a telephone, you can't cope with the person that answers at the other end because you don't know the language. So, yeah, these things are positive and significant difficulties in my experience.

MR. WORTH: Thank you.

MR. GRBAVAC: Ross, this is no reflection on your recommendation, although I tend to disagree with your last sentence there, which suggests that "we believe such a recommendation to be within the bounds of the Commission's mandate." When I read the legislation that created us, if you will, I would say that this is outside the scope of our mandate. I would like to hear your rationale as to why you believe it is within the scope of our mandate as the legislation is now before us.

MR. HARVEY: Well, our understanding of your mandate is that you are required to set out 83 constituencies. There's nothing in your mandate that prevents X number of those constituencies being identical, at least not as I read it.

Now, I suppose you could say, "Well, that's just a sort of textual

sleight of hand,” and perhaps you're right. But in the absence of a positive prohibition, again I would say there's nothing in the legislation that prevents you from making this recommendation. Obviously, you're of a different opinion, but I'd be . . .

MR. GRBAVAC: No, no, don't assume that. Don't assume that. I just wanted you to focus on the mandate of the commission and your interpretation of the legislation that in fact spawned us.

MR. HARVEY: Well, that's it in a nutshell.

MR. GRBAVAC: Okay. Let me make this clearer. Your geographically discrete constituencies would vary no more than 10 percent from your nondiscrete constituencies?

MR. HARVEY: That is our recommendation. That is within the bounds set by the Act.

MR. GRBAVAC: Yeah. Okay. That makes it a little more clear for me. Thank you.

MR. LEHANE: Have you considered, Mr. Harvey, whether you would have any minimum limits in terms of the percentage that a political party obtained in your proportional representation before they would get that proportional share of seats? In other words, if a system like this resulted in there being 10 political parties, let's assume, would they all share in the seats to the extent of the popular vote?

MR. HARVEY: Something like Germany's 5 percent cutoff you mean?

MR. LEHANE: Well, a number of jurisdictions that have this type of system do have cutoffs, whether it's at 5 percent or whatever.

4:39

MR. HARVEY: There is, of course, at least an implicit and effective cutoff in the recommendation that we go with 27 proportional representation ridings. That would mean, in effect, that it would be extremely difficult to achieve a proportional representation seat with less than 4 percent of the vote. That being the case, we didn't think it necessary to specify any further cutoff point. We figure that's a reasonable cutoff.

Obviously, if you were to expand the Alberta Legislature, this would be beyond your mandate, I agree. But if you were to expand it to a couple of hundred seats or as in the case of the Canadian House of Commons, for example, where you've got just a touch shy of 300 seats, then yes, things can get a little squirrely, and you might want to look at legislated minimum percentage requirements. But given the circumstance in Alberta, I don't think it's required beyond, again, the cutoff implicit in the number of 27. Again, the reason for that number is that it's one-third of the whole, so you've got a one-third/two-thirds situation.

MR. LEHANE: I take it the proposal is that the 27 seats would be filled from a list of names that was provided by each political party prior to the election.

MR. HARVEY: That's correct, yeah. A very common proportional representation procedure.

MR. LEHANE: And there would be no separate vote in terms of proportional representation. It would be based simply on the vote for the 56 districts.

MR. HARVEY: That's our recommendation, yes.

MR. LEHANE: So if I was of the position that I wanted to vote for Ross Harvey because I liked the man, I would be caught to the extent of my vote counting towards the proportional representation of his party.

MR. HARVEY: In that sense, yes. Let me say that should the commission embrace the idea but decide that that was a sufficiently troubling point to warrant on your own proposing instead a system of separate vote for the proportional representation seats, we would greet your report enthusiastically nonetheless.

MR. LEHANE: Thank you.

MR. MCCARTHY: I just want to make sure I understand your proposal correctly. If you had the Social Credit Party, for example, get 4 percent of the popular vote, then they would get three seats. Am I correct on that? Four percent of 83 is about three seats.

MR. HARVEY: Roughly, yeah.

MR. MCCARTHY: Okay. Now, how would you – I'm just looking at it conceptually here.

MR. HARVEY: Actually, it would be four seats; wouldn't it?

MR. MCCARTHY: Well, I'm saying 4 percent times 83 is 3.3 seats.

MR. HARVEY: Oh, yes. I'm sorry; you're right. Yeah. Three seats. My apologies.

MR. MCCARTHY: And the problem, as I see it, is: what do you do in the circumstance when you get one party that gets 3.5 seats and another one gets 10.5? How is that dealt with in those other jurisdictions?

MR. HARVEY: There are several systems that have been devised to deal with that. The most common is the so-called largest remainder system, and in fact that is the system that used to be in effect in Edmonton and Calgary back in the days when we had essentially a multimember proportional representation system in Edmonton and Calgary. It wasn't exactly prop rep, but it was as close as we've ever come. It's actually a fairly complicated way of adding votes as you go from decision to decision to decision as you bounce around on your various lists nominating people. I must confess that I am not wholly conversant with it myself, so any recitation I could give you this afternoon would be far from authoritative.

The point I wish to leave you with is that these questions have been considered and solutions devised which I'm certain could be implemented if not with ease then at least with effect.

MR. MCCARTHY: Okay. So that's the one question I had.

The next one was: do you not think that setting up a system like that can be destabilizing, could I say, with respect to a series of minority governments in trying to run a democratic state?

MR. HARVEY: It can be, and those who argue the point delight in raising the example of Italy. But of course there are far more counter examples, ranging from Denmark to Germany. Well, in fact all of the Nordic countries have elements of proportional representation in their electoral system. In fact, what is found over time is that in the first instance parties do learn to work together. In the second instance this often means the emergence of stable electoral coalitions, and in the third instance it also means that you don't get the kinds of jarring changes in government policy and program that we have witnessed certainly in Alberta in the last three years, that they witnessed in Britain in the 1980s, and that they witnessed in New Zealand in the 1980s. In fact, it has been argued by political scientists who have studied the matter that it was the changes introduced by the Lange government in the mid 1980s that led directly to the ultimately effective enthusiasm for proportional representation that was finally implemented in 1992.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you.

MR. GRBAVAC: Ross, would you concede that the problem with a first past the post system is exaggerated, if I can use that term, by a strong party system, and would not a relaxing of party discipline or party vote, if you will, ease that problem? In many instances you know there are some very divergent views within a party itself, but our strong party system has resulted in people toeing the line, if you will.

I watch quite closely the American political scene, and it's obvious to me – and this is my perception of it – that they deal with this system very simply. It doesn't matter whether you're a Democrat or Republican. There's one overriding principle there: your vote's for sale. You just make deals. So Republican or Democrat is not all that significant in terms of dealing with your state or your area of representation. I'm just curious as to your view on the strict party line that we've adopted in the Canadian system.

MR. HARVEY: That's a very large area of discourse.

MR. GRBAVAC: Yeah, I understand that, but you're proposing a fairly complex system for the average elector to comprehend. I mean, they're going to go to the poll with some choices now saying: do I like Ross Harvey the person? Do I like the party? Do I want who they nominated? Who am I voting for? What am I voting for? What am I getting?

MR. HARVEY: But electors make those choices now. In fact, as I understand it, the overwhelming weight of evidence in exit polls and in-depth interviews conducted with electors by political scientists, party remains the main determining factor in voting behaviour, followed very closely and in some cases exceeded by party leader, which, it can be argued, is more or less the same thing, especially in the kind of rigid cabinet government which we've evolved in this country.

Personally, I think that strong party influence in politics is on balance a good thing, because when it works properly, when the parties themselves take seriously the idea of mandate, then you can actually confront your electors with an array of honest choices in policy and program, and that's very healthy for democracy. I think that's what elections ought to be, and I think that's what clearly elections are not in the United States. Because you're absolutely right. Elections in the United States have to do with making deals,

and that means two things. First of all, it is rare that you get the presentation of an overarching program to the American people, and secondly, it wildly exaggerates the influence of cash in the American electoral system because it's the people with cash who have the money to make the deals, and obviously this is deemed by New Democrats not to be a terribly good thing.

MR. GRBAVAC: Thank you for your response.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Well, I want to thank you for coming, Ross. I should tell you this. We had something similar from the Social Credit Party when we had our hearings in November in Red Deer. I can't exactly remember the details, but their proposal was along the lines of yours.

MR. HARVEY: I think the reasons why small parties would more enthusiastically embrace proportional representation are perhaps obvious.

Thank you very much for your time, and the best of luck in your deliberations.

4:49

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We still have with us Mr. Tschetter, and he asked if he could come back. He wants to make some comments or ask a question.

MR. TSCHETTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had neglected previously to mention one other concern of mine. I was somewhat nervous. I wanted to ask the commission about their matrix as well. Could not 11 or 12 or 15 points be considered for their matrix instead of 10? And if each category of the matrix was strictly regulated to counting for 10 or if they could be weighed differently, would this require legislation to change it or is it just something that could be done?

THE CHAIRMAN: It doesn't require legislation. The matrix is an idea of this commission in trying to determine how hard or what effective representation meant. We're free to change the matrix to whatever way we like. We have some difficulty between ourselves as to whether each category should be equal or shouldn't be equal or whether one category should have 15 points and another category should only have seven points. We came up with our matrix in respect of our preliminary report to show the people that some constituencies, according to that matrix, were a lot more difficult to represent than others.

We were hoping that in the process of our second round people would come to us and tell us where our matrix was incorrect or how it could be improved, what could maybe be taken away from the matrix or what could be added to the matrix or how it could be changed.

So the matrix is an innovation of this commission, I want to say, for the first time. It was put in the preliminary report with the hope that we would get a reaction to it, and we are getting a reaction. A lot of the written submissions that we've got deal with the matrix.

Does that answer your question?

MR. TSCHETTER: Yes, sir, it does. Thank you. I understood the matrix. I thought it was a good idea myself. How it operated and how it worked was explained very clearly. That was the only other question that I had about the matrix, other than if it was being used on a computer. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Well, I guess we'll adjourn this afternoon's session. We made it within 10 minutes of our time limit, which I think is very good.

[The hearing adjourned from 4:52 p.m. to 7:03 p.m.]

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we would ask that you be seated as we would like to start the hearing. I want to welcome you and say good evening. I would like also to make a few introductory remarks.

My name is Edward Wachowich, and I am chairman of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'm also the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of Alberta. I feel certain that my other job in the court is much easier than my work with the commission. Hopefully, before this second round of hearings is concluded, I shall be able to decide which job is more difficult.

Let me introduce you to the other members of the commission. Robert Grbavac of Raymond, Alberta, is on my immediate left, Joe Lehan of Innisfail is on my immediate right, John McCarthy of Calgary is on my far right, and Wally Worth of Edmonton is on my far left. The five people you see before you make up the commission. I want to say that we are very happy to be here to receive your comments and your criticisms and to consider your thinking with respect to the proposals that we have made in our report, released in January.

Why are we here? The commission is here to listen to your comments on the proposals made with respect to the electoral boundaries in Alberta in our first report, which I believe received very wide circulation throughout the province of Alberta. The commission is charged by law to examine the areas, the boundaries, and the names of electoral divisions in Alberta and to make recommendations with respect to them.

As I have said, we made the preliminary recommendations in January. These recommendations were given wide publicity, and more than 3,000 copies of our report have been circulated throughout the province. We feel that on the second round of hearings we need only listen to your reactions, evaluate your comments and critiques, and move on to our final conclusion with respect to our mandate.

I want to assure you that every member of the commission has reviewed the law and the literature which has been recently written concerning electoral boundaries in Alberta. I want to tell you that we have reached preliminary conclusions with respect to our mandate, but I also want to tell you that our minds are not closed, nor have we reached any final conclusion. Every member of this commission has given these matters a lot of thought, and in reviewing the law, the work of previous commissions and committees which have studied boundaries in Alberta and in reviewing what the courts have said about electoral boundaries in the province of Alberta and in Canada, we've attempted to craft a preliminary proposal that will assure that all of the citizens of Alberta and all of the regions of Alberta are adequately represented in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

In order to put our second round of hearings in perspective, I want to present a brief summary of the electoral boundaries law. One, our function is to review the existing electoral boundaries and to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly about the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions in Alberta.

Two, we have a very limited time to accomplish this task. We submitted a report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in late

January and must now, after a second round of public hearings, submit our concluding report to the Speaker before the end of June of this year.

Three, as I have said, the commission is required to hold two sets of public hearings. The first set of hearings was completed last year in November. This second set of hearings will be completed in April of this year, and after we have considered the input from the hearings, we will craft our final report for submission to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Four, we are required to hold public hearings to enable representations to be made to us by any person or organization in Alberta about the area, the boundaries, and the names of electoral divisions that we have set out in our first report. I believe we have given reasonable notice of the times and places for this second round of hearings.

Five, the commission has the power to change its mind with respect to its preliminary proposal. When the second round of hearings is completed, we will also complete our deliberations and lay before the Speaker our final proposals with respect to electoral boundaries. The Speaker shall make the report public. It shall be published in the *Alberta Gazette*.

Six, if more than one report is submitted from among the members of the commission, the report of the majority is the report of the commission, but if there is no majority, my report, or the report of the chair, shall be the report of the commission.

Seven, the final report of the commission is then laid at the earliest opportunity before the Legislative Assembly, immediately if it is then sitting or within seven days after the beginning of the next sitting.

Eight, then it is up to the Legislative Assembly by resolution to approve or to approve with alterations the proposals of the commission and to introduce a Bill to establish new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution. This law would then come into force when proclaimed before the holding of the next general election.

Population rules. Population means the most recent populations set out in the most recent decennial census of the population of Alberta as provided by Statistics Canada. We are also required to add the population of Indian reserves that were not included in the census as provided by the federal department of Indian and northern affairs. But if the commission believes there is another provincewide census more recent than the decennial census compiled by Statistics Canada which provides the population for the proposed electoral divisions, then the commission may use this data.

Number of electoral divisions. The second rule is that the commission is required to divide Alberta into 83 proposed electoral divisions. The commission may take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but it must and shall take into consideration the following.

Relevant considerations: one, the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; two, sparsity and density of population; three, common community interests and community organizations including those of Indian reserves and Métis settlements; four, whenever possible existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary; five, the existing municipal boundaries; six, the number of municipalities and other local authorities; seven, geographical features including existing road systems; eight, the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

Population of electoral divisions. The population rule is that a

proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 percent above or below the average population for all 83 electoral divisions. There is an exception to the 25 percent rule. In the case of not more than four proposed electoral divisions the commission may have a population that is as much as 50 percent below the average population of the electoral divisions in Alberta if three of the following five criteria are met: one, the area exceeds 20,000 square kilometres or the surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15,000 square kilometres; two, the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of any proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres; three, there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people; four, the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Métis settlement; five, the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the province of Alberta.

Crowsnest Pass. For our purposes the boundaries Act instructs us that the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town.

This is a very general overview of the legislation, but we must also turn to the guidance that has been provided by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Supreme Court of Alberta. The commission wishes to note that many persons may not agree with our interpretation of these decisions. Be that as it may, we are certainly prepared to hear argument on the various points and to reconsider our position.

What have the Supreme Courts said? The Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal have agreed that the right to vote under the Charter includes, one, the right to vote; two, the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; three, the right to effective representation; four, the right to have the parity of the votes of others diluted but not unduly in order to gain effective representation or as a matter of practical necessity.

The rulings of the Supreme Courts as well as the electoral boundaries Act must guide our decisions and ultimately the proposals that we make to the Legislature.

Our focus. The commission clearly stated in its report that it wishes to merge a number of rural electoral divisions and to add one electoral division to Calgary and one electoral division to Edmonton. We invite you to comment on these proposals in their particulars. We have put before the people of Alberta our preliminary conclusions with respect to this matter. We have not reached any final conclusions.

7:13

The commission now wishes to hear the views of Albertans with respect to our first report and the focus I have described. Please let me assure you that our deliberations are preliminary at this point and that no final conclusions have been reached. The commission shall not move to the consideration of final proposals without the benefit of input from individuals and organizations in Alberta. Indeed, this is the whole purpose of the second round of public hearings.

I also want to say that without public input the work of the commission will be seriously impaired. We want to hear the arguments and reasoning of all organizations and individuals in Alberta with respect to the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions.

I'll now call upon the first presenters, and they are Kim Cassidy and John Day. Even though you're back – and we welcome you – and you gave us a very long report in Calgary the last time, I just got

your report when I came in, so I haven't had a chance to study it.

MR. CASSADY: Okay. There's not a whole lot in here in terms of changes. You guys have obviously done a lot more work than we ever thought about doing. A good job.

I'm going to just give some brief comments while John puts up our map of Edmonton, hopefully without destroying anything. First of all, as I say, a good job on the work you guys have done. It's probably the most complete electoral boundaries report I've ever encountered, and I've seen one or two of them from across the country. You've done a lot of work. There's an obvious trade-off here between representation by population and representation of the rural areas, addressing those fears. That compromise has been well done.

We've gone over it a little bit and made some suggestions for change. We've accepted that there's going to be one seat added to Edmonton and one seat added to Calgary at the expense of the rural, and we've addressed that accordingly and then made some suggestions for changes within that framework. I have focused more on Edmonton than the rest, so I'll let John address the bulk of the questions. I don't know much of the details of what we've proposed for outside of Edmonton. I'll leave that to John now.

MR. J. DAY: Okay. Fortunately, the ones outside Edmonton are fairly fast to deal with. They're all in page maps at the end of the written brief in somewhat different order than the text in the brief goes, but we'll follow them according to the order of the maps.

I think the first one is the city of Calgary. Starting from south to north, we wanted a small alteration between your proposed Calgary-Lougheed and Calgary-Shaw. The area that you have presently in Calgary-Lougheed that's south of Fish Creek is completely geographically isolated from the rest of Calgary-Lougheed. I guess you can wade across Fish Creek by horse, if I understand correctly, but that's about it.

MR. McCARTHY: There are a few footbridges.

MR. J. DAY: I sit corrected.

It just seemed to us that there would be a rather obvious geographical and community interest of that chunk of Calgary-Lougheed with Calgary-Shaw. It's not a very large population, I believe about 120 people, that's involved in that one.

In the case of Calgary-Glenmore and Calgary-Elbow, we think that area I believe between the Glenmore Trail and Heritage Drive should be either entirely in Calgary-Elbow or entirely in Calgary-Glenmore. Simply because there has been a previous association with Calgary-Glenmore, we thought it would feel more at home in Calgary-Glenmore.

MR. McCARTHY: So can I interrupt you as we're talking here?

MR. J. DAY: Certainly.

MR. McCARTHY: On your map that's that little jog there that you've got, which is what we had, and then yours is the darker black line. Is that correct?

MR. J. DAY: That's right, yeah. The darker black line is mine; the smaller one is yours.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay. Thanks.

MR. J. DAY: Calgary-Buffalo and Calgary-Currie. The boundary you have, as we said in our initial report, is simply not one that certainly I would have recognized as a natural dividing line when I was a resident there nor my many relatives when they were resident in that area. We are asking you once again to consider using 17th Avenue S.W. as a boundary line from 4th Street S.W. onwards. The population in that area being quite dense, you would have to make some sort of a trade-off with that, and we'd suggest that the Spruce Cliff area, having previously had an association with Buffalo, would be a fair trade. I think that sets more natural constituencies both for Calgary-Buffalo and Calgary-Currie. Okay; that's the end of it for Calgary.

Then we go to the next page. We're considering the five constituencies of Barrhead-Westlock, Athabasca-Wabasca, Lesser Slave Lake, Peace River, and Dunvegan. Barrhead-Westlock: there's just a small area involved. It's an area of 43 people that lies between the Pembina and Athabasca rivers; again, completely geographically isolated from the rest of Athabasca-Wabasca. It's really an extension of the Neerlandia-Vega settlement. It's an artifact of the municipal boundaries that it's been placed in Athabasca-Wabasca. The 43 residents of that area would have quite a job getting to any other part of Athabasca-Wabasca. Their community of interest is with Barrhead-Westlock.

Dunvegan is also fairly easy to dispose of. What we're suggesting there is that the two townships immediately west of Peace River be transferred back into Peace River from Dunvegan. It's basically the Peace River town airport and a small surrounding area that's always had a very close and intimate connection with the Peace River town. I might mention that it's an alteration that was proposed by both Mr. Walter Paszkowski and Mr. Nick Taylor at the time that the present set of boundaries were passed by the Legislature. It's an alteration that I believe would have been adopted by the Legislative Assembly except that they ran out of time at their committee stage to put it through, but there was a fair bipartisan interest in that one.

Okay. The starting point, looking at the big changes here basically involving Lesser Slave Lake, involve some geographical realities. There is a fundamental dividing line in the communities of the lower Peace and the mouth of the Athabasca; it's the Vermilion Chutes. They are approximately at the mouth of the Mikkwa River where it meets the Peace River. In a sense, the Mikkwa River is the boundary that we've drawn in at the northeast corner of Lesser Slave Lake. That involves the Fox Lake reserve and the settlement of Garden River, which is in Wood Buffalo national park. The natural connection with those communities historically, both market and transportation, has always been with Fort Chipewyan. Our argument is that Fox Lake and Garden River should be in Athabasca-Wabasca. It makes life, I think, a little easier for whoever is going to represent Lesser Slave Lake, and I don't think it makes life much more difficult for the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca. The connection is with Chipewyan; it's not with Fort Vermilion or anything upriver from the Vermilion Chutes.

The same would have applied to the reserve of John D'Or Prairie, which is the only remaining inhabited area of the part of Lesser Slave Lake that now lies north of the Peace River. It's right at the end of the highway running east from High Level. Since that highway has been built, its markets, its community interests, its normal transportation, its normal routes in and out are with High Level, so we suggest that that should be in Peace River rather than

in Lesser Slave Lake. Similarly, that highway corridor and, for that matter, the air routes that tend to fly in that area tend to follow that line now running from Fort Vermilion to Slave Lake. It would seem to us that Fort Vermilion and La Crête and all those areas have more in common now with Lesser Slave Lake, and that community of interest is going to increase. We gave a population figure of 5,400 for that area. That will strike you as large. It may well be that we're wrong in that. It strikes me as strange.

7:23

We think the end result of these northern changes, though, is better from a community standpoint, transportation standpoint, representational standpoint. I think it also makes the three constituencies a little easier to represent.

A quick note on this one. If you were to adopt this, Peace River would become a special consideration constituency. I think it would meet all your criteria, and I don't think it's a difficult case to justify. I think Lesser Slave Lake on these boundaries comes in just under the 25 percent limit.

Okay. We'll go on to the next page, which is central Alberta. Again, the suggestions we're making about Barrhead-Westlock and Athabasca-Wabasca – that's just a little easier to see on this map at the top. It's just that little area between the Athabasca and Pembina rivers. At the bottom between Rocky-Sylvan Lake and Olds-Didsbury we suggested the transfer of three tiers of townships east of Banff national park. The population is not large; there are about 20 people who live there. They do live in the municipal district of Clearwater, but they are miles and miles away from anybody else in Clearwater. They pretty much are associated with the town of Sundre and we think should be associated with Sundre for representational purposes.

The last page is the fastest one to deal with, you'll be delighted to hear. Between Banff-Cochrane and Highwood we would strongly suggest that the Sarcee reserve be in one constituency or the other constituency. Because there's a historic connection with the Morley reserve and so on, we suggest it would be better placed in Banff-Cochrane. It's a community with an obvious joint interest, which we believe is better handled by one member.

In the case of Crowsnest-Macleod and Cardston-Taber we simply ask you the question again about Waterton Lakes national park. To at least outside appearances, Waterton Lakes seems to have more in common with the Crowsnest.

Bow Valley-Chinook. There's another group of people who would be completely isolated from the rest of their constituency. That's right at the southernmost point, the Pearsonville area in Bow Valley-Chinook, about 12 residents whose connections are pretty much entirely with the town of Bow Island. So we suggest you transfer them to Cypress.

We ask the question again about the area between the South Saskatchewan and the line between townships 12 and 13. Simply, as you've drawn Bow Valley-Chinook, the member for that constituency is going to spend an awful lot of time on the Highway 41 corridor. I think he's going to be finding he's spending a lot of time driving back and forth between Medicine Hat and Empress, along that way. So it occurred to us that it might be easier both for him and for the Member for Cypress if that corridor was entirely in one constituency.

So that's the story outside Edmonton.

Kim, if you want to take over on Edmonton, and we'll take it from there.

MR. CASSADY: We had a good long look at Edmonton and talked with quite a large number of people in coming up with the proposal that we have. The proposal we've come up with essentially leaves most of the constituencies exactly as the commission has drawn them, particularly in northeast Edmonton. Where we fooled around a little bit was down in southwest Edmonton.

First of all, this Riverview constituency crossing the river. The river is perhaps a greater boundary in Edmonton than the commission realized. It's a huge psychological barrier. When I lived on the south side – and I was just in the university area – it seemed to me to be quicker to go to Mill Woods than it was to Westmount. That's a difference of probably seven or eight miles. There's that much of a barrier involved. If you had to draw a cross-river constituency, we say in our written presentation that you couldn't have found a worse place. The two halves of the proposed constituency of Riverview are not even connected by a bridge. It's difficult to do that in Edmonton, to draw a constituency like that without having a bridge in it, but you managed. So this is, I think, a bit of a problem. There is that barrier there.

Instead of just simply criticizing, we decided to come up with another proposal, as is our wont. What we did was recreate the old constituency of Jasper Place, which has some historical significance in Edmonton. It was a town until – what year?

MR. J. DAY: Until 1964.

MR. CASSADY: Until '64. So it's a fairly recent history, in living memory of a whole lot of people out there.

We took parts of Edmonton-Meadowlark and a little bit of Edmonton-McClung away and gave them to Edmonton-Glenora and took some stuff away from Calder and . . .

MR. J. DAY: Mayfield, you mean.

MR. CASSADY: Mayfield. You took Mayfield out of Mayfield and still called it Mayfield. I don't know.

We kind of took pieces of it to recreate this old constituency of Jasper Place. Now, if you reject the idea that there can be a constituency in Edmonton crossing the river, you'll find, if you just go through the numbers, that the new constituency has to be created on the north side. If you create it on the south side, you end up with constituencies with an average of about 29,000. It's much too small for an urban area. If you do it on the north side, you're just under 31,000, so you're just about right bang on average for an average constituency size on the north side. So that's why we did the boundaries the way we have. I don't think there's much more to say on that, really.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll start the questioning with Wally. He's the expert on Edmonton.

MR. WORTH: Well, again you've overwhelmed us with the scope and comprehensiveness of your work, and I congratulate you and commend you on it. It does hurt us a little, though, to have you say that the Edmonton-Riverview solution is the worst possible proposal that could have been made, because we sort of believed that it was perhaps the best solution that existed, given the fact that we were trying to do something about alleviating the population distribution on the south side, which sees a buildup in Edmonton-Strathcona and Edmonton-Rutherford, at the same time acknowledging that there

was a buildup of population and certainly one in the future in the west end of the city as well.

MR. J. DAY: Well, that would have made a brilliant argument, in fact, for allotting two additional seats to Edmonton, one on either side of the river. We assume you thought that one through and, notwithstanding disclaimers, we don't expect you to change your mind about that one, but if you do, think about it.

MR. WORTH: Well, we'll take your advice if we do.

The other point I wanted to make was that we thought also that there was some community of interest at least socioeconomically between the north side of the river and the south side of the river, the groups that were involved in the new proposed constituency, but that community of interest may not be as forceful or as important perhaps as some others.

I also was interested in your comment that to an Edmontonian a community on the other side of the river may as well be on the other side of the world. I guess our mayor here is wondering which part of the city he represents then, whether he's the north side mayor or the south side mayor. Certainly in municipal politics we know that we do have constituencies, or wards, that cut across the river.

All that aside, let me clarify your proposal. You're basically suggesting that changes occur in what is now Edmonton-Mayfield and part of Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. CASSADY: And Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. WORTH: And Edmonton-Meadowlark. Okay.

MR. CASSADY: And a minor change to Edmonton-McClung.

MR. J. DAY: Coming back to that one, essentially there has always been something of a twin-cities concept about Edmonton. It goes back to the historic city of Strathcona. There's still that very strong remaining civic sense appropriate to the south side and one to the north side to the extent that this creates a certain amount of schizophrenia in a civic sense. I guess as a former school trustee I can bear some witness to that.

As to the cross-river wards, the observation is that the city was playing with six electoral units. If you were thinking in a similar way of the federal ridings, similarly they pretty much have to cross the river, given their criteria, but their criteria are, again, dealing with six electoral units. When you're dealing with 18, 19, or 20 – and we're not debating that number – the river then becomes a factor you can't ignore. There is a certain amount of socioeconomic community of interest. I suppose, though, the same observation could equally be made, say, of some of the higher income areas along Ada Boulevard in the Highlands area and in Riverview; you know, the Henderson Estates actually in the far southwest corner. They are similarly socioeconomic communities, but they are two entirely different worlds. Basically, the two sides of the river began differently. They've developed their own personal identities. They do go their own way to a certain extent. Yes, indeed, Mayor Smith . . .

7:33

MR. WORTH: Well, John I think I understand your proposal and the rationale for it, and we'll have to study it.

MR. J. DAY: Very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions, just a comment to reiterate what I said in Calgary. Congratulations; I think you did an excellent job. You probably recognize some of your work in our interim report, and consequently you may recognize some of your work in our final report.

MR. J. DAY: Well, that will go as it goes. Thank you for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No questions. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to again thank you two gentlemen for all the work you've done. You're probably our hardest working team, coming here and making your views known and the assistance you're trying to provide us. Thank you.

MR. J. DAY: Well, it's been great fun. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Mayor Bill Smith of the city of Edmonton.

MR. B. SMITH: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, and certainly thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the citizens of Edmonton. As outlined in our submission and in previous dialogue we've had, we certainly share with Calgary a concern, so to speak, for the worth of our people's vote, a concern that the level of underrepresentation in Alberta's big cities could translate into inequity, a concern shared, as you know, by the courts. So we're pleased to see that the work of this Electoral Boundaries Commission acknowledges that concern and takes a step toward equity. Of course, we hope this step represents the beginning of a longer walk, but for now we as a city council certainly support your recommendation and would welcome this overdue addition of one electoral division within Edmonton's boundaries. We would hope that the government approves. For half of Alberta's citizens it would be a step closer to the ideal.

Some observers have pointed out to me that the number of MLAs representing Edmonton already outstrips the size of our own city council, but we would urge the government to see this question within the proper context, the context of a provincial decision to maintain an 83-vote legislative body. Each voter should have the satisfaction of an equal vote, so I commend you for moving closer to that goal. I also commend you for making many wise choices in the proposed boundaries for our city.

We're happy to note that changes from current electoral districts are minimal, and where changes do occur, they usually result in improvements by shifting communities to more appropriate districts. In general, the resulting proposed electoral areas are identifiable and reasonably compact while respecting community league boundaries, and I think this is a really key consideration. Equally important, proposed district populations and percentage of variance appear reasonable. Much of your work reflects good understanding of the dynamics of our community, and I would certainly like to take this

opportunity to salute you for that insight.

The city's response to the commission's report is summarized as follows. First, we support the addition of one electoral division for both the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, and when we talk about Riverview – well, I mean we could also have two there – I think we have to remember that rivers separate us but they certainly don't divide us.

Finally, I'd also request that the commission examine the merits of reducing the time interval established by the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act for future boundary reviews. I wish to reiterate that our city sees much value in reducing the time between boundary reviews. Like it or not, it seems inevitable that rural populations will continue to shrink in comparison to our large urban centres. So shorter time periods between reviews would help us avoid making huge overnight changes in boundaries and help us attain the Alberta Court of Appeal's expectation of gradual and steady change to fair and effective representation, which I'm sure is a goal that all of us share.

Thank you very much for allowing me this short presentation, Mr. Chairman and commission. If you have any questions, I've brought my learned friend with me to support what I can't answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll start with Dr. Wally Worth. He's our Edmonton expert.

MR. WORTH: This is going to get me in a lot of trouble with some people in this audience, I would suspect.

First, thank you very much for your accolades in terms of how well we've done thus far with some parts of Edmonton. I'd be interested, since you have your expert with you, in your comment about something that you didn't mention during your presentation but which has concerned us in trying to draw boundaries in Edmonton, and that is: do you believe that we were able to anticipate the potential growth areas adequately in terms of our proposals?

MR. B. SMITH: Well, Dr. Worth, I think that's probably a difficult one to answer, because I anticipate the growth of Edmonton is going to be huge. That aside, do you know what? I think one of the most difficult things to do here is: how do you draw these boundaries so that you're going to satisfy everybody? I really believe that you've looked at it well, and it's never going to satisfy each and every person within the city or within the province, but we've got to come up with what we feel is the best thing.

You know, when we talk about Riverview under that Act, if we're not contravening any laws that the Act has set out, I don't see a problem with Riverview, but as my friend had said earlier, if you want to divide it and make it two, that would be fine with us, I'm sure.

However, on a serious note, I think Riverview can work. It's an area that I'm very familiar with in the city. Again, I think rivers separate us; they don't divide us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No. No questions.

MR. LEHANE: It's probably putting you both on the spot to ask you to comment on the previous presenters' proposal. Mr. Day and Mr. Cassidy have proposed an alternate boundary division for Edmonton which would eliminate the Riverview constituency. I

don't know if you've had enough of an opportunity to look at that to feel that you could comment, but perhaps if you couldn't, you could get back to us later with that.

MR. B. SMITH: Sure. Mr. Lehane, if I understood, with respect, their concern, it was the natural division of the river, and there seemed to be a feeling that these were different people on different sides of the river. Of course, with respect, I don't see it that way. They referred to whether there was a bridge there, but I don't think that's important. I think that with Riverview – again the river separates us; it doesn't divide us. I think that on both sides of the river you have similar types of communities. So I didn't share their concerns.

MR. VAN SCHAIK: In support of Mayor Smith's comments, the planning and development department did a review of the proposed boundaries as per the interim report and really did find that in a lot of cases they did result in improvements. There was a sympathy and a review to the community boundaries, and as such, I think it's favourable.

THE CHAIRMAN: John.

MR. McCARTHY: Yes, I have a question. It may not be a fair one because I didn't give you a chance to prepare. What are the city's criteria with respect to the variances of population within your wards, and what are they now?

7:43

MR. VAN SCHAIK: The current percentage variance is plus or minus 10 percent, is my understanding from the city clerk's rules for wards.

MR. McCARTHY: All right. So obviously they comply with that at this stage then. Is that correct?

MR. VAN SCHAIK: My understanding is they do comply, yes.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make this comment and see what your comment is. I think you've already commented on this. I look at the new constituency of Riverview. It takes in Grandview, Belgravia, Windsor Park on the south side and takes in Laurier Heights, Valleyview, and part of Meadowlark on the north side. These are identical communities. The *Edmonton Examiner* had an article, that having the river divide these two areas in one constituency was atrocious. I had some lady phone me up at 11 o'clock at night telling me that the *Examiner* was all wrong, that there's nothing wrong with being on both sides of the river. We had Mr. Cassaday and Mr. Day here today telling us that we've made a mistake in respect to Riverview being divided by the river and that it should either be on the north side or the south side. So, you see, we're getting two different views on this thing. But I gather what you're telling us is that the river separates us but doesn't divide us.

MR. B. SMITH: It separates; it doesn't divide us. Mr. Chairman, those communities that you've identified are very, very similar types of communities. If you want to break it down to income levels, that type of thing, they're very, very similar. But, again, I think the important thing to mention, as I said earlier, is that as long as it

doesn't contravene the Act in any way, rivers separate; they don't divide. The last time I looked, they still spoke the same languages on both sides.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, representing that constituency as far as travel – even though there is no bridge exactly in the constituency, there are bridges close to each side. I think that's a lot easier constituency to represent than a lot of rural constituencies in Alberta.

MR. B. SMITH: I would agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank you for coming.

MR. B. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, commission, for the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is John Ward.

MR. WARD: Gentlemen, I'll try to get you back on scheduled time. I'll make it very short. I think you did a pretty fair job, and your Riverview problem is no problem at all. It's your returning officer. He's the one that's got to go across the river, not the people.

Edmonton-Centre is what I'm concerned with. I had no problem there at all. I look at the population in the next election. It will become again another 10 percent of what it is now, based on what's happening with the high-rises. In that area you don't have the population in homes except for about four of them. Outside of that, you have your major population in your high-rises, and that again is growing down there. So I can see that what you've done now and left it as is is appropriate, to tell the truth.

That's the end of my submission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Wally.

MR. WORTH: I really can't think of any questions at this stage, Mr. Ward. Again, let me say that we appreciate your kind comments about our work.

You did serve as a returning officer. I do have one kind of question. You served as a returning officer in Edmonton-Centre; is that correct?

MR. WARD: Yes. Right.

MR. WORTH: That's an inner-city constituency. Going to the question of effective representation, are there factors in a constituency like that that our commission should pay special attention to in terms of their contribution to the degree of difficulty of representing that constituency?

MR. WARD: Not really. The constituency is broken down into ethnic groups, shall we say. It's just a case of working with that group in each area. You have population growths that are coming towards – the 101st Street area is growing higher, and in the next election you will see a bigger growth there again, I think, in population. So it just means that total is expected to grow.

MR. WORTH: Is transiency a factor? Mobility or transiency: is that a factor?

MR. WARD: Oh, the transiency factor is there. You're looking at about a 40 percent change in population from the last election.

MR. WORTH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe.

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John.

MR. McCARTHY: No questions. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to make one comment and see whether you agree with me or disagree. I want to say that Edmonton-Centre, because of the fact that you have the poverty section and the wealthy section and you have the different nationality groups and whatnot, is a harder constituency to represent than our new constituency of Riverview. Do you agree or disagree?

MR. WARD: Very much so. We have to make sure that the people working in that area understand the language.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next presenter is Vern Green.

MR. GREEN: Chief Judge Wachowich, your panel, and ladies and gentlemen, my name is Vern Green, and I come here as a past returning officer from the last election. My credibility in this area is that I was a past president of Jasper Place, which was mentioned a little while ago as the Jasper Place constituency; it disappeared. I was also a regional director, and as a regional director I was representing Glenora, Meadowlark, Kingsway, and Jasper Place. I learned a little bit about being diplomatic here, because we did at that point have some very high profile ministers leading those constituencies. That wasn't an easy operation, but it had to be done.

The returning officer for Edmonton-Mayfield – that was a brand-new constituency. I would like to say now that I'd congratulate your group and the electoral office for the patience and understanding you've had to date in looking at all the proposals that are coming from everyplace. I think you've done an excellent job in laying out the constituencies for 83 places.

My job, when I come in as a returning officer, as John Ward will agree – we get the boundaries from you. When they come to me, I've already got the outside layout. From then on, I had 65 polls to put down together, and at that point I had to make sure that the people were – again, we had to put the number of people in each poll. We had a similar job. I got an extreme lot of help and a lot of education and training from the electoral office. Without that, it would be an impossible job as a returning officer. The polling places were a small problem, but they worked out with some help from the local people. A lot of legwork in there.

The new Mayfield constituency. It looks like Jim Acton from Mayfield decided that he wanted to get rid of the name so we could throw Mayfield out, so I have no home. I was looking forward, maybe, to following into Glenora. Glenora came up with their

proposal this afternoon and said, "Hey, we don't want any changes." I'm sitting in a kind of limbo now. There's a beautiful little area of Mayfield, Youngstown and Britannia, with community centres in there all intact. I worked with the community centres, and I'm concerned also about them. They're all in one nice little package, and I'm looking forward to Mayfield having a home.

Also, I'll just say thank you again for your job. Whenever this is all settled, I'm ready to offer my services in whichever constituency Mayfield comes into.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you for coming, Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Greg Krasichynski.

MR. KRASICHYNSKI: Krasichynski.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is it? Krasichynski. Okay. I'm sorry; I should be able to deal with those names.

7:53

MR. KRASICHYNSKI: I'm just sort of Joe Q. Urban Albertan. When I found out that I could just call up and come in here and talk, I thought it was so cool. I'm not particularly politically active. I've been an Edmontonian for 15 years now. I've always taken the issues of democracy and politics sort of for granted. You know: "Well, others are watching them. They can't do anything wrong. It's got to be airtight." Then somebody explained the concept of gerrymandering to me, and I thought: right; you're pulling my leg. Then I read an article in the *Edmonton Journal*, and they overstated the case, but basically what they showed was three rural votes to one urban vote in this province. I have a background in statistics, so once I was able to take out the hyperbole, it was still there. It terrified me, like a scream running around inside my brain: no way; this doesn't happen, not in Canada.

So I just wanted to be here to express my support for what you're doing. I fear that perhaps the politicians have become the guardians of politics and that your commission, the hands-on administrators of the electoral process, are the ones who are the actual guardians of democracy. It's way overdue here.

My wife wished to speak on behalf of the Alberta Federation of Labour. She was unable to attend because she was ill, but she wanted me to convey that she believes very firmly in the four

precepts as agreed by the Supreme Court, particularly the right not to have your vote unduly diluted. She and her membership fully support the addition of the ridings as they exist.

I've taken a look at the statistical models, and I think you've done a marvelous job with what you've got. Bill Smith pretty much said the rest of it, but the one thing of his that I would like to repeat is that I agree that perhaps the review process could be made a little bit more frequent, the intervals in between a little bit less, to make the process a bit more dynamic so that we don't have to worry about these big changes and big leaps and then of course the inevitable opposition that follows.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Wally, any questions?

MR. WORTH: No. I just want to commend you for coming out, and I think your point of view is clearly stated. Thank you.

MR. KRASICHYNSKI: Thank you. You do know the work. Good luck.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe.

MR. LEHANE: No questions, thank you.

MR. MCCARTHY: No. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to explain the fact that I didn't make a mistake on your name. It was spelt wrong on my sheet.

MR. KRASICHYNSKI: I know. It was spelt wrong in the book.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because I don't make those kinds of mistakes.

MR. KRASICHYNSKI: All right. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Krasichynski.

Bronwyn Shoush and Mr. Opalinski.

MS SHOUSH: Thank you, sir. Chief Judge Wachowich, members of the panel, good evening. I'm here to make a submission on behalf of the Edmonton-Strathcona Progressive Conservative Association. The main point of our submission this evening is that we object to the creation of a riding that crosses the river in the way that it does in this case. We understand that in Calgary there is a constituency that crosses the river, but the river there is a much different kind of entity from the North Saskatchewan River at the heights of Windsor Park going over to Laurier Heights.

I have prepared a submission, which you've just received tonight. We take the position that Edmonton-Strathcona is a historical electoral district within Edmonton and Alberta, and it's a cultural, social, and educational centre in Edmonton and Alberta. Its northern boundary looks toward the southern bank of the North Saskatchewan River, and it looks directly ahead to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. There is no problem for any person in Edmonton-Strathcona, as it presently exists, to seek proper representation from

his Member of the Legislative Assembly. We are directly across the river and have very easy access to the Legislative Assembly.

We believe that Edmonton-Strathcona is part of the urban core of Edmonton and that the proposals you have put concerning Edmonton-Riverview are to add suburban parts of the city to an urban core and to remove from Edmonton-Strathcona the focal point of it, namely the University of Alberta and the University hospital.

Now, this evening I heard from the mayor that he believes that the people who live on both sides of the river in Windsor Park – I live in Windsor Park – and the people who live over in Laurier Heights and Crestwood and Lynnwood form part of the same kind of community and they have the same community of interests. I would disagree with that.

I grew up in Jasper Place, and I remember very clearly that we did not have the same kind of interest in the development of our city and in the development of the province insofar as our interests looked north towards Stony Plain and then down to 124th Street and to the downtown core. Now those same interests might lie in looking west to West Edmonton Mall and to the Misericordia hospital and the high schools that are west of the river.

We've taken a look at some of the statistics that concern the last election. We believe that the commission in deciding how to propose boundaries can look at the number of electors in a constituency as part of the consideration of how you should draw the boundaries. We have provided for you a breakdown of the number of electors. I guess I should have added the numbers of population beside it; I did it on my own copy in handwriting, and I can do that for you as well. We believe that if it's necessary at all to add another riding to Edmonton, there should be 11 electoral districts on the north side of the river and eight on the south side.

The eight on the south side should be divided with four east of the CPR tracks as they now exist – there are four there now – and four west of the CPR tracks, taking in all of Edmonton south of the river. We have provided descriptions of the boundaries of each of those ridings. We believe that they would meet all the criteria set out in the Act, in the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal. We also believe they'll take into account our own experience in living in Edmonton-Strathcona and understanding what makes up Edmonton-Strathcona.

Old Strathcona, a cultural centre with the Fringe and the festivals and the theatres, the University of Alberta and the hospital, the communities right around the University of Alberta – Windsor Park, Belgravia, Garneau, and McKernan – have very close interactions on a community-level scale. We believe it was a mistake to break up those communities, to separate Garneau and McKernan from Belgravia and Windsor Park, or the parts that have been separated in the proposal.

I have a number of statistics in here that would explain to you how, if the proposal we submit is accepted, the population numbers and the numbers of electors would fall well within the range of the criteria set out in the Act. I guess in particular we're looking at the definition of community provided in your document or as referred to by some academic who has provided a definition of a community as that which is revealed through patterns of work, strong historic divergence of identity, and looking at the urban core as being substantially different from the suburbs.

If you like, I could read to you the boundaries that we propose for Edmonton-Strathcona. We would propose to I guess insert a new electoral district south of Edmonton-Strathcona, then have Edmonton-Rutherford, and then at the southern extreme of the city,

Edmonton-Whitemud. We would suggest that Edmonton-Strathcona should commence at 76th Avenue and the CPR tracks and travel north to Whyte Avenue, then easterly to the right bank of Mill Creek north of Whyte Avenue, then continue north to 97th Avenue and the river boundaries, then go west along the left bank of the North Saskatchewan River to Whitemud Drive at the Quesnell bridge, then from there a fast U-turn and drive east along Fox Drive to Belgravia road, following Belgravia road into 72nd Avenue to 109th Street and north to 76th Avenue and then east to the point of commencement.

8:03

This proposal follows natural boundaries or geographic entities that exist in Edmonton as part of the transportation system. In particular, it provides a means of not having our constituency cross the river at points where it's going to be very difficult for a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I would submit, to represent the interests of the persons who live on the north side of the river and those on the south, in particular the people who will be moved out of Edmonton-Strathcona to be placed across the river with the communities of Glenora and Jasper Place and McClung.

Those are my submissions. I'll answer any questions if I can, or we would be pleased to put something in more detail for you if you would like.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would. We'll listen to Alex Opalinski next, and then we'll ask both of you questions.

MR. OPALINSKI: Well, Bronwyn has said what had to be said, and I'm wholeheartedly backing her.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

MR. WORTH: I would just like to begin by pointing out that this is one of the few submissions we've received that talks about electors as opposed to population. I'm assuming that the reason you did that is because there is some significant difference in proportions here when you start using electors as opposed to population. For example, you show in here that Strathcona has 26,000-plus people whereas Edmonton-Roper has 18,900.

MS SHOUSH: Yes. We found that very interesting. We thought it might have been an omission by the commission, the fact that they didn't look at the numbers of electors in each constituency when looking at the populations as well. I know the Act says that you should look at the populations, but you have the discretion to take into account other matters. We believe that the Electoral Boundaries Commission in this first report has not taken into account the fact that they could, if it's necessary, distribute the electors or the population in a different way without having to cross a formidable boundary. For example, Edmonton-Roper is 18,993. Edmonton-Ellerslie is very small; it's 17,320.

MR. WORTH: These are electors?

MS SHOUSH: Electors, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, what do you infer from that about the composition of the population in those areas?

MS SHOUSH: Well, I guess we would infer from that that there are more families living in single-family dwellings perhaps. Edmonton-

Strathcona has a more concentrated number of electors, so I would submit there are probably more adults living there and maybe more single individuals living in their own homes. There are quite a few apartments there, for example.

MR. WORTH: Does that kind of population composition or demographics pose any particular problems with respect to representation in a constituency like Edmonton-Strathcona?

MS SHOUSH: I don't think that within the constituency of Edmonton-Strathcona it's difficult to represent those individuals. There are, of course, quite a few people who attend the University of Alberta. They're younger and their interests may be different from those of families. Now, in Grandview, in Laurier Heights, Lynnwood, there are lots of young families living there, and their interests may be quite different from single individuals who haven't yet taken the steps, or who may have taken the steps and completed them, with their families.

MR. WORTH: I notice that you've stopped the boundary at the CPR tracks on the east side. That's an interesting decision, because it would seem to me that the community of interest between 109th Street, let's say, and 76th Avenue – and you think of the old Strathcona community and so on – might be stronger and more cohesive than one that stretches from the CPR tracks to the river on the west, where you have your Windsor Park and university crew.

MS SHOUSH: I may have misstated my boundaries there if that's what you understood. We're saying that from the CPR tracks and White Avenue, we would go east up to the Mill Creek Ravine.

MR. WORTH: But you wouldn't go into Ritchie.

MS SHOUSH: No, we wouldn't. Historically, when Julian Koziak represented the riding of Edmonton-Strathcona, that area north of the tracks went, I think, up to Bonnie Doon. I believe those are distinct communities, and it's because of the industrial area around. It's starting to change now. There are more new businesses going into the Whyte Avenue area east of 99th Street. The people who live north of the tracks between, say, 103rd Street and 99th Avenue have quite similar interests, I would think. There are many high-rise apartments, and there are a number of communities right on the very east side, right by the ravine, that are quite similar to Windsor Park.

MR. WORTH: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of your comments.

MS SHOUSH: Thank you, sir.

MR. GRBAVAC: Well, I certainly yield to my colleague with respect to his knowledge of the city of Edmonton. However, 25 years ago as a university student I did live in this now reconfigured riding. My recollection is – and I would tend to concur with the mayor in his remarks earlier – that the people on either side of the river probably had a lot in common in terms of their socioeconomic background and various other community interests as opposed to those in our old watering holes, which were the Strathcona and the Commercial and the areas down there along Whyte Avenue. That's my recollection of the constituency, that those areas along the river would have a lot more in common than the area to the east. Has that

changed? I appreciate that a lot has changed along Whyte Avenue; I hardly recognize much of what I remember of Whyte Avenue. Has there been a dynamic shift there in terms of who resides there and the socioeconomic strata that they would fit into?

MS SHOUSH: Yes, I would certainly say so. I believe one of the main features of Edmonton-Strathcona is the cultural and educational contribution it gives to the life of the city. The cultural contribution comes through the theatres and the arts, the artisans, those people living there. Whether they have the same incomes as people living in Belgravia or in Valleyview or somewhere like that I don't think is the point. I think we should look at a community of interests. We may have professors of drama or English and so forth and people who are poets and dramatists who live in the Old Strathcona area. I would challenge the mayor, if I had the opportunity to do that, to tell me exactly how people in Lynnwood have an identity of interests with the people who live in Garneau or Windsor Park or Belgravia. I don't agree with him.

MR. GRBAVAC: Okay. Thank you. That answers my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that we've put Lynnwood into Riverview. Have we?

MS SHOUSH: I believe you have, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's fine.

MR. LEHANE: I'd just like to respond for a moment to your position about looking at electors as opposed to population. As you're well aware, we're proscribed by the Act in terms of looking at population, and, as you indicated, we can look at other considerations. But I think that if you look at the variances in electors between constituencies, it really doesn't tell you why there's a variance in electors. There is a multitude of reasons. It may not be only the fact that there are larger families with more children in the area. It may be, for instance, that the Blood Indian reserve, with a native population of 7,200, is in that constituency and that they choose not to participate in provincial elections. So, you know, there are many, many reasons, and there are not a lot of constants in using those sorts of figures. So that's one of the problems.

MS SHOUSH: I guess the reason that we put the numbers of electors in this submission is because in Edmonton-Strathcona, from many years of campaigning there and doing polls and all those things, we know that a large number of the electors living in that constituency are people who are adults as opposed to families which include young children. Those people's ability to express themselves and get their message across to the Legislature is, I would say, very good.

Now, Edmonton-Strathcona has 26,444 electors and about 38,000 in population. Each elector would speak for 1.5 persons in my calculation. I think that the proposal we have put to you is a reasonable way of adding a new constituency to Edmonton in the southwest quadrant of the city and leaving a fair number of electors and/or population in each of those. Again, our objection is to crossing the river.

8:13

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No questions. Thanks.

MR. OPALINSKI: If I might add, if you were the MLA . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: I won't be.

MR. OPALINSKI: I'm generalizing. If you were the MLA and you were representing the people, I will just ask the question: how would you represent them? Are you going to give the wherewithal, the provisions for that MLA to have two constituency offices, one on the west side of the river and one on the east? It is in excess of 17 miles for the person to travel around to the constituency office.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are MLAs in Alberta that have seven constituency offices.

MR. OPALINSKI: In the city of Edmonton?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. I'm comparing all MLAs.

MR. GRBAVAC: Alex, I used to live on Fox Drive. I thought everybody from the west side of the river drove in front of my house. Maybe they don't do that anymore.

THE CHAIRMAN: There's no doubt, Alex, that to represent two sides of the river is a little more difficult than just having your constituency on one side.

MR. OPALINSKI: Yes, and that's the only thing I said about the mayor. Nothing against him, but if he was to campaign and run as an MLA, what would he envision? Two campaign offices, to be fair to the population: that's all we're saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's still easy compared to somebody who's campaigning out in the country.

MR. OPALINSKI: At minus 34 – I agree with you, sir. Thank you.

MS SHOUSH: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: We had Cathy Cram scheduled for 7:40, who was added to our list, and I want to now call upon her. I'm sorry for having overlooked you, Cathy.

MS CRAM: That's okay. I thought maybe you'd taken a look at my brief and knew I was going to argue against this Riverview constituency and that you didn't really want to hear from me.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. We want to hear from everybody.

MS CRAM: I'm glad now that I'm following Strathcona anyway. I feel there's a little more support in the room for my position perhaps.

Gentlemen, I'm providing this submission this evening on behalf of the Glenora Liberal Constituency Association. I, too, have some serious problems with your proposed Riverview constituency, and the bulk of my presentation will be focused on that. I have also provided you with a suggestion, and I will thank John Patrick Day and Kim Cassady for assisting me with my presentation and map. You'll see that it's very similar to the one they have already provided you.

I'd like to, I guess, base my submission on three separate headings: community, history, and geography in the city of

Edmonton. Communitywise my comments are very similar to those by the previous presenters, although I've provided you with some more personal thoughts even, as far as my experiences in Edmonton have gone.

When I first came here, I too came to the university and lived near the university. I found that my experience and that of many of my classmates and friends was that we basically stayed on the south side, and in fact in probably the first two years I was here, I think I maybe crossed the river twice. I know that as a student that's perhaps a little bit different, but that was the experience. I've now moved to Old Glenora, and I now find that I rarely travel to the south side, obviously for some things, but generally we stay on the north side. I'm not sure totally what the reason is. It's not that we're big community supporters or anything. Part of it is that you support your community, and you don't necessarily travel to the far malls or even to Whyte Avenue. Very rarely. We tend to stay closer to home, 124th Street and those areas.

Another experience that I also think is relevant and is indicative of the spirit of community that is evident in the communities north of the river which currently make up Glenora is that I've run the community basketball program for the Glenora community association for a number of years. It's quite a large organization. I found that the kids that make up that program basically come from Glenora and then Parkview, Laurier, Crestwood, all down through there and then also into the west end. When I was there, no kids from the south side played for Glenora. Nobody in Glenora or Parkview or Laurier went to the south side; they all played on the north side. I think that's just also indicative of the sense of community and the fact that those communities up from Laurier are all tightly bound to Glenora. Then as time goes on, the children also end up going to north-side schools and things like that, and it just becomes even closer.

I don't think there are a whole lot of ties to the south side. I will concede some of the points that have been made, socioeconomic-type points, that perhaps economically or financially the communities of Parkview and Laurier are very similar to those of Windsor Park and Belgravia, but that's only money. They're probably exactly the same as the people in Highlands or some of the ones down in Riverview, and there's not much tie to those communities either.

Moving on to just the historical. As I'm sure you already know, the communities of Laurier Heights and Parkview and Sherwood and Crestwood have been closely tied to Glenora, Capital Hill, and Grovenor over the years. As a provincial constituency I believe they've been tied in with Glenora since 1959, since the boundaries were changed then. The fact is that in the central-west part of Edmonton a provincial constituency, a one-MLA constituency, has never crossed the river. I think that while you're saying that, you know, it's not that big a deal, it's not that big a divide, it is significant that historically Parkview, Laurier, all of those communities have been aligned with Glenora and with the Glenora constituency. In fact, I've had people say to me since your proposal that, you know, they've always voted in Glenora. They've lived down in Laurier or in Valleyview, but they've always considered themselves part of the Glenora constituency.

Geographically, I would say that the river is a natural boundary, and it is a divider. Certainly it's not an insurmountable barrier by any means, but I think it plays a role, and the fact that there are no bridges connecting the two halves of your proposed Riverview is also important. Basically, you kind of have to go around up Groat

and over and down. I know that out in the rural areas, that's a minor inconvenience, but in Edmonton and in Glenora and in these constituencies it's not called for, and it's not necessary.

So I guess my conclusions are therefore that the proposed Riverview constituency is untenable, perhaps unreasonable in Edmonton. Other than numbers and perhaps money, there is no particular arguable basis for having Riverview where it is. I realize that it's taken some of the numbers out of some of those southern constituencies as well, but I think the proposal to add one constituency in the north still brings those numbers into alignment sufficient for the guidelines you have before you.

8:23

As I've said, I've provided the map. My suggested new constituency would also, as I say, be similar to the one presented earlier with Jasper Place and Calder, Jasper Place being made up of parts from Glenora and Meadowlark and the current Mayfield, roughly based on the old town of Jasper Place along with some constituencies fairly closely tied to Jasper Place.

Glenora would be giving up High Park, Canora, north Glenora, and Westmount. While I think those communities are also tied to Old Glenora and Glenora proper, they also have very strong ties on an east-west basis to Jasper Place. Then Calder would be roughly the old town of Calder. My suggestion is to follow the tracks down and then jog down and over south of the tracks. That area south of the tracks that would be in Calder still has a very strong sense of community and ties with those communities north of the tracks.

If you have any questions of me, I'd be happy to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll start with Wally.

MR. WORTH: Cathy, central to your argument is the strong sense of community in Glenora, and that's the basis on which you argue for its retention. You've given us an illustration or two in your submission here this evening of, you know, some things that contribute to that sense of community. Could you expand that a little more in terms of: what indicators are there of that strong sense of community there that you could point to?

MS CRAM: I'm not sure if I can come up with or expand too much on that. I just know, speaking with the people out there and, you know, even politically, being out at the doors talking to people – the community is on the north side, and they're tied with Glenora for a number of reasons historical and geographical. It's just a sense that is there. It's very hard to explain. It's very hard for me, coming from Calgary, even to explain this whole north-south division, but I definitely feel that it's there.

MR. WORTH: Okay. Let me push it just a little further. Where do the students of that area go for senior high school?

MS CRAM: I guess, depending on your religion, but probably the bulk of them would be going to Ross Shep.

MR. WORTH: Yeah. That would not be in the constituency as you propose it.

MS CRAM: Pardon me?

MR. WORTH: That would not be in the constituency as you propose it.

MS CRAM: No, no. That would probably be in Calder, I guess.

MR. WORTH: Okay. Thank you very much, Cathy.

MS CRAM: They don't go to Ainlay or, you know, the south side.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions other than I'm glad we didn't try to add two ridings to the city of Edmonton.

MS CRAM: That would have been easier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No questions, thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm sorry to keep you waiting, but I want to thank you for coming and making your views known.

MS CRAM: Great. Thank you for listening to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Dennis Lafonde.

MR. LAFONDE: Honourable sirs, I'm Dennis Lafonde. I'm the CAO for the town of Cold Lake, making representation today on behalf of the town of Cold Lake, the town of Grand Centre, and also the surrounding communities of Cold Lake. I believe you have a letter before you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct.

MR. LAFONDE: After hearing all the debate tonight, I'll have to say that our request will be quite simple. We had presented prior to this a summation on an electoral boundaries name change recognizing the Cold Lake area. In that, the town of Cold Lake had presented a recommendation of a hyphenated name change – we are currently in the Bonnyville riding – to Bonnyville-Cold Lake. We also supported the name Lakeland. I believe that at the same time we had the town of Grand Centre present a presentation on the name change to also support the name Lakeland. The commission wasn't looking favourably upon name changes that were more of the generic nature. So after further discussions, we got together with the town of Grand Centre and through the councils both agreed on a name change that they would all support, and that would be the possibility of a hyphenated name change recognizing the Cold Lake area as a complete area.

Not only is the town of Cold Lake, I guess, in this recognition. In our area we also have, as you're probably familiar, the Cold Lake air weapons range, which is about 4,500 square miles of air weapons range, the largest in Canada. We have 4 Wing Cold Lake, which is Canada's largest air force. We have the lake itself, which is one of the largest bodies of fresh water in Alberta. In addition to this, we have three separate First Nations sites all called Cold Lake First Nations, and we have the Cold Lake provincial park. Those, I guess, are some of the main areas. In our submission we are asking for the

recognition of the name. The population shifts. Recognizing that in the original boundaries the population of our area was very small – I think we represented less than 20 percent of the area's population back in the original naming of the area. What we're looking for now is basically a recognition of the Cold Lake area.

That's about all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: You now say that you're in excess of 60 percent of the constituency?

MR. LAFONDE: Yeah, and we're counting in that the support of the town of Grand Centre, 4 Wing Cold Lake, the Cold Lake First Nations, and the people of the area that call Cold Lake their hub centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

Wally, any questions?

MR. WORTH: No. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: Your preference: is it Lakeland?

MR. LAFONDE: No. Actually it was Lakeland, but we were under the assumption that the generic names weren't something that was looked on very favourably. So our preference would be now, I guess, a hyphenated name. Cold Lake-Bonnyville would be our preference, but I think we also allowed for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

MR. GRBAVAC: Well, I for one like generic names. You know, I think it's neither here nor there. I mean, there is a tendency, though – if you include some communities, obviously you exclude others in the name. I just wondered if Lakeland was your preferred choice or the subsequent name. That's fine.

MR. LAFONDE: Speaking for the town of Cold Lake, it was Cold Lake. On the other areas, there are only really two large urban hubs in the whole riding. One is centred around the Bonnyville area, and the other one is centred around the Cold Lake area. That one does include Grand Centre. If you're familiar with the area, the towns' borders are only one mile apart. So they're definitely interdependent.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.
Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: Is Bonnyville supportive of this as well, this change that your proposing? Did you discuss this with them?

MR. LAFONDE: The MLA from the area, who is from Bonnyville, has also strongly supported this and actually uses the name informally quite often.

MR. McCARTHY: What about the town of Bonnyville?

MR. LAFONDE: We haven't made a formal presentation to the town of Bonnyville. No.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think in respect to the generic name of Lakeland, when we last discussed it, if my memory serves me correctly, Lakeland was being used by too many other organizations like the college and . . .

MR. LAFONDE: The federal riding also.

THE CHAIRMAN: We decided that it would be confusing to add the name of Lakeland.

Well, I want to thank you for coming here and trying to talk us into adding Cold Lake to the constituency name. I'm sure the commission will give your request serious consideration.

MR. LAFONDE: We'd appreciate that. Thanks a lot.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next presenter is Mayor Vern Hartwell of the county of Strathcona.

MR. GRBAVAC: Strathcona county.

MR. HARTWELL: Thank you very much, Judge Wachowich.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I understand from Mr. Grbavac that I'm supposed to say Strathcona county.

MR. HARTWELL: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see that that's how your letterhead is, but my sheet said county of Strathcona. So I'm blaming it on my secretarial staff for the second time today.

8:33

MR. HARTWELL: It's nice to have secretarial staff; isn't it?

I thank you. We did change our name in 1995, so it's a fairly recent change. We went from county of Strathcona No. 20 to Strathcona county for simplification.

Judge Wachowich, members of the commission, we thank you very much for allowing us to speak to you on our second occasion. Mr. McGhan, who is the chief commissioner of Strathcona county, will do the presentation, and I will be present along with him to answer any questions you may have.

So thank you.

MR. MCGHAN: Your Honour, members of the commission, thank you also for giving us the opportunity to speak to you once again. Firstly, I'd like to start off by complimenting all commission members on the report you tabled with the Speaker of the House in January. It's certainly indicative of a tremendous amount of work and effort and thought, and I congratulate you on the work you've done to date.

Our message this evening, members of the commission, is going to be primarily the same as it was back in November of 1995, when we implored you to consider an additional MLA for Sherwood Park. Page 3 of the report that you tabled with the Speaker in January indicates that you're prepared to consider current population, and

page 26 of the report reiterates that same commitment.

Unfortunately, throughout the report and in many other circumstances in this capital region Sherwood Park gets lumped in with the city of Edmonton on many occasions. The growth projections that were identified for Sherwood Park over the last number of years were assumed to be somewhat consistent with that of the rest of Edmonton at some 5.85 percent. However, during the period of 1991 to 1994 there was an 11.4 percent increase in Sherwood Park and from 1990 to '95 a 16 percent increase.

Your report also, I noticed as I was reviewing it, contends that urban constituencies ought to have the lowest possible variances to compensate for growth, so I just wanted to mention that point. I would like to say that we're growing so fast that we had to amend our documentation from the time we submitted it till today, but we did have to amend one of our graphs as a result of needing to take the city of Fort Saskatchewan into the figures for the Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan constituency.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first refer you to the first map in the package. It's the one you're looking at now that illustrates the way things are today, with Sherwood Park in the blue and the Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan constituency in yellow. The population statistics that are shown there are as of May 1, 1994, just about two years ago. We do a census in Strathcona county every year. At one time it was very important to do that when many of the provincial grants were population based. It's less important now, but we continue to do it to make sure we have an accurate count of our population. So the Sherwood Park constituency May 1, 1994, at 39,085 Albertans and Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan at 35,000.

I'd like to refer you to the next graph, and that's the amended one that we provided you today. The second bar on the left side, which is 1994, again would illustrate the same population: 39,085. The problem we have, members of the commission, is that two years ago it had already exceeded the quotient that you have calculated as the maximum of plus 25 percent. Your quotient of around 39,000 had been exceeded two years ago. So if you're going to use a 1994 population, not 1991, then we're already outside the parameters and the limits. We shared with you what exists in Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan today: again 35,000. So it's above the provincial quotient, but certainly it's not above the 25 percent.

If you move back to Sherwood Park again, if we don't do anything to adjust it, by 2000, which will be partway through the next mandate, we will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of plus 40 percent. By 2005 it will be almost plus 60 percent, and these are conservative growth projections on the existing boundaries. So we do have a problem. It's a problem today, and it's going to be a very, very serious problem in short order. Less of a problem for the Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan constituency.

What we want to share with you is our recommendation of how we may be able to deal with the problem. In the next map what we've done is split Sherwood Park, a north-south alignment. There's nothing magic to it. It's not like a river; it's just a street. We tried to pick an alignment that would show some balance not only currently but also taking into consideration future growth and removing some of the current Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

The next map is the detail, showing how that goes through Sherwood Park. Then the final graph is what you can expect and what has been calculated, based on a 1994 census, for the two new ridings of Sherwood Park West, Sherwood Park East, and Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan. Where all three of them two years ago May 1 would have been in the area of between minus 25 and the

provincial quotient, by 2000, partway through the next mandate, Sherwood Park East would be right about the provincial quotient and the other two would be gradually coming up to that over the next 7 to 8 years.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for listening and giving us the opportunity to share with you our views.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll start the questioning with John this time.

MR. MCCARTHY: No questions. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe.

MR. LEHANE: No questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: Eric, just a comment. You make a very compelling argument. However, our mandate restricts us to use a population figure that's not consistent with yours. We have to use an earlier population figure, and I'm not so sure there aren't some other ridings in the city of Calgary that may have the same fate in store for them as your problem, which you've very succinctly pointed out to us. I recognize what it is that you're saying. However, to give one more riding to alleviate the problem of which you have alluded – have you any suggestion where we may get it?

MR. HARTWELL: We heard some people were having a lot of trouble with the new riding you put on the south side of Edmonton. If they're having that much trouble, we could be of assistance to them.

MR. GRBAVAC: That's kind of what I was hoping you'd say.

MR. HARTWELL: No, we don't really have a total solution, but we want you to recognize the problem. While we understand the difficult job in the task you did have in your hands – and we think you've done an admirable job – we do, however, feel that we have a very, very heavy difficulty coming up in the very near future.

MR. GRBAVAC: That is a consideration we have in that we do have the latitude to consider population growth areas, and we can use those statistics to augment any argument we would have to create a constituency that may be underpopulated by virtue of the fact that we know that the population is in fact going to grow or may in fact already have grown. You pose an interesting problem.

MR. MCGHAN: Mr. Grbavac, we're not recommending additional MLAs, and we're certainly sensitive to the rural/urban provincial issue. We're certainly mindful of that, and we're not suggesting in any fashion that we do in our rural cousins, because a lot of our municipality, as you well know, is very rural. It's some of the most rural area in the province. But in the overall rejuvelling of the boundaries – and we haven't talked to Camrose and Beaver county and Lamont – we believe there's some room to move in some of those areas.

MR. GRBAVAC: That's actually indirectly what I'm referring to. Is there a way that you could add to each of those constituencies to in

fact make room for more? I mean, have you looked at that? Have you configured any particular ridings or drawn any lines that would lend support to that? Because I suggest to you that if we try to take another riding out of southern Alberta and give it to Sherwood Park, I may not be here to answer your next set of questions.

MR. MCGHAN: We're not asking for that. We certainly recognize the issue there.

It would be somewhat premature for us to speak on behalf of some of those other municipalities and constituencies without talking to them first, but certainly we've looked through the documentation that you've provided to see what type of room there would be to expand some of those boundaries. We believe there is an opportunity to do that.

8:43

MR. WORTH: Just another kind of what-if question: what if we were to propose some extension of Edmonton constituencies out into your area? I don't know what they might be, but let's say Ellerslie or Avonmore or Manning move out into parts of the county or some part of the area anyway.

MR. MCGHAN: The honest answer: it scares the hell out of us. Sometimes you get what you ask for, and the council thought about that a lot. It's not what we would lobby for or ask for, but certainly we took that into consideration before we came here this evening.

MR. WORTH: Okay. Thank you for your frankness.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to put it this way. I accept your figures and your growth figures. There is no doubt that there's a problem here, and the problem is coming within the next few years. It's already here to some extent. But when we look at your proposal – and I don't blame you for giving us the proposal because we like to get proposals – the proposal causes us another problem: your minus figures get to be too high. I want to say to Strathcona county: I agree with you but you're a little early.

MR. HARTWELL: Well, we worked very, very hard on the figures and on the map so that we could be as close to it. We knew the dilemma that you faced, and we weren't here to condemn but rather to be of assistance. So we had a very difficult time.

As a suggestion has been, if we could go further into the east, you know, there's a possibility to add population, but the population is relatively sparse and we would have to get the approval of our neighbours, because we do nothing without their approval. So we'd definitely be pleased to go and speak to them, if that would be your choosing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think the rural constituencies that surround you are also in a minus figure.

MR. HARTWELL: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be nice if you had a constituency next to you, on the east side of you, that had about plus 15 percent, but we just don't have that.

MR. HARTWELL: We just can't grow it instantly. We'll work very hard at it.

MR. GRBAVAC: So what is your preference, the status quo as opposed to being amalgamated maybe with a city constituency, or is that an unfair question?

MR. HARTWELL: Well, that's a bit of an unfair question, but it probably deserves an answer. I wouldn't say that it would really terrify us to the degree that he said, but our preference would be not to be amalgamated with a city constituency.

THE CHAIRMAN: They've spent a lot of money defending amalgamation here in this area, and they don't want this indirect amalgamation.

MR. HARTWELL: Mr. McGhan has a further comment.

MR. MCGHAN: Just one more question there, Your Honour. I'm wondering: when you know that the population as of May 1, 1994, already exceeds the plus 25 quotient, how are we going to be able to deal with that? If you could just assist me a little bit in helping me explain that to the folks when I report back.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we're entitled to use the 1991 census.

MR. MCGHAN: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: A commission before us wanted to go out and do a population survey and spend money on it so that they could say we were up to date and more accurate. The legislation says that we go by the last decennial census unless there's another overall census. So I think what we've got to say to you is that according to the 1991 census, your constituency is okay, even though we know it's not okay in reality. We know that's true in Edmonton and in Calgary in certain areas, but there's just nothing we can do about it. When the year 2001 comes and the new census is done, then they're going to have to deal with your problem. It's going to be unacceptable.

MR. MCCARTHY: It's the only common denominator that's available to us, because you may have a current census in your own area but other areas do not have that, so as a result we back up to the 1991 census, which is a common denominator according to the statutes. So that's hopefully an explanation you can give to your council.

MR. MCGHAN: When I picked up the comments on page 3 and page 26 of your January report, you seemed to open if not the web, the door – at least you opened the window to say that you were interested in more up-to-date information. So that caused us to leap right in and say, "Okay, here." You almost sent us an engraved invitation to come back in again.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can appreciate how you looked at it. Thanks for coming.

MR. HARTWELL: Thank you very much, Your Honour and members of the commission. It's much appreciated.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Ted Yadach.

MR. YADACH: Good evening, gentlemen. My submission is going to be quite short and to the point and won't create nearly as many

political problems as the last two gentlemen will create for you. It's just in the renaming of Edmonton-Mayfield to Edmonton-Calder, based on an historical basis. I believe you have the submission in front of you. I don't know if you want me to go over it or if you just want to ask questions on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just tell us briefly. I don't see the submission. When was it turned in? Tonight?

MR. YADACH: I just dropped it off with the ladies. Maybe they didn't bring it up for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We had somebody earlier today – I think it was Mr. Acton.

MR. YADACH: Oh, I wasn't aware that he was here to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he was just trying to help you out. Go ahead. Tell us.

MR. YADACH: The historical reasons being that shortly after the province was formed, the land in the area was owned by the Calder family, and as far back as 1910 we have a map of the city of Edmonton which shows in this part of town only the village of Calder along with the railway yards, which were at that time known as Calder Yards. Subsequently CN has removed the name of Calder from the yard and has renamed it Walker Yards. We are one of the oldest community leagues in the city of Edmonton, having celebrated our 75th anniversary in 1995, and the renaming of the constituency to Edmonton-Calder would provide us with some pride and notoriety for the residents.

Edmonton-Calder was formed originally for the election of 1971 and remained so until the past election. I have spoken to Lance White, who is the sitting Member for Edmonton-Mayfield, and he has agreed that he would have no problem with representing Edmonton-Calder with that name.

That's about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: What percentage of Calder area residents make up the present constituency?

MR. YADACH: I really don't know. I didn't go into that. I would suspect that we are not that great a percentage. We're basing this mainly on the historical fact of the age of the area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No. I'm getting more and more persuaded by this gentleman and by Jim Acton and others, that this makes sense to me as a name for that area.

MR. YADACH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No further questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may be successful, but I'm not promising anything.

MR. YADACH: That's all we ask.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming, Ted.

MR. YADACH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Reeve Wes Tweedle, MD of Brazeau.

MR. TWEEDLE: Good evening, gentlemen. My submission is quite short. It's basically the same as what we presented in Red Deer in November. Our biggest concern is the dwindling away of the rural constituencies and the swing to urban constituencies. The council of the municipal district of Brazeau, centred in Drayton Valley, appreciates the opportunity to meet with the commission and present our concerns regarding the review of the electoral boundaries. Our concerns which we wish to present to the commission members are as follows.

The current makeup of electoral boundaries already places excessive demands on the MLAs serving rural areas. Rather than serving one densely populated community with a single identity and common needs – and we heard before where crossing a river that takes 10 minutes seemed like an insurmountable boundary, whereas some of our rural MLAs travel 70 miles and cross rivers and mountains and everything else.

8:53

Our municipal district is located entirely within the Drayton Valley-Calmar constituency. Located within our boundaries are two incorporated urban municipalities, seven hamlets, numerous community centres located in rural areas, as well as a recreational resort community. Each of these serves as a centre for the community residents which reside within those areas, and each is a distinct group of interests which the MLA must represent. Additionally, the Drayton Valley-Calmar constituency already takes in portions of the county of Leduc, the county of Wetaskiwin, the county of Parkland, and the MD of Clearwater. These would each have a comparable number of smaller communities within, each requiring representation. Assuming that a similar distribution of communities exists in most rural constituencies, it is clear that the work required for the rural MLAs to effectively represent their areas is already extreme. The workload would be compounded if the geographic area is increased.

The geography of the municipal district ranges from Crown woodlands on the west to agricultural lands on the east. The economic basis is agriculture, oil and gas exploration, forestry, and tourism. Each of these individual areas of economic activity requires our MLA to develop a detailed understanding of the issues affecting these industries. This same scenario is likely the case with most rural constituencies. Although they collectively represent a proportionately smaller part of the population, they represent a very large percentage of the resource base, which continues to fuel the provincial economy. The understanding required to make effective decisions concerning these areas is enhanced when the MLAs are in touch with those closest to the roots of the industry concerned. As is often said, the best decisions are those made closest to the level affected.

In summary the municipal district council feels that the existing

boundaries provide for a reasonable distribution of the work it takes to effectively represent the residents of the province. Any significant shift will only increase the already heavy workload for the rural MLAs, increase the area covered, increase the travel requirements, and decrease their ability to effectively represent their individual communities. The current boundaries are already within acceptable variances of representation by population. Changing these boundaries to reduce this acceptable variance will create unacceptable differences in the ability of each MLA to provide effective representation of what is already a widely diverse constituency for most rural MLAs.

That, gentlemen, is basically our concern. We would like to see the rural areas at the lowest extreme possible so that the MLAs can effectively represent them, not just based solely on population.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally?

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: Wes, I guess, you know, our interim report and your position tend to agree other than in degree. We accept that rural ridings are harder to represent, and our population variances are reflective of that. We've indicated that there's a problem in southern Alberta and maybe south-central Alberta. I'm not sure what the final report will look like, but I'd suggest that the reflection of the fact that rural ridings are harder to represent will be given serious consideration in the final report. Again, it's just a matter of degree.

I'm just curious as to your opinion with respect to: what do you see as an acceptable variance, other than the current status quo obviously? What would you see as an acceptable variance? Is it our 12 percent, or are you suggesting, then, that our 12 percent . . .

MR. TWEEDLE: I would almost like to see it at the full extreme, 25 percent, especially for remote areas where there's a lot of diversity in industry and in the needs of people. For an MLA to cover a remote area, a sparsely populated area of a large size, it's pretty difficult.

MR. GRBAVAC: So are you suggesting, then, that the city ridings could go to plus 25 percent? You know, obviously that represents a 50 percent difference.

MR. TWEEDLE: Well, I would say that it certainly should go fairly significant, because urban ridings are pretty easy to – you could walk around them pretty near as fast as the rural ones can fly around them. To me that has to have a significant bearing on it.

MR. GRBAVAC: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No question. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: Thank you, Wes, for your presentation tonight. I'd just like to perhaps repeat what Robert has said, that we've tried to reflect those sentiments in the interim report. We've not only tried

to reflect them, but we've tried to show in a quantitative way how they can be justified so that we don't only reflect them but we put them in a report in a manner that is not as likely to be attacked by the courts in moving to more of a one person, one vote situation. We were faced with some situations – and I was just looking for the exact figure when I unceremoniously took John off the panel here. You're at minus 16 percent, but Cardston-Chief Mountain was minus 38.5 percent. It had a very small geographical area. It could not be compared at all to Athabasca-Wabasca or Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. TWEEDLE: No. I understand that.

MR. LEHANE: So I guess we agree, and as Robert says, we agree but to a certain degree. I guess that's where we came down in terms of seeing that the reasons you've given tonight are valid reasons, but there's a point at which you have to recognize the prime importance of the right to vote and you cannot unnecessarily dilute it.

MR. TWEEDLE: Yes. I guess our opinion was that if it was at all possible, shift the rural ones around a little bit and even them out rather than discontinue any of them. That was our biggest concern, that we not lose any of them if there was some way that the boundaries could be altered to still remain within acceptable levels without actually losing any.

MR. GRBAVAC: The problem in southern Alberta, Wes, is that virtually all of them in southern Alberta are approaching the maximum variance in terms of 25 percent. So it would result in an extreme reconfiguration of the entire province in order to reflect a change there.

MR. McCARTHY: What do you think of combining some city or heavily populated with some of the rural to try and correct that? You've heard what our previous friend said about that.

MR. TWEEDLE: Yeah. That's basically our opinion too. I suppose you could come into the fringe areas, but I don't think we'd want to come in very far because of the diversity. When you start getting a densely populated area in one end of your constituency, it's obvious that's where the activity is going to be, and things are going to get pulled that way. So I don't think we would be really in favour of that, although as I say, we could probably stand to come into the fringe areas.

MR. McCARTHY: Without getting swamped.

MR. TWEEDLE: Yeah. Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to put it this way, Wes. When we started this project, we had a lot of rural constituencies that were well over 20 percent. On the basis of the Charter and the court decisions we tried to reduce the variance, and basically we ended up with decreasing the variance, the 15 percent and below, plus or minus, for all of Alberta except for three constituencies. One was Drayton Valley-Calmar, which was at minus 16, and the other one was Dunvegan at minus 16. The other one was Barrhead-Westlock at minus 16. So we got them all down to the 15 percent except the three constituencies. I suppose we could have done something to tinker with those, but it would have meant jumping county lines and making ridiculous changes to those constituencies.

Now, you're in, as I understand, Drayton Valley, and you're at minus 16. We basically haven't changed you because we couldn't find any simple way of changing you, and so far our recommendation is to leave Drayton Valley the way it is. Nobody's coming forward to say to change it at this point, so I feel that you should be happy with our preliminary report that we're leaving Drayton Valley the way it is.

9:03

MR. TWEEDLE: I guess we're not just concerned about our own constituency. We're quite happy with that one. Our biggest concern is for all of rural Alberta, that we not lose our voice basically. That's our concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, the point you're trying to make here today is that you're speaking for the rest of rural Alberta.

MR. TWEEDLE: Right.

MR. GRBAVAC: Well, for what it's worth, Wes, you know, I share these same concerns. However, I tend to recognize some of the more urban ridings as if essentially they're rural. I submit that any prospective MLA who would take a contrary position to agriculture in the city of Lethbridge would meet with limited success. As a matter of fact, in some instances I think the population makeup of the city is more rural than some of the peripheral areas in the rural area. I mean, the retired farmers are in fact living in the cities of Grande Prairie, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Medicine Hat. In essence, I think overall my honest view is that rural, however you define that, still has a very strong voice in the province of Alberta. Although I appreciate what you're saying, that it may be somewhat weakened, I still feel that it has a very strong voice.

MR. TWEEDLE: I hope you're right. I hope it'll continue that way. I thank you very kindly, gentlemen, for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming and making your views known.

Well, we've gone through everybody who was registered here to make a presentation, and as I look over the crowd, I think almost everybody has spoken. Is there anybody here who wants to add anything or say anything or has something intelligent to say? Come forward.

MR. CRAWFORD: I was waiting for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What's your name?

MR. CRAWFORD: My name is Ian Crawford, and I did try to get on the list as I came through the door. I thought I was on it. I did give you a written submission which was before the March 22 deadline, and I just wanted to supplement the information in that.

I guess there are all sorts of things that we can comment on when we listen to all the other points that are made, but really the main – well, maybe first of all I'll back up.

I have been a realtor in south Edmonton for the past five years, and I've been politically active virtually all my life. My father was a five-term MLA in south Edmonton, so I've certainly worn out many pairs of shoes politicking around constituencies in Edmonton. I guess for those reasons I consider myself something of an expert witness.

Really, I guess my main contention was that Lansdowne not be separated from areas such as Grandview, Lendrum, and Malmo Plains, for example. The 1993 boundaries are the only time that Lansdowne has been separated from those other areas, and that wasn't the case in the initial proposal. However, somebody came up with another idea, and it was adjusted and moved into another constituency. It was in Edmonton-Rutherford originally, and part of Blue Quill I guess wasn't in Rutherford, so they changed it for that reason. There are 315 single-family residences and 221 apartments in Lansdowne. In my submission to you I suggested that the new growth in the Edmonton-Whitemud constituency was sufficient to have surpassed the population of Lansdowne. I have some CMHC statistics here which indicate that in 1995 – well, just using, for example, the 315 single-family residences in Lansdowne – in the new development in the Riverbend area and the area south of 23rd Avenue, which would be down into the Blackburne area, there were 353 new single-family residences built in that area. In the previous year, 1994, there were even more than that; there were 387. So there were in excess of 700 over the past two years in new single-family construction. I think that really just underlines my point that the proposal you published in January – you know, Lansdowne shouldn't be separated from the other areas.

I guess we can get into all sorts of other things. I think that, as much as possible, natural boundaries are good. There hasn't ever been a constituency crossing the river before, and Whitemud Drive, or freeway, has always been a boundary, with the exception of 1993, between the people on the north and the people on the south of the freeway, and they're different down there, I'll tell you.

I guess that's mostly what I wanted to say. However, I will add that I hadn't seen the submission from Edmonton-Strathcona previous to coming in tonight. I did look at it briefly before I came up here, and I would actually endorse that if the numbers work as well as we would hope they would. You know, that does make sense, to try and not make a constituency cross the river, if it's possible.

When the mayor was here earlier he was saying: well, gee, the folks are the same, and, you know, Laurier Heights and Grandview Heights are certainly very similar. As a realtor I have worked, I guess, almost entirely in south Edmonton, but as a realtor that's done a lot of work in Pleasantview and Grandview and Lansdowne and Malmo and so on, I haven't ever had any transactions in the area across the river there. It really is different from the university community and the area south of the river.

I know we're in overtime here, so I'll wrap up with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wally.

MR. WORTH: Well, thank you very much for those additional statistics that you quoted about the growth in the Whitemud area. As you recall from our report, we tried to acknowledge that there will be considerable growth south in the Whitemud area by allowing for a small negative variance, but your data does, I guess, point to the wisdom of that decision on our part in the past.

I recall in reading your submission that you made I think a fairly compelling argument for linking Lansdowne with the Malmo-Grandview Heights areas as opposed to linking them up over the ravine and the drive, so we will certainly take a look at both those considerations, the consideration of growth in the Whitemud area south and certainly with respect to the location of the Lansdowne community.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

MR. McCARTHY: No questions. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have no questions. I want to thank you for coming and making your views known.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that it? Well, these proceedings are adjourned. You'll have to wait until the June report now, because we're not coming back to Edmonton. If you have anything more you want to add, you're going to have to go to Red Deer or Calgary or Lethbridge. Don't go to Hanna or Taber, because those meetings are full.

[The hearing adjourned at 9:12 p.m.]

