



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Wainwright

Thursday, September 17, 2009
7:03 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-2-4

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chair

Dr. Keith Archer

Peter Dobbie, QC

Brian Evans, QC

Allyson Jeffs

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Acting Chief Electoral Officer

Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

Doreen Anderson

Kelly Clemmer, Editor, Star News Inc.

Jeff Newland, Councillor, Town of Wainwright

Support Staff

Clerk

W.J. David McNeil

Clerk Assistant

and Director of House Services

Louise J. Kamuchik

Senior Parliamentary Counsel

Robert H. Reynolds, QC

Shannon Dean

Administrator

Erin Norton

Communications Consultant

Melanie Friesacher

Consultant

Tom Forgrave

Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Liz Sim

7:03 p.m.

Thursday, September 17, 2009

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good evening. I have to say thank you for coming out, and I hope some of you have some views that you'd like to share with us. My name is Ernie Walter. I'm the chair of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce to you the members of the commission: to my far right Dr. Keith Archer of Banff, next to him Peter Dobbie of Vegreville, on my immediate left Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton, and next to her Brian Evans of Calgary.

Our task has been directed by legislation. We are to make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly on the areas, boundaries, and names for 87 electoral divisions based on the latest census and population information. In other words, our job is to determine where to divide Alberta into 87 areas so that each Albertan receives effective representation by a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Over the next few months we will seek community input through a province-wide consultation before developing our recommendations, through public hearings such as the one here today, one in which we hope to hear from you people, not to put any stress on you.

In carrying out our work, we have to follow the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. It says that we are to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly regarding the areas, boundaries, and names of 87 electoral divisions. You will recognize that this means we are mandated to propose four additional electoral divisions in Alberta, which will come into effect at the next provincial general election. I think that in the last 22 years this is the first time Alberta is getting four new ridings. We've reviewed the law and what the courts have said about electoral boundaries in the province of Alberta and in Canada and the work of previous committees and commissions.

A brief summary of the electoral boundaries law. First of all, there are to be 87 electoral divisions. We have a limited time to accomplish this task. We are required, after consideration of representations made at the public hearings, to submit an interim report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in February of 2010 that sets out the areas, boundaries, and names of the 87 proposed electoral divisions and the reasons for those proposed boundaries.

Following publication of the interim report, a second round of public hearings will be held to receive, again, the input on the proposed 87 boundaries from the public. After consideration of the input the commission must submit a final report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by July of 2010. 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 the new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution. The law would then come into force when proclaimed before the holding of the next general election.

One way to ensure effective representation is by developing electoral divisions with similar populations, especially where population density is similar. You will note on the handouts that there is a breakdown of the populations with the data we had at the time they were produced. We will also have access to further population data.

In the Wainwright constituency – since we're here, we'll refer to it as the Wainwright constituency – we hope to hear from the people as to what their views are, and you will note when you look at the population densities that this riding is down in terms of population from the average. The average is 40,466. We have an update of the ridings, and I believe Battle River-Wainwright is at 30,752, which puts you roughly at 24 per cent below the average. As the act states,

a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 per cent above or below the average population for all 87 divisions.

In dividing Alberta into 87 proposed electoral divisions, we must take into consideration factors that we consider appropriate, but we also are bound to take into consideration the following:

- (a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,
- (b) sparsity and density of population,
- (c) common community interests and community organizations, including those of [First Nations] reserves and Metis settlements,
- (d) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary,
- (e) wherever possible, the existing municipal boundaries,
- (f) the number of municipalities and other local authorities,
- (g) geographical features, including existing road systems, and
- (h) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

7:10

There is one exception to the 25 plus or minus per cent. We have the authority for up to four proposed electoral divisions that may have a population that is as much as 50 per cent below the average population of the electoral divisions in Alberta if three of the following five criteria are met:

- (a) the area . . . exceeds 20 000 square kilometres or the total surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15 000 square kilometres;
- (b) the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres;
- (c) there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 8000 people;
- (d) the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Metis settlement;
- (e) the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the Province of Alberta.

It says that for these purposes the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town.

That's a general overview of the legislation, and the Alberta courts and the Supreme Court of Canada have also provided guidance. In rulings they've agreed that under the Charter the rights of Albertans include the right to vote; the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; the right to effective representation; 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. These rulings as well as the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act must guide our decisions and, ultimately, the proposals that we make to the Legislative Assembly.

Now, as I've said, that's the law, and we're guided by it, but we want to receive and it's very important that we receive input from the public. We believe that what we hear from the public and the people who are affected by these boundary changes is critical to recommending a new electoral map that will ensure fair and effective representation.

Again, on behalf of the commission I want to say welcome to the people that are here today. You, of course, may also make your views known by written submissions, writing by mail, fax, or e-mail. Again, we would be very interested in hearing what those opinions are.

Now, it's at this time that we would call on our first presenter. I don't think we have anybody that is signed up as a presenter at this point. If there is anybody here who wants to speak or make a presentation, please feel free to do so.

Do you want to come forward, ma'am? We can't record it unless you're here. If you'd be so kind, for the recording people, to give your name.

Doreen Anderson

Mrs. Anderson: Doreen Anderson. I was the returning officer for the last provincial election for Battle River-Wainwright. I was only involved with Elections Alberta for the one term, so I hesitate to make too many comments. I do think there could be some improvements to our southern borders and also one to the west. We had some problems in the Meeting Creek-Rosalind area, so I think the boundaries should be adjusted there somehow. Then, we do business with Stettler as far as advertising and what have you. They are not in our electoral division, but maybe they could be included. I don't know how that would affect their riding, but maybe that portion could be included in our electoral division. I don't know for sure. That's about all I have to say.

The Chair: All right. Would you mind taking the mike and going up and just showing us that first proposed adjustment?

Mrs. Anderson: Okay. Here's Meeting Creek. There was a poll there, and our residents that lived to the southwest of the Meeting Creek creek had to – there are not too many crossings there, apparently. They were supposed to vote up here at Rosalind, whereas if they could have just gone over here to Meeting Creek, which was in the Lacombe-Ponoka riding – if somehow that could be adjusted, just that little corner right in there, it would save these people a lot of miles to drive to vote.

Then, here's the Wainwright riding. I don't know if this could come across, maybe, and include the county of Stettler somehow, in through here. I don't know how that would affect our riding and theirs also. The population of Stettler I think is right around the same as Wainwright. Right there it would increase our population by probably 6,000 or so, and then there are all the other little villages and hamlets and farming area also. So I don't know. Like I said, I was only involved in the one election, so I don't want to say too much because I'm not too aware.

The Chair: That's very interesting. Thank you. Now, would you mind answering a few more questions? If you would like to just take your seat here again.

Are there any of the members of the commission that would like to ask any questions here?

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mrs. Anderson. Although you were the returning officer only in one election, I think that still provides a lot of, you know, detailed understanding of a constituency. I'd like to take advantage of some of that knowledge that you have, having lived in this area and worked with Elections Alberta in this area.

One of the things that we heard in some of the other public hearings today was the importance of having the constituency boundaries correspond with other political divisions within an area. The argument was made that where a municipal district overlapped with a provincial constituency, that was often helpful for people. Could you just outline the degree to which that currently exists within this constituency? Is that an issue that is important within this area, and if so, are the boundaries at present aligned well with the municipal districts?

7:20

Mrs. Anderson: No. The federal riding includes Vegreville – and I'm not sure how far north it goes – and Vermilion and then includes most of Battle River-Wainwright. So, yes, it is a bit confusing for some of the voters because they say, "Well, I voted over here for one election," and they're not too sure if they voted for the federal election or if they voted for the provincial. You know, like, they just voted. Yes, it does get confusing for them.

Mr. Dobbie: I think the question is more downward because the federal ridings are so much larger. What about the counties in the area? Is Meeting Creek, for example, within the county of Wainwright?

Mrs. Anderson: No.

Mr. Dobbie: So, again, it's not part of this county in any event.

Mrs. Anderson: No, it isn't. And for federal it wouldn't be in Vegreville-Wainwright either.

Dr. Archer: If I could ask a question, also, about the suggestion of looking at extending westward into Stettler and possibly including the town of Stettler. What's your sense of the connections between people within that county and the current constituency of Battle River-Wainwright? Again, I'm just asking for your sense here. I'm sure that people haven't done a survey on this or anything, but would that be seen as an unusual alignment for people who are living in this area, to have the residents in the county of Stettler connected to the people in Wainwright?

Mrs. Anderson: I can't really foresee a problem, but for maybe the residents of Stettler it might, you know, because they've always voted for a certain person, and then to have to – I really don't know. I really hate to comment on that.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thanks.

The Chair: Any other questions?

Mr. Evans: Thanks for your presentation. I'm just curious about whether you discovered any areas in the constituency that are growing at a more rapid pace than other areas. We should be concerned about that, obviously, with the quite small population and the closeness to the 25 per cent maximum. We really do want to try to identify areas that are growing.

Mrs. Anderson: Wainwright had taken quite a spurt previous to the election, but other than Wainwright and probably a bit of growth in Provost, we have three Hutterite colonies, but we don't have any Métis colonies or anything. So I can't foresee any drastic change in population, no.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Any others? Yes, Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you again. I just had one clarifying question. When you were talking about the boundaries, I thought you'd mentioned something as well about the southern boundary. Did you have a suggestion for us with respect to that southern boundary of the riding as well?

Mrs. Anderson: No. I should have said "west." It's more west.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. So it's bringing it in line to that southern boundary.

Mrs. Anderson: Yes.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, because we have you in captivity. You had mentioned in your initial comments about including Stettler. An

example you used was commonality of advertising. I take it that there's some advertising by local businesses, so there must be some business that is going back and forth. People from Stettler would be coming here and vice versa.

Mrs. Anderson: Well, we did everything through fax and phone and computer, but yes, they did do some of our advertising and what have you.

Mr. Dobbie: Is that election advertising you're talking about?

Mrs. Anderson: Election advertising, yes.

Mr. Dobbie: Not necessarily business advertising?

Mrs. Anderson: No. Election.

The Chair: All right. Well, thank you very much for your presentation, and we'll certainly take these matters under consideration.

Mrs. Anderson: You're quite welcome.

The Chair: Thank you.
Now, is there anyone else?

Mr. Clemmer: I wouldn't mind saying something.

The Chair: Certainly.

**Kelly Clemmer, Editor
Star News Inc.**

Mr. Clemmer: My name is Kelly Clemmer. I'm the local editor of the newspaper in Wainwright. On some of the things that Doreen said, I can see where she's coming from, being the returning officer. My opinion of the Stettler issue would be a little different. We deal with the advertising in the newspaper, and there's zero connection, in my opinion, between Stettler and Wainwright. Our trading area includes much of what the constituency is. Our advertising hits a lot of those communities within our constituency, and they come to Wainwright as a hub to shop. The connect would be closer north, I think, the Vermilion area north, Dewberry. Those communities probably come to Wainwright to shop a little bit more, say, than the Stettler route just because of geography, I think. Stettler is closer to Red Deer, and they do their shopping that way. So I don't think there's as much of a connection with the Stettler community.

There was something else that you had mentioned. But maybe you have other questions for me because I maybe have a little bit more distinct perspective with the newspaper.

Ms Jeffs: Well, if you can just build on your comments. You've responded to the suggestion about including Stettler in the riding. One of the issues we face is that the riding is currently very close to that threshold below the average. Do you have any suggestion? I mean, you mentioned, I think, a bit north to Dewberry.

Mr. Clemmer: Yes, and Vermilion, the county of Vermilion River. I mean, those are more connected to the Wainwright area. It cuts into other electoral districts, obviously, that perhaps don't connect. I'm not sure.

The idea of it being closer to the federal riding region is a good idea, obviously, to keep people a little more clear. We include the Vegreville area and that in our constituency, our riding. But the

Crowfoot riding, which is just south of us, is a massive piece – right? – as is our Vegreville-Wainwright north and east.

What I see is that when you have, obviously, the bigger geographic areas, even though you haven't hit that population threshold, you run into issues where your MLA is pushed so far, so thin, that he has trouble necessarily connecting with some of those communities. I mean, that's something you hear probably a lot. You know, there are 34 communities in our constituency currently. Like, 34 communities are a lot of communities to be running back and forth, trying to meet their needs. I understand representation by population, that we want to have enough people, when there are so many more people in the cities, but I would hate to see our rural areas become more diluted by having much larger areas where you may have less time with your MLA because there are so many more communities and further away and you have to drive hours to get across your constituency. That's an issue, I think.

Mr. Dobbie: We're working at this stage to try to develop some concepts as to what basic rules to apply. We haven't done that yet. We're quite wide open in our approach. It strikes me that what we will be doing ultimately is making some trade-offs between the factors that we look at, trade-offs between in some cases splitting a county to make numbers work or keeping that county whole versus uniting some areas that might not have commonality of interests.

7:30

I'm wondering: from your perspective can you rank the two of them? Is it more important to you as a citizen here to see, say, the county of Stettler kept whole so that it's within one MLA's area and less important to perhaps bring in other areas that aren't natural trading partners? We at some point will have to do an analysis, some sort of regression analysis, and start knocking things off, and something will trump something else. So from your perspective can you rank any of the factors as most important to you?

Mr. Clemmer: Yeah. I guess commonality isn't necessarily that important. I mean, when it comes to our constituency, obviously what we have is, generally, that Wainwright's the biggest town, and the rest of them are smaller towns and villages and hamlets. Our commonality is basically that we're in east-central Alberta and we're often forgotten about, as they say a lot, compared to the rest of Alberta because we're not as densely populated. We don't have as much in the way of, perhaps, industry because we're in agriculture- and oil-based communities, and that's what binds them together. Whether Stettler because it's not connected to us through our normal thought of who's near us – maybe that doesn't matter when it comes to your MLA and how he represents that community.

The Chair: Certainly that community would have agriculture, oil and gas . . .

Mr. Clemmer: Exactly, yeah. They probably have the same issues as we do, but we just aren't connected to them necessarily. To answer your question, I'm not sure if that would make any difference at all or what ranks higher. You know, just because we know that we travel more to Vermilion and Lloydminster than we do south to Stettler, does that make a difference for who represents us? I don't know if that makes a difference or not, if that answers your question.

Mr. Dobbie: Yeah. I guess, as I'm sure you have multiple roles with your newspaper, if you become aware of some feedback from this area, it is never too late until the final report is approved to get that feedback to us. If you are asking people and you're getting

some feedback, we'd welcome you to pass that information along because the more information we have, the better decisions we can come to. So I'd encourage you to keep doing what you're doing tonight.

Mr. Clemmer: For sure. Thank you.

The Chair: Anyone else? Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. I think just probably more an observation than a question, but you may want to comment or react to it. As I look at the configuration of the boundaries at the moment and given your description that you think of this riding and people think of this riding as east-central Alberta and if one of our principles is as much as possible to not develop constituencies that are unmanageably large geographically, it does seem that with the various trade-offs if you do include Stettler county, that seems to keep this constituency as east-central. It seems to add a fair population without adding too much geography, and it accomplishes a number of the things that you're talking about. It seems on the surface for someone who doesn't live in this area that that would be a compelling choice to make in the first blush.

Mr. Clemmer: Right. You're probably right. I don't think I would speak against it, you know. But like I said, we don't have a connection to them. It doesn't mean that they couldn't be represented appropriately within this constituency. I'm not sure how connected they are to where they are either. I mean, they may be very connected to the issues that revolve from Stettler south and west as opposed to our own issues, but most likely they're the same.

The Chair: Any other questions?

Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Clemmer: You're welcome. I'll definitely forward any information that I attain through news issues or letters to the editor or whatever. I'll make sure I forward them appropriately.

The Chair: We'd very much appreciate that. Thanks.

Is there anyone else who would like to come forward?

**Jeff Newland, Councillor
Town of Wainwright**

Mr. Newland: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jeff Newland. I'm a town councillor in Wainwright. I've lived here since 1995, and I'm also involved in the media.

If you want to make a presentation after me, we could create history here because 100 per cent of the audience would be making a presentation to you here.

Thank you very much for coming to Wainwright and being able to discuss things with us when it comes to the representation issues that we have here, and also thank you for your comments at the beginning. I understand that there will be four new ridings for the constituents in the province, and I also understand the problems that you're facing here. I was at a similar meeting not too long ago in Hanna, and I learned a lot about representational population in communities and things like that when I was listening to the people making presentations. Would that have been eight years ago now, something like that?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Newland: I know that in our particular area here we currently have two municipal districts, Wainwright and Provost, and the

counties of Flagstaff and Paintearth involved in the constituency. As Mrs. Anderson was saying earlier, when we inherited the western portion of the riding, that we got the last time around – the communities there are somewhat disjointed from us because they're so close to Camrose and involved, I believe, in the county of Camrose.

As Kelly also mentioned, our MLA, whoever he or she might be or is at the present time, represents 34 different communities plus all of the school boards and things like that. He's a very busy individual trying to represent all of the rural and urban and 'rurban' concerns that he has to deal with in a riding that is as large and complex as the one here. I notice the population numbers are just over 30,000 for the total riding, and that is, according to this, about 19 per cent under the grid. You had some updated figures, obviously, that made it a little bit worse.

I guess the idea is, learning from what I heard in Hanna, that nobody wants their community split up, whether it comes to municipal districts and counties and things like that. If we were to move to the north, well, we have the Vermilion-Lloydminster constituency to deal with. Yes, we're very close to Vermilion, and I could see a riding going that way, but then we're interfering with a riding that's only a couple of thousand people bigger than we are in terms of Vermilion-Lloydminster. If we go the other way to the west, we're in a riding that's 40,000 people in the Camrose area. If we go down into the Stettler area, the town of Stettler is about 5,500 people and the county of Stettler is a similar number, so there would be 11,000 more people.

One part of a constituency that we do a lot of business with: we have a lot of people from the Consort area that come up here. With the special areas they're so thinly populated down there. I believe their entire population between the three areas is something like 15,000 people. Consort is a part of that, and that particular special area there would only add about 3,000 or 4,000 people to our constituency. It would make more sense having that part of the riding with us, as opposed to the little bit of the county of Camrose that we have here now, but that still wouldn't improve our numbers too much. We just happen to be in a part of the province that's fairly thinly populated.

I don't know what your terms of reference are when it comes to splitting up rural municipalities. It makes sense to me, if we could live within the parameters, to have an entire municipality or at least half of a municipality. I know that when we had a different federal riding here, we did have a lot in common with Stettler because they were in the same federal riding and there was some trade that went back and forth and things like this. We as a town are involved with some tourist groups and things like that. We do some trading back and forth that way. In terms of our promotional things and through the provincial tourism and things like that, we do have some things in common with Stettler.

7:40

In terms of the general population I guess it could work. We'll have to make it work, whichever way we can go ahead with this, but I don't know how long we can exist as a constituency the way we are now with the numbers that we have here. I know our MLA does work very hard in terms of representing even the smallest hamlet in the constituency. He takes a great deal of pride in representing all parts of the constituency regardless of what the size is.

My comment is that we're kind of happy being where we are now. If we have to grow, in my opinion maybe the areas to the south are what we should be looking at because there is quite a bit of north-south trade in eastern Alberta. But if you talk to the special areas people, they probably wouldn't like that suggestion because they want to keep all of the special areas together. At least that was their opinion eight years ago.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much. Would you mind answering a few questions?

Mr. Newland: Sure.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks for your comments. I guess the only problem with doing anything with the special areas is that historically the population would be shrinking there, not growing. So longer term with populations increasing in other parts of the province, it's not going to have any measurable positive effect. As you said yourself, you'd then be splitting the special areas. I know it's my recollection that when I was in the Legislature and Shirley McClellan represented that area, she always felt very protective about that area because it had so many natural, geographic, environmental, weather-related issues. I think that splitting up any of it would not, in my base of knowledge anyway, be very well received by the folks who live in those special areas.

Mr. Newland: Yeah. I agree with that, but I was just trying to – I know that I saw Shirley here. She comes to Wainwright several times a year, so I've seen her a couple of times. I know that they come up for business here. I know how they don't want that to be split up, but by the same token, we looked at what we've got with the county of Camrose now. We've got two or three of their communities involved in this riding, and we don't really have much in common tradewise with those people.

Stettler looks like a fairly logical step. That would work, but if the town and the county were to become a part of the constituency, we would certainly increase our population numbers.

Mr. Evans: Right. Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Councillor Newland. I know you hadn't planned to present, but it is very helpful to hear from different people.

One of the realities that we have is that even if this area grows, which it likely will in the future, the rate of growth is not likely to be the same as in some of the larger urban areas. A concern I've had – I live in the county of Minburn – is to moderate, to the extent we can, the swings so that we can get away from the unfair perception that there is an overdilution of votes in some cases. One of our discussion points has been: where is growth likely to be? If we're at the margin already, we're just really deferring a problem that will be significantly harder to deal with next time.

At this stage the more that you can direct people to the website or to contact the office with their opinions, the better information we'll have. I think it's very helpful that you were at the Hanna exercise. The message you took from that was: keep the counties and the municipalities whole. It may give us an opportunity to deal with the county of Camrose problem. Again, the more that you can direct people to give us their input – it doesn't have to be a formal report. It can be, you know, in point form. But if they get that to us – they're not here tonight. It's hard for us to hear from them unless they get things to the website. We would be concerned about creating a constituency that's perilously close to the minimum that we can create right now.

Mr. Newland: I appreciate that. Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Nothing other than just to add to Peter Dobbie's remarks that we are accepting written submissions for the interim report up until October 13.

Mr. Newland: Our official population, by the way, in the town of Wainwright is 5,755. When I moved here at the end of 1994, it was about a thousand less. We've kind of considered that as pretty spectacular growth for the size of the community. If you look at the city of Calgary, that would be a disaster if they only grew by 1,000 people even on a monthly basis, I guess, but it has been very noticeable here with the Department of National Defence. A lot of that growth has been at their investment in Denwood and the base here, which has been hundreds of millions of dollars in the last decade. They've assured us that, as far as they know, there won't be that kind of growth again for quite a long time, but it is a major training area and a major base. It will be steady with slow growth over the next few years, but there will be some growth in the area.

I'm not aware of any other communities in the constituency that will experience a major amount of growth over the next five to 10 years. We do meet with other councillors on the municipal level. We all have our five-year plans and 10-year plans and things like that. We meet and discuss things at the AUMA, as well, about the rural issues and about our growth and our successes, but I'm not aware of any areas in the Battle River-Wainwright constituency right now that will experience a lot of growth.

Dr. Archer: I wanted to follow up, Mr. Newland, on the point you made about a few of the communities I think you were saying it was from the Camrose municipality that are part of this constituency, for which there may not be as strong affinities, trading or otherwise.

Mr. Newland: They were the same communities that Mrs. Anderson was talking about.

Dr. Archer: I see. Below the river there.

Mr. Newland: In the extreme western portion of the constituency.

Dr. Archer: Right. Okay. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you very much. That was very helpful.

Again, is there anyone who would like to say more?

Otherwise, thank you for being here, and thank you for your opinions and your presentations. Again, we encourage you for any other input till the 13th of October; we would very much appreciate it.

Mr. Newland: When will your deliberations be made public?

The Chair: We will give to the Legislative Assembly our interim report by February of 2010, after which there will be another opportunity for further public hearings. Then we will give our final report by July of 2010.

Mr. Newland: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you all.

I don't believe we have anyone further who wishes to make a presentation, so we're going to adjourn, but feel free to circulate here and chat with us, if you want, for a few minutes. Then we are going to be catching our planes.

[The hearing adjourned at 7:49 p.m.]

