

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, February 9, 1993**
Date: 93/02/09

8:00 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Be seated, please.
Deputy Government House Leader, procedural.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would seek the unanimous consent of the Assembly to revert to Notices of Motions.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the request, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried unanimously.
Deputy Government House Leader.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to give oral notice of a motion which I hope we will have an opportunity to deal with tomorrow. This is concerning a resolution of relationships between the Grand Council of Treaty 8 First Nations and the province of Alberta. We expect to have a number of chiefs of Treaty 8 First Nations in the galleries tomorrow. If it would please the Assembly, I would like to read the motion as we would propose to have it on the Order Paper. I do have sufficient copies for Table officers, for yourself, and for all of the members of the Assembly.

The motion reads as follows:

Whereas the government of Alberta wishes to enhance relations with first nations located in Alberta, and whereas the Grand Council of Treaty 8 First Nations has indicated that it wishes to enhance relations with the province of Alberta, be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government of Alberta to

- (1) enter into an agreement with the Grand Council of Treaty 8 First Nations to establish a process for dialogue to facilitate consultation regarding policies, programs, and services affecting the first nations located in Alberta who are signatories to Treaty 8;
- (2) ensure that any agreements resulting from this resolution will be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of Canada and, in particular, shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal or treaty rights of first nations or their members;
- (3) ensure that this resolution and agreements resulting from it do not diminish the special relationship first nations have with the government of Canada; and
- (4) indicate their willingness, upon request, to enter into similar processes of dialogue with treaty organizations which represent, respectively, the first nations located in Alberta who are signatory to Treaty 6 and Treaty 7.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Government House Leader, for the notice.

If hon. members would be kind enough to make one correction to the matter before them, in the first line, where it reads, "Whereas the government of Alberta," it should be changed to "the province of Alberta." Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The committee will come to order.

Bill 55

Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would recognize the hon. Minister of Justice with regard to government amendments.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to bring discussion by the members of the Committee of the Whole of the Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 55. This has been further amended to incorporate the most recent additions from the ongoing process of public consultation. There should be distributed on each desk amendments to Bill 55, Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, as well as an errata, a one-page document to that amendment to Bill 55.

As I have indicated in speaking at first and second reading of this Bill, the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries relied very extensively on public input. This was obtained from 62 public hearings actually, written submissions from interested members of the public, and research data that resulted from the work of two previous committees struck in 1989 and '91. During the exhaustive process, Mr. Chairman, Albertans were invited to become involved and responded with an overwhelming 1,309 submissions both during and after the second reading of Bill 55. Much active and public debate has taken place, and the latest amendments have been made, as I've said, even after more public input to the process.

With these amendments some of the proposed names have been altered to reflect community history and pride. These changes reunite communities and are a reflection of our commitment to Albertans to ensure that their right to effective representation is in fact safeguarded. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote Norman Cousins, who said, "In a democracy the individual enjoys not only the ultimate power but carries the ultimate responsibility."

Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor, I would like to take the opportunity to address two sections in the amendment. The first is in section A, which proposes that the constituency shown in the Bill as Spruce Grove-Sturgeon be named Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert. Approximately 10,000 residents of St. Albert are to be part of this constituency. It in fact is fairly evenly distributed between Spruce Grove, the good residents of Sturgeon, and the city of St. Albert, and they have a desire in St. Albert to have that fact recognized in the constituency name.

The second, Mr. Chairman, is in section C, which proposes that the names of the constituencies of Edmonton-Manning and Edmonton-McClung be exchanged. Both names recognize the contributions of former members of this Assembly, Ernest Manning and Nellie McClung, to the development of our province, that they made much contribution. When the committee proposed the names for the constituencies, members overlooked the fact that the Manning Freeway and Ernest Manning's home are located in and near the constituency which they suggested be called Edmonton-McClung. The potential for confusion was

drawn to our attention by residents, and we are pleased to propose the name change.

I look forward to additional comments about individual sections of this amendment by my colleagues in the House and on the committee and indeed to debate by members throughout the stages of Bill 55's progress.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I rise this evening just to make a comment on behalf of my colleague the MLA for Innisfail, who is not with us this evening. It has to do with the amendment on the name of the Innisfail constituency, substituting that with Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

The makeup of the constituency covers most of the county of Red Deer. The two largest communities within the county are Innisfail and Sylvan Lake, and it is indeed the recommendation of the hon. member that the amendment be accepted by the Assembly to reflect that reality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to rise in support of that amendment as well. Currently the town of Sylvan Lake is within the Rocky Mountain House constituency. I'm very sorry that I'm losing it, but I know that the commission had a great deal of difficulty fitting all the population in, so I would urge support of that amendment. Sylvan Lake, incidentally, is one of the fastest growing towns in the province, so certainly they warrant being mentioned in the name of the constituency.

8:10

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comments will be just a few minutes longer than the latter speaker's. In responding to this general amendment in front of us, which is a series of amendments, I would like to speak out on behalf of people who have written to members of the Assembly arguing for additional changes to the boundaries as proposed by the committee's report.

In particular, the first one I'd like to address is the Athabasca-Lac La Biche constituency, which suggests that the Fort McMurray riding remain the same as it presently is. They argue that Athabasca-Lac La Biche should include Wabasca-Desmarais but drop the southern portion at the county of Athabasca border as proposed and then retain the eastern boundary as it exists now to include Caslan, Lac La Biche, Plamondon, Hylo, Venice, Kikino, Buffalo Lake settlement, Rich Lake, et cetera. They argue that the proposals and amendments in front of us this evening artificially divide a community that has a lot in common, not only trading patterns but social patterns, Mr. Chairman. They have a community of interest.

I'd also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the village of Hay Lakes has taken a position wholly supporting the county of Camrose No. 22 on the proposed electoral boundaries changes. The latter - that is, the county of Camrose No. 22 - have suggested that the proposed constituency of Wetaskiwin-Camrose provides for no continuity at all compared to the previous constituency. They go on to argue that: the division of the county of Camrose into three electoral districts will also make it difficult for council in the county of Camrose to present countywide concerns to three Members of the Legislative Assembly. They've

gone into a pretty sophisticated analysis, I must say, on population base to make their case as valid as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also speak on behalf of the village of Ferintosh, the mayor of which wrote to the Speaker, I believe, on December 22 saying that they were very disappointed upon reviewing the proposed boundaries to find their previous letter of February 19, '92, imposing the inclusion of the village of Ferintosh in the Ponoka-Rimbey division had been completely ignored. They included a copy of that letter as well, and I think that their concern needs to be addressed tonight. They request that we reconsider the present proposal and include all of the urban centres within the county of Camrose in the Camrose electoral division.

The village of Bawlf wrote to the Assembly on January 16 again suggesting that the county of Camrose, which they reside in, being divided into three electoral divisions was very difficult, essentially for the same arguments put forward by the village of Ferintosh.

The village of New Norway wrote to the Assembly on January 5, 1993. There's a major consideration which prompts their opposition to the boundary changes, and that is that they seem to have been drawn to meet a certain arbitrary set of criteria that failed to take into consideration local dynamics and realities.

What they're pointing out, Mr. Chairman, is that located 25 kilometres from Camrose on Highway 21, New Norway is a part of the city of Camrose trading area. It is essentially for that reason that they're requesting that the boundary be drawn so that New Norway and district would remain within the Camrose constituency.

Mr. Chairman, we've also had a letter from someone in Drayton Valley - this one was dated January 7, 1993 - arguing that the constituency did not have a vote to stay with the boundary lines. They say that the town of Drayton Valley and area has had a lot of division these last few months, and they don't need any more. The people in the Moon Lake area conduct their social and business affairs in the town of Drayton Valley, not Stony Plain. They appeal to us to stop this action and leave the Moon Lake area in the Drayton Valley constituency. There are backup letters in support of that request.

Mr. Chairman, forgive me for one moment while I find my next . . . I think that's a repeat of the one that I already read.

The council of the village of Rosalind has discussed these electoral boundaries as proposed and don't feel they're acceptable to the needs of the residents of that community. They are arguing that they have nothing in common with the Ponoka-Rimbey areas. Similarly, the town of Bashaw wrote on January 12, 1993. They argue that being on the edge of several areas and not really belonging to any makes things difficult enough but to push them into the riding of Ponoka-Rimbey makes no sense at all. They're arguing that they should be in the county of Camrose, which Bashaw is a part of. They agree with the county of Camrose that being in three electoral divisions will make it difficult for the county "to represent countywide concerns to the different Members of the Legislative Assembly."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to represent the concerns presented to us by John Patrick Day in writing on February 1, 1993. He argues that essentially the northwest section of the city of Edmonton has been redrawn in a fashion which is both inconsiderate of community concerns and draws artificial boundaries. He presented to the Assembly an alternative map, something of which we may be considering later on this evening. Now, the reason I read into the record these concerns is, quite frankly, that even though this process is very near an end, these people need to be heard and on the record. I, for one, would like

to see their concerns addressed in this debate on the set of amendments now before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lloydminster, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. CHERRY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of my colleague, the hon. Dr. West, I want to bring the amendment of the name change . . .

**Chairman's Ruling
Referring to a Member by Name**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair just reminds the hon. member that there's no Dr. West in this House. Please refer to the constituency or the position.

MR. CHERRY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I apologize. Hon. Steve West.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CHERRY: Oh; sorry.

Debate Continued

MR. CHERRY: . . . the Member for Vermilion-Viking to propose the amendment to the constituency from Lloydminster-Vermilion to Vermilion-Lloydminster. All right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, part of this might be a question to the hon. Member for St. Albert.

First of all, I want to make a generic complaint against some of those name changes that involve three names, because the Speaker has a difficult enough job anyhow without recognizing Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert. There are a number of others here where we've got two or three names involved. I think we can stretch out the question period by another 20 minutes just to cover all the names. I think maybe the best way to sell the civic pride of Spruce Grove and St. Albert is just knock them both off the title, and just put the word Sturgeon on there. I think it would be a heck of a lot easier. As a matter of fact, it goes back to that old song about Sturgeon and what urging that they need. Nevertheless, I don't see any need for Spruce Grove and St. Albert to be in the title along with Sturgeon.

I'd also like to ask a question of the Member for St. Albert, if I could get his attention, Mr. Chairman. Would the Member for Stony Plain leave the Member for St. Albert alone for just a second? I notice there is a written change but not a mapped change here, if I could ask him to explain. Although I'm an engineer and a surveyor, reading this thing doesn't tell me a heck of a lot. I suspect Muir Lake has been left out. It would be a lot easier to read it – in fact, it would be a lot easier to see the picture, if there is one somewhere, as to what the amendment is. I would appreciate hearing that.

8:20

To go on, I don't understand this business of Lloydminster-Vermilion, Vermilion-Lloydminster, Mr. Chairman. There, again, we can solve the problem of Athens and Sparta or Calgary and Edmonton, whatever you want to call it, quarreling to see who is going to become the leader of the area, and just call it

plain Lakeland. It's a nice easy name to remember, it's easy to spell, and neither Lloydminster nor Vermilion can claim credit, then, for the amendment.

We have another one farther on. I don't know if it's in this book or not, but it seems just about as silly. Was it Drayton Valley? No, that's not the one. It was Wetaskiwin-Camrose, which was supposed to be changed to Camrose-Wetaskiwin or something else. I suggest you pick a town half way in between and leave the two big towns out of it.

Sorry, Mr. Chairman; I'm just trying to catch up. I would ask the Member for St. Albert what that change is. Is it just leaving the Muir Lake community out of Sturgeon?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any boundary change at all after the map was put out in respect to the new name of Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert. It was only a name change. There was no boundary change in there that I'm aware of, or somebody's put one by me.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the only reason I bring up the boundary change – and I haven't had a chance to have a couple of lawyers sit down to read it – is that you've described the boundary. If it was only a name change, why was the boundary description put in there? There's no need to describe boundaries if you're only changing names. Do I have the word, then, of the member that there's been no change in the boundary? Because that's a long description to check out one by one.

MR. FOWLER: I can understand the hon. member's concern, Mr. Chairman. I will check that out, but as far as I'm concerned, at this time there is only a name change. Nothing more was requested, unless it was done through another MLA or through another constituency, but certainly not through me.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I might be able to provide some assistance to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon on this matter. The member will recall that in the legislation there are schedules which appear which list the constituencies, and one of the schedules lists all of the constituencies alphabetically.

When names are changed, if it's a dual or triple name and the first name changes, then the order in which that constituency appears within the list of 83 also changes. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the description for the constituency is reprinted. There are no changes to the boundaries, if it is indeed nothing more than a name change. In terms of the way the amendments were indeed put together, that was deemed to be the most appropriate and the clearest way in terms of communication.

MR. TAYLOR: I appreciate that information. Then could the hon. member tell me: how do you know when the boundaries are changed from when they're not changed?

MR. BOGLE: If the hon. member would look at the amendments, which are indeed put forward, and if we would go down to section H on page 2, Peace River, there indeed is a boundary change for the Peace River constituency. While it's not required by legislation, we did circulate maps. If we take the package of maps which was distributed to members in the Assembly, the covering map is of the Peace River constituency. The original proposed constituency is in yellow, and the proposed amendment is in a light red. That is the area to be added. What would be really helpful, Mr. Chairman, is if members who have effected changes in this package as introduced by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General could give a brief description of what is

proposed. That in itself might provide some clarity to all members of the Assembly. Then if we could go on and have a more general debate on the amendments.

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I propose an amendment by striking out the boundary description of the electoral division of Peace River and substituting the following. For those that would just follow the map the hon. member just mentioned, the change involves moving it about three townships east of the present yellow line, starting at the bottom of township 110 down to 104. The important part of this amendment is that it involves a number of families that have been inadvertently excluded, two pockets of families, one to the east of La Crête and involving Mennonite families which are all part of the Mennonite communities of La Crête and Buffalo Head Prairie. The other one is on the north side of the Peace River, or the top end of the amendment, where a small number of citizens, some of them really through their relatives sometime ago, settled there over 200 years ago, and their history and business and farms and trading areas are all centred around Fort Vermilion.

As a result of that, Mr. Chairman, I move that that boundary be moved east as suggested by the map.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

MS CALAHASEN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would like to make a few comments on the amendments that are being proposed, but first I'd like to talk about some of the concerns that have been brought forward to me by my constituents relative to the proposed changes.

Like everyone else in this Assembly, I made a number of presentations that were related to the proposed changes by numerous commissions and committees that were established either by the Legislative Assembly or by each individual caucus. It was based on these comments, on my constituents' views, that I made the comments relative to the changes that were proposed. My constituents were very concerned about changes to the present state of this constituency of Lesser Slave Lake. There were many presentations made also by my constituents to all representatives that entered into any kind of committee relative to determining what should happen to the constituency. Although there were the different commissions and committees that were put forward, it has come to our realization that what was being proposed by the independent commission was probably what I would feel was the most detrimental for representing people in the Legislature. It seems that the Lesser Slave Lake constituency proposed by the independent commission would incorporate a quarter of the province. Most of my constituents considered this a dog's breakfast, Mr. Chairman, and therefore they were quite concerned with that specific change being proposed.

There have been a lot of comments in terms of the process in this Legislature as well as out in the areas. It seems that there have been many concerns . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could there be order in the committee, please, so that the hon. member can be heard.

MS CALAHASEN: When we had an opportunity to be involved, there were a number of people who did not want to get involved, and I for one got involved, Mr. Chairman. I spoke to every committee, as I indicated, and every commission and encouraged my constituents to also bring their concerns forward, which they did. It's not our fault that the opposition chose not to sit. I feel very sorry to see that we did have that happen.

8:30

This was a process to not only satisfy the MLAs, it was to satisfy the people of Alberta. I think sometimes the views that are reflected are not necessarily our views personally but the views of the people. Despite the fact that I felt that my constituency was going to drastically change by the proposed Lesser Slave Lake constituency, I still had to concede to those individuals who felt that they wanted to go to another constituency. Although I'm going to lose some of those wonderful people whom I've represented in the past, I say that I am still going to get other people who are just as beautiful. I know the wishes of those individuals who have wanted to go to another constituency are being considered. Although as an individual MLA I'm very concerned about that, it's still very important that the people get represented and get seen as being heard in terms of what it is that they want.

There are many areas where they feel that they have different trading links, and the fact remains that relatives are still located in the Wabasca and Calling Lake areas. Although it's very difficult for me – as I said, as the MLA to represent them, it's going to be a great loss to lose some constituents – I look forward also to those constituents who have been added. I know it's really a sad time whenever you have to lose a group. I'm glad to note that the committee has determined Lesser Slave Lake as a special riding constituency, which requires three of the five different exceptions that are needed to include the constituency as a special riding. Although I gathered more kilometres, I now have less people to look after, and I really look forward to representing those people, Mr. Chairman. I open my arms and extend my arms out to those who are added to my area because I feel, although we're going to get into different areas, it's going to be a challenge, a challenge to make sure that those small communities are also represented.

It's in a different context than what the arguments have been here that I make my points. I believe that no matter where they're located, they also have to be represented to the best of anyone's ability. Those boundaries that I now have extend farther up to the north. I think it's really important to look at those boundaries. The proposed boundaries include Wood Buffalo national park. My amendment is to ensure that Wood Buffalo national park be divided based on the fact that there are people who live near Lake Claire who trade in the Fort Chipewyan area and should be linked to the Fort Chip group rather than linked to the areas in the Lesser Slave Lake area. I wanted to make sure that the people who are in the Garden Creek area are also brought in so that they belong to the Little Red River band and they all stay together and these people are taken care of.

So my proposed amendment is to make sure that those people are included and that Wood Buffalo national park be divided so that it incorporates that community so that it stays as one community.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Might there be unanimous consent in the committee to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MRS. B. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce to you and though you two constituents from Calgary-

Bow, Bob Bird and his wife, Donna. Bob is the former past president of Bowness Community Association, and both he and Donna are excellent residents and have done a lot of volunteer work in the community of Bowness. I'd like to welcome you to the Assembly. Would you please rise.

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Committee of the Whole**

Bill 55
Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993
(continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: While you're on your feet, hon. member, you may make your intervention.

MRS. B. LAING: Thank you very much. I'd like to speak on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Calgary-Millican in support of sections F and G of the amendments. This change of name to Calgary-East from Calgary-Millican is as a request from Mayor Al Duerr and the city council for the city of Calgary. The area now known as Millican is no longer within the proposed boundaries, and they feel that Calgary-East better represents the actual area that it's in.

Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, identified in the amendments under J there are some amendments to the Spruce Grove-Sturgeon constituency that are proposed. There has been ample consultation with the county of Parkland, with the Muir Lake community association, and with other interested parties. I would like to propose this amendment so that we do not split the Muir Lake Community League. This is an active community league with approximately 200 families served during the 1992 year. There were 300 individuals who volunteered their time in activities ranging from coaching of ball teams to putting on community social events, working at fund-raisers, maintaining and improving the community hall. It's an area - and it's described in the maps which were distributed to all members of the Assembly - just to the north and west of the city of Spruce Grove. This would, in fact, keep the Muir Lake community intact in one constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc and because it affects the Drayton Valley constituency, I would like to move a very simple amendment, simple in the matter that it changes some small lines on the map, but it's not simple because the people of Devon will be affected by it. I know the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc would like to welcome those people from that area. They're very valuable constituents and very involved in the political process and in the provincial process.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, changes the northwest corner of the Leduc constituency to follow Highway 39 west to Highway 60 and north to the boundary of that constituency.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could speak for a few moments about the proposed amendment to the Cypress-Medicine Hat constituency, the line when it was drawn in the original report appeared to be drawn on a line that was a bound-

ary of the Suffield range. At one point the Suffield range crosses the South Saskatchewan River. It is on both sides of the South Saskatchewan River for a small area. Near as I can figure out, nobody lives in the area that had been cut out. There are only a few hundred antelope and deer that call that area home and the occasional cow perhaps. The change will then bring the constituency back in line with the centre mark of the South Saskatchewan River all the way from the corporate limits of Medicine Hat to where the river enters into Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, if I could also talk briefly about the new constituency and the loss of the town of Redcliff from that constituency, one that I've represented since 1979. It was added to the constituency under redistribution in 1979. It is now being added to the Bow Valley constituency. As others have said, after you represent people for a certain length of time, you get to know them and get used to working with them. That is lost and goes to another constituency. In addition, we get 13,300-plus people from Medicine Hat. I'm sure, whether it's myself who represents that area or somebody else, that it will be a challenge. It will be virtually a new constituency. It will be a whole new challenge and a whole new experience for that person.

In addition, we have an area in the MD of Taber that goes to the Taber-Warner constituency. That area was added to Cypress-Redcliff in, I believe, 1954, so it's been there quite a number of years. Ironic or not, I believe that area was added the year that the hon. Harry Strom first ran in that constituency, and it's being taken away after I've served it for somewhere between 17 and 18 years. So in 40 years that area has had two MLAs.

I would ask all members to support the amendment. Thank you.

8:40

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The amendment that I would like to move right now is very simple. It's just simply a name change from Drayton Valley to Drayton Valley-Calmar. I feel it's important that we recognize the contributions that the people in and around the Calmar area have made in the last years in matters of advice to me and in policy direction for this government. I think we should also recognize the valuable contribution that these people have made in earlier times in settling this area and the input in the formation of this province.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I would like to make a couple of other comments, if I could. There are some areas that I'm losing in the new constituency boundaries, and those areas are Moon Lake and Tomahawk and Devon. Now, the Moon Lake and Tomahawk areas north of Drayton Valley have traditionally been a part of the trading area of Drayton Valley, and I'm really sorry to lose these people. I've talked to them many times about this change. The overwhelming representation made at all of the hearings that took place in this province regarding boundaries was to make sure that the commission or the committee followed municipal boundaries wherever they could. This area happens to reside in the county of Parkland. All of the boundaries committees have seen fit to follow municipal boundaries, so unfortunately I'm losing these people. They've served on many constituency committees and volunteered on behalf of their communities, and I commend them for that. Again, I'm sorry to lose them.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, the community of Devon, which I mentioned before, will be transferred to the constituency of Leduc. Again, these are very valuable constituents who've participated in a wide range of projects that have been available to them. I am sorry to lose them as well. They do fit a little

better in the Leduc constituency, as they are closer to Leduc and closer to Edmonton.

I have one other area that's being added to my constituency, and I would just like to make it noted that I welcome these people from the Pipestone and Falun areas. They're people I've known over the years. Had they their wishes, I'm sure they would maybe have liked to be in the Wetaskiwin-Camrose constituency because that's their trading area, but because of the numbers, they fell within the Drayton Valley-Calmar constituency. I welcome them, and I'll be very happy to work with them in the coming years.

Thank you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I wish to ask for unanimous consent of the committee to make two withdrawals from the government amendments that I put forward. It is withdrawal of the Stony Plain constituency amendment in section J. I ask for unanimous consent that I can withdraw that and deal with it tomorrow. Also, section O, which is the Whitecourt-St. Anne constituency, which has a boundary difficulty we would like to have further discussion on with the county people as well as the relevant members of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. So ordered.

The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Member for Red Deer-South, the basic change here from what's been already put out in the existing proposal would be a change that is internal to both Red Deer-North and Red Deer-South and does not affect any of the boundaries that are surrounding those two constituencies. In fact, there was a suggestion made in the proposal that at the east end of Ross Street, where you can find the community of Rosedale – Rosedale has traditionally been in Red Deer-South even though it is on the north side of Ross Street, and there was some logic to moving that to Red Deer-North. However, to accommodate that difference, Ross Street as the natural dividing line in central Red Deer and the western part of Red Deer would have to move up north to 55th Street. There was considerable concern expressed by citizens of Red Deer that Ross Street itself was a natural divider and that Rosedale should be left in the constituency of Red Deer-South, therefore allowing the suggested boundary to move from 55th Street back to Ross Street. That, in fact, is basically what this amendment does. It satisfies the concern and leaves a more logical division and does not disrupt the numbers or the variance to any great degree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Well, I have one simple little amendment here in the southwest corner of the constituency. It's well marked out on the map. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon seemed to get a little lost there. Hopefully he'll get that map out and look at it so he can follow my description here.

It entails moving the proposed boundary in the southwest corner two miles west for a distance of five miles. That will reunite the very close-knit community of Woody Nook that was split right down the middle by the proposed boundary. It came right through the community itself, which is basically well settled. This

just brings it back together into one constituency. It's just a minor change, just moving over two miles, five miles north. I'm sure the good Member for Westlock-Sturgeon will be able to follow it on the map, hopefully.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I would like to thank the members of the committee for their dedication and hard work, all the hours that they put into coming up with these boundaries. It certainly was a very difficult task, especially when you look back at all the public hearings that were held and look at the *Hansard*, the minutes of those meetings, and see how this end product is so close to what the people of the province of Alberta were telling the first committee that went out and then the commission as they went out.

The amendment Q that we're looking at to the Rocky Mountain House constituency really is a fairly minor one. It moves the boundary on the east side of Sylvan Lake one mile east of the lake, then follows along township 38 over to the west side of Sylvan Lake. The errata that is attached tonight and introduced simply is to identify a few residents that are in the summer village of Norglenwold who live south of township 38. The intent is to try to keep that summer village entirely within the bounds of the Rocky Mountain House constituency. Then for easier identification we moved the line on the west side of Sylvan Lake so that it would follow the range line as opposed to one mile over, so it makes it much easier to describe.

8:50

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am asking for approval of this amendment and these boundaries with much mixed emotion. I regret losing the town of Sylvan Lake from the Rocky Mountain House constituency and the communities around Sylvan Lake, the recreation area of Benwood that I have got to know and been able to work with. The town of Sylvan Lake, of course, offers many challenges with the rapid growth of the tourism industry in that community. It was certainly a great deal of pleasure serving those people.

I look forward to taking in a much larger area to the northeast. It's going to be difficult because of the size of the constituency. When I hear people talking about getting down to the one person, one vote and then I look at this constituency, it's going to be about 23 percent below the mean, yet it is going to be just about a hundred miles from the one corner of the constituency down to the other corner where people live. Certainly it's going to be a real challenge for an MLA to service those. I know the service that the area that's going to be coming into the Rocky constituency got from its former MLA. I certainly will not be turning to the left; everything will be to the right. I think things will work out very well.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Parkallen.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment that deals with the area of southwest Edmonton that is considerably different from the boundaries as they currently exist and also the boundaries as proposed by the boundaries commission. The entire argument for this amendment hinges on one fact and one area of the city, and that is the area known as Riverbend. The submissions that I and others from southwest Edmonton made to the various and several boundaries commissions over the many

months and the many hearings had as an overriding theme the inclusion of the Riverbend neighbourhood in one constituency. It is currently represented by two MLAs: the MLA for Edmonton-Parkallen, who represents the northern part of Riverbend, and the MLA for Edmonton-Whitemud, who represents the southern part.

Recently the Riverbend-Brookside community league constructed a new community hall that serves a large area. It's a large, new, and quite nice community hall. Currently and also in the proposed boundaries, that community hall falls south of the delineated boundary, which is roughly the Whitemud freeway and the extension thereof along 45th Avenue. What you've got, in fact, is the community league based in one area and its community hall or centre based in another constituency. I understand how the boundaries commission came to this conclusion, because the information they were operating on was community league maps provided by the city of Edmonton. Unfortunately, the map that the city provided was dated 1987, and this community league hall and the redistricting occurred in 1992, so there's a four- or five-year spread there where information was out of date.

The proposal that is included in the amendment rectifies the situation and has as its chief objective including all of Riverbend in one constituency to be represented by one MLA. Well, if you use that as your base objective, a number of other factors occur in order to meet the tests that are included in the legislation and elsewhere in these proposals in terms of numbers and areas of interest and so on. So in order to clearly delineate what this amendment is and what effect it will have, it would be easier, as opposed to going down streets and avenues, to just lay out the broad parameters. I think I can do that fairly quickly and bring the Legislative Assembly and the committee to some understanding of what we propose.

With the western boundary of this exercise the North Saskatchewan River, the southern boundary as the city limits, and the eastern boundary as the train tracks, we then include in the amended constituency of Edmonton-Whitemud these communities: all of Riverbend, Lansdowne, Aspen Gardens, Westbrook, and those communities south of 23rd Avenue, Yellowbird east, Brookview, Twin Brooks, and so on. That would constitute the constituency of Edmonton-Whitemud as amended. The constituency of Edmonton-Rutherford would then consist of the following communities: Malmö, Empire Park, Royal Gardens, Greenfield, Blue Quill, Rideau Park, Duggan, Ermineskin. On that basis the numbers are consistent with the legislation, the communities of interest are much more consistent with the legislation than under the proposals in the original Bill 55, and all the tests are met.

There will be some individuals in some communities who will feel that there is some disparity here. I'm sure those people in Grandview would like to have been included in Edmonton-Whitemud. I spoke to an individual today who suggested that the people in Aspen Gardens-Westbrook felt aligned with those people in Greenfield-Petrolia. Mr. Chairman, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which are just the arithmetic of this kind of an exercise, it was not possible to accommodate everyone. I believe the amendment that is before us meets the base tests and the primary objective: including all of Riverbend and all its expanding communities of Brookview, Terwillegar, Promontory Point, Whitemud Creek, and so on – all of those – in one constituency. That objective has now been met, according to this amendment, and I would urge its acceptance.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, it's my pleasure to rise as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Calgary-Shaw to move an amendment to Bill 55. I do so with some regret, because it

has been a pleasure to serve both north and south sides of Fish Creek park on the west side of Macleod Trail.

Mr. Chairman, much as my colleague from Edmonton-Parkallen has avoided the legal description in proposing his amendment, I will do the same. Suffice to say it is spelled out in the amendment. My amendment would be that Evergreen Estates and Shawnee Slopes, including Shawnee as well as the Fairways, be housed in the revised constituency of Calgary-Shaw and that it not be placed within the revised proposed constituency of Calgary-Lougheed, such that Fish Creek itself now would become a more natural boundary for the two constituencies. I have had the honour of serving all of those areas since 1986 and would look forward to doing the same had it not been for some tremendous growth that has occurred in all of these communities. I recognize the realities of that growth and propose this amendment.

The communities of Evergreen Estates and Shawnee and the Fairways share a greater common interest with Millrise and Shawnessy than with those communities north of Fish Creek park. They share the use of the Shawnessy barn, a common facility in all of those communities. They share the facility known as Shawnee Slopes golf course and often use that hall at the golf course as a meeting place. As I said, Mr. Chairman, the creek is a more natural boundary, and I would so recommend that. Finally, I should mention that the Shaw family, after whom the constituency is named, has historical roots in that part of Fish Creek park and that part of Calgary north of 146 Avenue that I am now recommending be housed within the revised constituency of Calgary-Shaw.

For all of those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would so move the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. FOWLER: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there is no further debate on amendment one from the government, excluding section O and Stony Plain from section J, we would ask that the question be called on that.

9:00

MR. McINNIS: I'm just rising to debate one of the amendments, the proposed amendment to Athabasca-Wabasca. I think it should be observed that people who live in the Athabasca-Lac La Biche area of the constituency have natural and historical trading relationships, and their concern is that the revised riding boundaries as proposed to the committee today physically isolate those communities from the opposite end of the district. It has been observed that the distance from Fort Chipewyan to Athabasca is almost equal to the distance between Lethbridge and Edmonton. It would be as if somebody in Edmonton were represented by somebody in Lethbridge or vice versa. It's a scale that I think boggles the imagination, in the experience of most members. I don't believe any member of the Assembly currently represents a district that far flung. The suggestion that has been made is that perhaps the more logical way to do things is to have the natural trading areas observed in the way the district is drawn, and that would show trading relationships between Fort McMurray, Anzac, Fort Fitzgerald, and the northerly communities, as compared with trading relationships that exist within the Wabasca, Desmarais, Athabasca, and Lac La Biche area.

It has also been observed that the riding boundaries as proposed almost exactly correspond to the FMA boundaries of a particular forest industry in Alberta, Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc., which might provide some convenience from one point of view

but seems to represent a major inconvenience from the point of view of representation within that district.

Since I was asked, I would like to put those remarks on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any more?

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few comments on this omnibus series of amendments we have, called amendment 1. The Liberal caucus is sensitive to what is trying to be done here with respect to making the boundaries better, so I want to make just some general comments about the group of amendments we have before us today.

There are sort of, if you will, two classes of amendments here, Mr. Chairman. There are the name change amendments, which by and large the Liberal caucus has no difficulty with and could probably end up supporting were they put forward independently. However, because they are part of a larger group with other amendments that propose substantive changes to boundaries, we have gone on the record as saying that we're opposed to the principle of MLAs setting their own boundaries, and we believe this to be a continuation of the same process. So generally speaking, then, when we vote on this particular batch of amendments that we have before us, we will be voting against it. The concern we have with respect to setting boundaries is before us once again.

I do want to thank the members for providing us with maps, which do make it substantially easier for us to understand the proposed amendments that are being made with respect to some of them. Just a couple of comments, I suppose, with some of them. The boundaries, for example, that were mentioned by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff I think are a good improvement. I thought I would just put on record that the concept of using a natural boundary like the South Saskatchewan River certainly is an appropriate direction to be going. We have heard from the residents of Muir Lake that this is an amendment that should be approved. Were it standing by itself, the Liberal caucus might be able to support that, but again because it's in a package, Mr. Chairman, and because of the principle we've outlined at second reading stage, we will not be supporting that particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there's one that I want to point out to the Member for Rocky Mountain House and the Member for Innisfail. The proposed name change of Innisfail-Sylvan Lake I think might not be in the best interests of the people there from the standpoint that on one hand the town of Sylvan Lake will indeed be in the Innisfail, or as the amendment says, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake constituency, yet the lake itself is going to be in the Rocky Mountain House constituency, which could lead to some confusion amongst people who don't live right in that area. Perhaps the government might want to reconsider that or move the boundary so that it includes all of the lake and all of the town within one or the other constituency. I think that it may create some difficulty having the town in one and the name in one and the lake itself in another constituency. That was a concern simply that I did want to raise with respect to that particular constituency.

Mr. Chairman, the Liberal caucus has spoken before about this concept of writing descriptions for particular constituencies. Again, we have some difficulty with writing those particular descriptions, drawing the maps. I note, for example, with Drayton Valley-Calmor that, first of all, with a letter M, as in Michael, there's a proposed name change, and then with the letter N, as in Norman, there's a proposed change of the description,

yet there was no map with that particular one, which would have made it easier for us to work with.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to some of the name changes, I would like to propose perhaps a caution to the ease of operation, if you will, of the House of representation. If we start drawing out names that get too long, it becomes difficult for the Speaker and it becomes difficult for the Chairman to call members by the name of their constituency if the names of those constituencies get too long. The very first amendment I'm going to use just as an example: Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert begins to be quite a mouthful. When we get to times in debate in the Legislature, I could see where you could run into some significant difficulties. If I were to use my own constituency as an example, to really clarify the constituency, perhaps instead of saying Calgary-North West, we should propose an amendment saying it should be Calgary-Silver Springs-Ranchland-Hawkwood-Arbour Lake-Citadel-Scenic Acres, which would be quite a mouthful for the Chair or the Speaker of the House to put forward. So a comment with respect to name changes is that it's important that the name reflect the constituency as near as possible, but we do want those names to be easily usable, if you will, by all members.

Mr. Chairman, while we respect the attempt and certainly the good efforts of the members of the committee, despite the fact that we have expressed our concern about the process, I believe that all four of those members who did the job deserve a pat on the back for certainly a job that required, I know, a considerable amount of their time, a considerable amount of their effort, and, I suspect, to be honest, a considerable amount of anguish. While I don't necessarily agree with this and won't be voting for it, I would like to compliment those members for a lot of hard work.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of amendment 1 as amended by the hon. Minister of Justice, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

[Motion on amendment 1 carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's certainly an honour to be here this evening to speak to this very important Bill that's before the House in terms of realigning boundaries in the province of Alberta. First of all, I'd like to compliment the committee on the excellent job they have done overall in terms of the province. I know it was a very hard job for them. It's not an easy task when you're looking at making decisions which affect the people of the province in the way in which these lines do affect representation.

In moving the amendment tonight, I'm moving this because of representations that have been made to me by constituents of mine, in particular the municipality of the Crowsnest Pass. I'd like to reflect briefly, if I could, in terms of the riding which has been created by the committee. It's certainly going to be a very diverse and challenging riding. I should note that from the perspective of my constituents, they would have preferred to have been consid-

ered as a special consideration status riding, but with the new rules, in terms of them not using 1991 census, our riding came out being 55 percent below the norm. As such, I think my constituents recognize that there'd have to be some additions to the territory, that we could not fit into the special consideration guidelines on the basis of the population which we had, and there would have to be changes.

This new riding is going to be a very diverse one with a lot of challenges. It's going to bring into play coal mining interests; gas processing interests; tourism; historic resources; many forms of agriculture, from irrigation, cattle, mixed farming, to grain farming; all the issues of the Eastern Slopes: a very historic constituency that includes Fort Macleod, where the first North-West Mounted Police arrived, to the coal mining in the Crowsnest Pass. Pincher Creek, of course, is a very historic area also. So it's going to be a very challenging riding for a new member of the Legislature to represent in its diversity.

9:10

With regards to the amendment I've proposed, the former constituencies which this new riding encompasses are the constituencies of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and Macleod. The committee suggested the name of Pincher Creek-Macleod. I've had representations from the municipality of Crowsnest Pass, and I would like to quote from a letter from the mayor of the Crowsnest Pass to the Electoral Boundaries Committee. He says:

I noticed that the riding is called Pincher Creek-Macleod omitting any reference to the Crowsnest Pass. We are the largest urban area both in population and size in the riding [and that] should be identified.

So, Mr. Chairman, I move this amendment to have the riding changed from the committee's recommendation of Pincher Creek-Macleod to that of Macleod-Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, which incorporates both of the names of the former ridings. Macleod is a historic name in terms of riding names, having been established in 1905, as is Pincher Creek. Crowsnest was added in the 1940s.

The Crowsnest Pass has often felt isolated in terms of its position up against the British Columbia border. Being a mountain community, in its association with people in Alberta of similar interests, they have to go north to communities in Canmore, Banff, and Jasper to have similar communities of interest to what they have. They feel that at times they've been left off the map, and the letter and representations from municipal council have also expressed that. In a recent meeting I had with the municipal council, they raised this again with me, asked me what was the possibility of having Crowsnest included in the name, and I offered to them that I would bring forward this amendment to the Assembly tonight for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, with that I move the proposed amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Macleod.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak on the amendment this evening. I intend to make some other remarks with respect to my constituency later on this evening, but reflecting tonight, I can appreciate fully the representation made by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

The Crowsnest area is one that's extremely important to Alberta and is a historical area that I know the member feels very strongly about. I personally am not very happy with the boundaries themselves, but certainly I'm not particularly happy with the name of the constituency. The people in Fort Macleod have been very, very concerned that Macleod, being one of the most historical constituencies in this province – in fact, I believe Alberta really got its start from the Macleod constituency, with Frederick

Haultain and others. To have the constituency named Pincher Creek-Macleod in my view is not the right name for the area at all. In fact, if you were to name the constituency properly, it would be named Claresholm-Granum-Fort Macleod-Brockett-Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. But I don't think you would allow that many names in it, especially if you had somebody like Fjordbotten, with that long a name, representing an area like that. It would be impossible to even carry on business in the Legislature.

I did talk to the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest tonight, and I suggested to him that I felt the right name for the constituency was not Pincher Creek-Macleod but Macleod-Crowsnest. Why would I say that? Because Macleod represents not only a historical area but the agricultural area, and Crowsnest represents the mining as well as the tourism opportunities in the Crowsnest Pass. That eliminates two names, Claresholm being one. Claresholm is, as you know, the community that was represented by Louise C. McKinney, the first woman in the British parliamentary system that was elected to a Legislative Assembly.

Pincher Creek would be eliminated. I know they have been there since 1905, and they would be hurt as well. But the balance in calling it Macleod-Crowsnest would make, in my view, the greatest sense. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest did not agree with changing that name. He feels very strongly about Pincher Creek as he feels strongly about Crowsnest.

[Mr. Main in the Chair]

So looking at what we have before us tonight, if we are to change it from Pincher Creek-Macleod to Macleod-Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, my constituents would find that totally unacceptable. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question on amendment 2?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment 2 lost]

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to try my luck at another amendment to Bill 55 by striking out the boundary descriptions of the Dunvegan and Peace River constituencies. This change would allow the Peace River constituency to retain the town of Grimshaw on the east side of MD 135.

AN HON. MEMBER: I can't hear the hon. member.

MR. ADAIR: I can turn it up. I hope my talking isn't interfering with your side discussions.

I've represented this area, Mr. Chairman, for the last 22 years, and I've enjoyed immensely serving the people on the east side of MD 135 in the town of Grimshaw. Their trading area, incidentally, is right to the town of Peace River. Over 30 percent of the jobs in the Grimshaw area are in Peace River, at either the provincial jail, Daishowa, or government offices downtown. For the life of me, I can't figure out what the cause would be to remove it other than something called the numbers. If it's such that the numbers do not make it possible, I want it on record that the residents of the suggested amendment area are absolutely great. I'm sure that the present MLA for Dunvegan will serve them well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there additional speakers? Any other comments? Is the committee ready for the question on amendment 3?

[Motion on amendment 3 lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Redwater-Andrew.

9:20

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to outline some of the concerns that are concerning some of the people in the Redwater-Andrew constituency. Firstly, I want to begin by saying that I agree in general with the redistribution of seats in Alberta and the Legislature. I think it was done in a democratic and fair way. I know that it's not easy to start redrawing lines with population shifts and many other things that happen within the province in a period of probably seven, eight years. I think the committee did as fair a job as possible, because I know looking at some of these and trying to get some figures and facts . . .

But I don't necessarily agree with every way it was done, because sometimes following natural boundaries maybe is not the right way to do it. This is what happened in the Redwater-Andrew constituency, and that's basically on the south side of the constituency in the east end. I just want to touch briefly on the south side, and that's the area on the south side of the North Saskatchewan River, the county of Lamont and also part of the county of Two Hills. As the committee and others know, there have been letters sent over and presentations made by the county of Lamont and the county of Two Hills, the villages of Willingdon and Andrew, and the town of Lamont on how they felt they should fit into this constituency which they were used to.

Point of Order Amendments

MR. TAYLOR: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon on a point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: I searched three desks here, and I can't find the amendment we're talking about.

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Chairman to the members, I have not gotten to the amendment yet. I'm speaking on the outline of some of the areas that have been affected, and then I will get to the amendment. [interjections] Well, I can pass them around because it covers another area that I am getting to, so please be patient.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be a lot easier to follow the hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew if we had the thing in front of him. Not that he doesn't describe it very well, but I am one of those that can understand better by looking at the map than I can by listening.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Redwater-Andrew is speaking to an amendment, and I expect when he gets to the appropriate strategic place, he'll make it available to us.

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what's happening. I couldn't get amendments to every part of the areas. There is one certain area in the constituency that I'm getting to that the amendment is pertaining to. If the Member for

Westlock-Sturgeon so desires, I'll ask the pages to hand out the amendments, and he can look at them till I get to them.

Debate Continued

MR. ZARUSKY: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I think I got to the area of Lamont and Andrew and the area on the south side of the river that went to the Vegreville-Viking constituency. As I said, these people have written and requested that they stay within a constituency that would include Redwater. The reason for that is that some of them have been in the constituency since 1971; others have been included in the constituency since 1986, in particular part of the county of Lamont and the town of Lamont. This area has been tossed back and forth for many redistributions. They were in Clover Bar, then back in some other one, and then ended up in Redwater-Andrew. They certainly enjoy the working relationship that they have with government and myself as the member representing them.

You can see, Mr. Chairman, that these are some of the concerns that came out of there. The big thing was that rivers don't in particular have to be a boundary, because we have things called bridges these days which were built. They're easy to cross and very convenient to help represent these people. So this is something that I feel could have been included in some way, but at the same time I'm sure the committee tried.

Mr. Chairman, on that note, getting to the amendment. I think the amendment is a very fair one because it includes an area in the county of Smoky Lake, an area that extends east of the town of Smoky Lake and heads to an area called Bellis, where the old boundary of Redwater-Andrew was and has been for many years. I think there's a total of approximately 500 people there that could have been represented, into the new Redwater constituency. The reason for that is - they've spoken to me, and to them the county of Smoky Lake is home. The county of Smoky Lake office is located at Smoky Lake, which these people have a general trading pattern with. So you can see that these are some of the concerns. All their business is done in the town of Smoky Lake. They just have similarities with the agricultural patterns and the work they do. Whether it's at Pine Ridge Forest Nursery or other areas in the gas fields, it all heads towards Smoky Lake.

You'll see on the amendment that it says striking out the boundary descriptions for the electoral divisions of Lac La Biche-St. Paul and Redwater. That's where this area now would be going, to Lac La Biche-St. Paul. In fact, these people would have to travel quite a ways maybe to an MLA's office and any concerns they'd have with regard to their area. I strongly suggest that, for that reason. It is, like I said, only 500 people included there in the new Redwater constituency which heads out to the west and takes in the whole county of Thorhild and part of the MD of Sturgeon, including Gibbons, Bon Accord, Namao, Morinville, and Legal. It would sort of make it an area that could be well represented.

Mr. Chairman, on that note I feel at this time that I am looking forward to the challenges facing me as a representative for the new Redwater constituency. I indeed welcome the residents of Gibbons, Namao, Bon Accord, Morinville, and Legal into the new constituency, and indeed welcome the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, who lives in the area and finally probably will get some good representation. As I said, I would like to see this added in just for the convenience of these 500 people. On that note, once again I ask the support of the Legislature on this amendment, and I certainly look forward to serving the people in the new Redwater constituency which, as I said, will be a great challenge, indeed, I'm sure, a beautiful area to represent.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Additional speakers on amendment number 4?

Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know; these are always difficult ones to address because I guess you can always poke out boundaries here and there. I'm disappointed that the chairman of the committee recommending it isn't in the House. [interjection] Or isn't available for questioning. Although this appears to be just a raid that the Member for Redwater-Andrew said was only about 500, I think it's more like 800 to a thousand, and that's taken away from Lac La Biche-St. Paul. So that starts a – I don't know what you call it – domino effect as you go around. It's not much use in the committee's report, I suppose, where the MLAs are supreme and can do anything, but the Redwater constituency now has already been changed substantially . . . [interjections] Yes, Lac La Biche-St. Paul is already 10.6 percent beneath the average, so we're pushing them down quite a little.

I don't think much thinking has gone in here. If Lac La Biche-St. Paul had been at the average or above the average, then I suppose snipping off 500 to a thousand people doesn't mean much. It's when it's nearly 10 percent beneath the average that it's got to be a bit of a concern. Actually, I mean if we're going to start adding and subtracting around Redwater, I'd like to sneak over there and steal a little bit out of St. Albert there. Then they wouldn't have to worry so much about that big, long name. I think we can go on and on. What I would like to get across to the House here is that it's not that we're enriching Redwater; we're impoverishing Lac La Biche-St. Paul to a very, very dangerous point. I would advise voting against it. I'm not crazy about the boundaries. I think I could do a better job, but I think if we just try to do it in the House, ad hoc around the edges here, we're going to end up in a real mess.

9:30

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question on amendment 4?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment 4 lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. WEISS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that's not an indication of matters to come in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you and through you to members of the Assembly regarding some concerns I have in the Fort McMurray constituency. I'd like to file with members of the Assembly a draft depicting how I believe the constituency of Fort McMurray should be realigned and not as proposed. I thank the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon for the reminder, because I appreciate his interest as well as the interest of the opposition parties in my concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I also appreciate the work that the Electoral Boundaries Commission had set out for them. It is a difficult task to redraw our boundaries in such a way as to ensure effective representation for all Albertans. While of course having to balance so many concerns, it came within the job and the job parameters. The legislation stated that each riding can only have 25 percent above or below the provincial constituency population average, and that was a part of balancing those interests.

Mr. Chairman, exceptions are allowed to this regulation with respect to ridings whose geographical features, accessibility, population density, and commonality of interest make them an unusual challenge. I feel that the riding of Fort McMurray is one of those areas which merits an exception to the plus or minus 25 percent rule.

The final report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission carves the city of Fort McMurray into its own area, which forces the surrounding regions, then, into an alliance with Athabasca-Wabasca as the new proposed constituency. The rationale is that the city of Fort McMurray, with nearly 35,000 constituents, merits its own constituency. This approach rather neatly solves the mathematical issue of getting the riding size to fall within the legislative limits set out for the commission. This neat approach, as well, looks very good on paper. However, I believe it fails miserably to recognize the economic, cultural, and transportation links and ties to the area of Fort McMurray itself. The city of Fort McMurray provides an essential link that binds together all of the communities around it. This proposal that was suggested for a new constituency of the city of Fort McMurray alone has defeated that. Putting Fort McMurray and the communities which depend upon it in different ridings violates the commonality of interest that has held this area together throughout this province's history. It also violates the basic premise behind the formation of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Mr. Chairman, and that was to redraw our boundaries to guarantee all Albertans fair representation. I suggest this is not the case.

A strong regional identity permeates all aspects of life in northeastern Alberta. The historic ties of the area go very deep socially, economically, and politically. The city of Fort McMurray is an integral part of this history. At one point Fort McMurray was part of the giant Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche riding. This was cut down in the early 1980s to its present shape and size. It is far easier now for an MLA to represent this area, with its reduced size and cohesive nature. I should be able to speak to that, Mr. Chairman, because I was fortunate enough to have been the MLA for that area at that time as well.

While it is a very diverse riding with a definite rural/urban split, the areas of commonality among the area outweigh any differences. Different communities work together on areas of mutual concern or interest. Concerns of the outlying areas have always been treated right alongside those of the city of Fort McMurray. A danger in change in a constituency like Fort McMurray is isolating these small communities as you move farther south. You find communities which are linked on all sides with different centres . . .

Point of Order

Reading a Speech

MR. HORSMAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A point of order from the Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. HORSMAN: I would refer the hon. Member for Fort McMurray to *Beauchesne*, section 473, relative to the subject of reading speeches, and I would urge the hon. member to be a little bit more discreet at least in not holding his notes right in front of him as he has been doing for the last several minutes. From the volume of notes still in his hand, it would appear that he's about to embark upon a much lengthier presentation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair takes note that you were directing your remarks not to the Chair but to the member, and we recognize the Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, further on the point of order. I think it's very unfair to the Member for Medicine Hat. At least he's learned not to move his lips.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I just thought it was most unfair criticism, because after all, he's quit moving his lips.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the admonition by the hon. member, but at the same time I thought it was important enough to get the content of the material into the remarks and into the Assembly. If the hon. member can't bear it, my suggestion is that he would leave the Assembly. If it's not that bearable, maybe he'd close his eyes and go to sleep. That, too, might help; I don't know.

Debate Continued

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe that in the case of Fort McMurray, communities like Anzac, Fort MacKay, Fort Chipewyan, Chipewyan Lake, and Janvier depend solely upon Fort McMurray and each other. That's very important. Redrawing the boundaries to put them in another riding will not change that fact. It only means that the electoral boundaries exist then in ignorance of the regional unity of northeastern Alberta.

Now, some may be offended about those remarks and those strong accusations, Mr. Chairman, but I believe strongly that there is an injustice being done and created in the redrawing of the boundaries as has been proposed.

The area's trading patterns put Fort McMurray directly in the centre of the area. People living outside the area rely upon Fort McMurray more than people living around other urban centres in the province. The isolation of the area makes the city of Fort McMurray vital to life in the northeastern corner of the province.

I go on to say and would repeat to the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, that it is so important to these communities to have the regional ties and the link that's so important. Geographically, if anybody were to travel to the area, they would find that we lack the vital road access and links that many prominent communities in the south have. This makes such a difference in serving the constituents, the MLA as well.

I would point out as well, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the Assembly that it's so important that the area relies upon consumer goods that are sold and traded within the individual communities. This, too, would break down in its buying patterns and trading patterns between the various communities because of the economic ties that are so important to the area. Syncrude is known as the largest employer in the province with approximately 5,000 employees, and nearly 2,000 employees work at the Suncor plant. Fort McMurray in itself provides the housing and accommodation and recreation amenities and other amenities for these people. It should be pointed out that the new proposed boundaries would separate the plants entirely from the city of Fort McMurray, which I suggest is inappropriate, inaccurate, and not realistic.

The social fabric that ties the communities as well is as important as the economic points that I've indicated. The outlying communities still maintain very strong ties with each of the areas. The most common denominator, though, Mr. Chairman, is not the resource that we hear talked about so many times, the oil sands,

but the families. The family itself is the most important resource in the whole area. In the Fort McMurray riding in particular, families are interrelated and connected amongst the entire region. Fort Chipewyan, by the way, is the oldest community in the province, and its tie has always been and always will be with the city of Fort McMurray in that region. The ties of family and common concerns hold the region together as a unit and will always do so, even if the proposed split is made as has been recommended. Slave Lake and Wabasca areas have no ties whatsoever either by road links or by family or economic ties. As well, and most important, Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, there is no road access.

As well, I would point out that many of the areas further to the south have strong agricultural bases. That again is not a common tie, because Fort McMurray and the entire region have no agricultural base.

9:40

The current boundaries respect our community links, and breaking this link will break down the communities, as I pointed out.

Many groups have made presentations to this effect at earlier meetings and commission meetings, in support of it as it is. I'd like to draw out a few and one in particular. Mrs. Ann Dort-MacLean on behalf of the city of Fort McMurray made a presentation to the Electoral Boundaries Commission last February, as she was then a member of the city council. I should point out that the council of the city of Fort McMurray – this is a council representing some 35,000 citizens in this province who should be listened to even though some do not want to listen to it in the Assembly – passed a resolution requesting that the Fort McMurray provincial riding be left as it is. Mrs. Ann Dort-MacLean explained to the commission the ties which link the riding together in a common banner. It should be noted that Mrs. Ann Dort-MacLean is the nominated NDP candidate, which proves as well that the opposition members agree with me in this regard.

Transportation issues have always been the primary factor that develops and pulls any region or areas together. If one was to travel in the earlier days to Fort McMurray, they would have found they would have had to go by air or by water, and that was impossible because of some of the portages. Now we have an all-weather road, of course, that links the city of Fort McMurray. But we do not have an all-weather road that links the communities of Athabasca onwards over to Fort Chip and to the outlying areas. So I'm suggesting that the proposed link with Athabasca-Wabasca is certainly unrealistic because of the road ties in the network alone. The proposed boundaries ignore the most basic mode of transportation which ties communities together, and that of course is the automobile. They would make transportation around the new riding costly and inefficient. It would directly impact the ability of the MLA to serve Athabasca and Fort Chipewyan effectively at the same time.

Some of the ties I've not mentioned relate to the services in the area, Mr. Chairman. The Fort McMurray regional hospital and the Fort McMurray health unit provide services to the entire constituency. These are regional services, I might point out. That's how we built them, and that's how we sold it to the areas, to the communities, to this Assembly for the expenditures: on the basis of regional facilities. Emergency services, including air rescue, ambulance, and fire are provided for Fort McMurray for the whole region. As well, whereas the educational facilities for many of the communities are only providing schooling to grade 8, our Keyano College provides upgrading and educational training facilities for communities and industry as well as mobile facilities in and around the communities in Fort Chipewyan.

Our communities work together on regional tourism plans. We've integrated a slogan called Magic Country, which encompasses the whole area and the whole region. This, too, would once again break down, and we would have dissension. The cultural and recreational facilities are all regional in nature, as well as the health and the service areas that I referred to earlier. This leads to the predicament wherein a Fort Chipewyan resident would have to phone Wabasca to discuss a problem they had in dealing with a Fort McMurray government office. What common sense is that, I ask you? Everyone is also closely linked and concerned about environmental issues, working together to ensure that plants and projects are environmentally safe and co-operating with each other on a new regional landfill site. These are some of the areas of concern that we have that we're working on. These we would lose in the fact that we'd have to now deal with a new MLA.

While deleting the outlying areas from the constituency would lighten the load of a Fort McMurray MLA somewhat, it certainly would impact on the services severely. The realities of commuting around a constituency with both Athabasca and Fort Chipewyan would make an MLA's job very difficult. Solving simple constituency concerns or attending simple constituency functions would become impossible, making the MLA far less effective and distancing him or her from part of the constituency. I can envision as well, Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, that in many cases there would be a duplication. There would have to be two MLAs come to many meetings that serve the region and the areas because of the close-knit relationship between the communities and the proximity of the communities to the city of Fort McMurray. Many functions would have to be attended by both MLAs because they all take place in the regional centre of Fort McMurray. It is difficult but physically possible to serve the region under the present boundaries. The present configuration is the only one in which that is possible. Travel from Edmonton to Fort McMurray is much easier than travel from Athabasca to Fort Chipewyan and less costly. Surely government has a direct responsibility to be fiscally responsible in serving the constituents. That in itself should justify the overall reason for changing as per my recommendations and suggestions.

I'd like to give you a little example, Mr. Chairman, if you'd be a realist, as I've always said I am, and listen to this comparison. To illustrate how difficult this would be geographically, let me point out that communities that are only 20 to 25 minutes away from the city of Fort McMurray which would be separated and taken away from this constituency are proposed to be then serviced by the MLA for Athabasca-Wabasca, some 300 miles, plus 480 air miles to Fort Chipewyan. That's the same comparison, I would say, as saying, "How about the Member for Edmonton servicing or looking after as an MLA the constituents in Medicine Hat or Milk River?" Does that make any common sense to any member in this Assembly? If it does, please stand up and challenge me on that remark. It makes it not only geographically but physically and formally prohibitive to do it and fiscally irresponsible.

I have many letters that I would like to file with the Assembly; I have copies of them. I have letters in support from concerned citizens from Fort McMurray, in particular Mr. Art Avery and Mr. Wayne Madden; the city of Fort McMurray; the chairman of the economic development board; concerned citizen Mr. Oliver Glanfield in Fort Chipewyan; the Fort McMurray Progressive Conservative Association, president Mr. Dave McNab; improvement district No. 18 north, chairman Shawn Hebblethwaite; the Fort McMurray Advisory Council; chairperson Miss Pat Flett from the ID 18 north; from the Fort Chipewyan Advisory

Council. I can go on and on and on but just want to file with the Assembly some of those copies, Mr. Chairman.

At a public hearing of the Electoral Boundaries Commission a number of Fort McMurray constituents made representations with their views of what the boundaries should entail. Not one of them spoke of this proposed boundary as a legitimate possibility. As one constituent stated, there is no other option; the constituency must stay as it is to be viable. Even a former member of this Assembly Mrs. Shirley Cripps stated, too, that she found difficulties with it and wondered why the proposed changes were being made. She commented on the special difficulties facing the boundaries and expressed reservations with the proposed changes.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to sum up very briefly. I want to say that laws are made to serve people and not the other way around. The plus or minus 25 percent rule should not be made to apply to the Fort McMurray constituency. An allowance must be made for that. The reasons that exceptions are allowed to the plus or minus 25 percent rule are precisely the ones which apply to my constituency. I'm told, and some have even suggested, that there would be a possibility of a court challenge. I suggest that no one from the riding will contest it. On the contrary, they'll contest it if there is no change.

Mr. Chairman, I go on further, and I would like to throw this out as a challenge. If we are supposedly the highest court in the law, who then will challenge us if we accept what is common sense and make the changes I'm suggesting? That is common sense. The people of Fort McMurray, our riding, are allowed to choose who their MLA is. They should be allowed some input into what areas form part of their constituency and which don't. The constituents want to remain status quo.

Mr. Chairman, there are three points I'd like to make. The Attorney General at that time filed a press release on January 25, 1993. I'm not going to read it all, but it was a release with regards to the Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993, introduced. He goes on to say:

"Bill 55 reflects the recommendations contained in that 1992 Report." said Mr. Fowler.

Mr. Fowler, I challenge you. It does not contain fully the recommendations in that report that was filed with you from the citizens and constituents of Fort McMurray.

It further goes on to say:

"The intent of this Bill is to provide Albertans with electoral boundaries which are a current reflection of our population, and which embody the concept of effective representation," he continued.

I challenge, Mr. Fowler, that it does not meet those conditions as well.

9:50

It goes on to say that it "may deviate up to 25%" and "The Courts have also permitted electoral divisions with special conditions to exceed the 25%." Mr. Chairman, the population of Chipewyan Lake, Anzac, Janvier, Fort Chipewyan, Garden River, and Fort McMurray combined is approximately 1,960 citizens. Added with the proposed constituency of Fort McMurray, with a current population of 34,706, the proposed constituency as I see it and recommend it would then be approximately 36,666, or Fort McMurray would be approximately 19.1 percent over the provincial average, which meets the conditions that have been suggested and outlined by all hon. members and the report itself.

Mr. Chairman, I think I've used the time that I feel is adequate to make a case and a presentation. I would ask all hon. members to seriously consider what I've suggested, whether it be now or in the future. I believe the citizens have a right. I believe all citizens of this province have rights, but I don't believe that you have a right to take away something that makes the most common,

logical sense, and I think I've outlined it here. I've asked hon. members to challenge me if my remarks have been inaccurate. I will accept that. On the other hand, I will sit down in my place and say that the citizens of Fort McMurray request your assistance in leaving this constituency as it is.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate you recognizing me in debate. The Member for Fort McMurray presents a message to the Assembly which is very clear. His logic is impeccable. The emotion that's behind his argument is understandable. He obviously feels very strongly about the integrity of the region, and he has marshalled his facts very well. I don't believe I've ever heard a better presented argument. Perhaps a little brevity wouldn't hurt in the presentation, but you work on it. You know, in time you get it down to where it really does bite.

I guess I'm one of the few members in the Assembly who has been to all of these communities. I believe it was 1975 when I assisted the returning officer setting up all the polls in these districts, and I understand what he's talking about. These are communities which are remote and isolated in many respects, but they do have a service centre, and the service centre of the region is Fort McMurray. The member has explained that very clearly.

Guess what, Mr. Chairman? People at the other end of this proposed Athabasca-Wabasca make the same argument. They say that within their area they have a trading centre, which is Athabasca. So what appears to be happening is that representations are coming from either end of this monstrosity constituency that they would like to be grouped around the population centres. I believe those views have been expressed clearly to the government, to the boundaries commission, to the committee and the whole apparatus on many different occasions, and it's a bit puzzling why at this late date the district remains the way it is.

So I think the member's impassioned plea should not fall on deaf ears. Sir, you've definitely earned the support of the opposition members, the Official Opposition in any case, through your presentation today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have heard the plea of the Member for Fort McMurray. I was on that first commission that came to his constituency in the city of Fort McMurray and heard the pleas from a number of the residents. I think the analogy was made that Fort McMurray acts as the hub and the outlying communities are the spokes. I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for the message that the member is bringing to the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I'm a little concerned, though, and maybe this is nit-picking, about the form of the amendment we have before us in that I note just in passing that there is no signature on it from Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, hon. member, but we are not dealing with an amendment. We are dealing with a filing, and the Member for Fort McMurray was speaking to a filing.

MR. BRUSEKER: All right. Then looking at what we have before us, the member raises a desire that these five communities be included in the constituency of Fort McMurray. I would be willing to support this amendment if he were to go just a little bit further because I think the member raises a valid point. I think

the constituency as proposed of Athabasca-Wabasca, the peculiar shape – I don't even know how you could begin to describe that particular shape, which takes a number of communities from the existing Fort McMurray constituency. It certainly creates a great deal of difficulty for the member who will be attempting to serve the constituents of the proposed Athabasca-Wabasca.

One of the things we have said before, Mr. Chairman, however, with respect to the setting of boundaries – I would have liked to have seen it in this proposal that we have before us – is that it be sent to an independent committee. We've talked about before in this Legislature that members themselves should not be proposing their own boundaries, that it should not be a committee of members or however you wish to describe it. So while I hear the impassioned plea that was well presented by the member, I would suggest that perhaps he might consider making a statement to the effect of sending it to an independent committee to come up with that proposal. That would certainly meet the approval of the Liberal caucus. So while I hear his points clearly – and I heard those of his constituents, in fact, when I had the opportunity to travel to his very, at least in parts, beautiful constituency – I think that would be an amendment that if it were to be tabled in the House would meet the support of the Liberal opposition.

I leave those comments as possible guidance for the hon. Member for Fort McMurray for perhaps another day of debate tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no matter before the House requiring a question to be asked yet.

The next item of business is the amendment to Bill 55 proposed by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View. We have a document and a map.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have previously circulated an amendment to amend and change the boundaries of Calgary-Mountain View and also a consequent amendment to change the boundaries for Calgary-North Hill. The effect would be to restore a historic relationship between the community of Vista Heights and the communities of Mayland Heights and Belfast on the northeastern side of Calgary-Mountain View.

Let me give a little bit of a summation here, Mr. Chairman. Vista Heights, Mayland, and Belfast were all developed at approximately the same period of time. They are bounded on the east by Barlow Trail, and beyond that is a significant commercial and light industrial area. To the north of Vista is also a commercial and industrial area and beyond that the airport. To the west of this community is Deerfoot Trail, and to the south is the river and Memorial Drive as well as another significant commercial and industrial area. So you have in effect an island of about 10,000 people isolated from the rest of the residential areas of northeast Calgary, with the exception that across Deerfoot Trail is the 8th Avenue connector into Renfrew and Bridgeland. So there are some historical relationships between communities to the west of Mayland and Vista.

Now, all of these communities also function under the umbrella of the Crossroads Community Association. All three are represented and participate fully in the activities of that association. The communities function together. They have been developed together. They have grown up together. They have collectively taken on city hall together. They have organized sports programs together. They have voted historically in the same ward in the city together, and as far back as I have been able to determine,

they have all been included together under one umbrella provincial riding of Calgary-Mountain View. As well, together they are represented in the Calgary Northeast federal constituency. So on every level, Mr. Chairman, Vista and Mayland Heights and Belfast operate as one community, as in fact a small city in northeast Calgary. Because of the boundaries of what's around them, they function together, they work together, they co-operate together: they see themselves as being part of one community.

10:00

It doesn't make any sense to me whatsoever that the community of Vista Heights would have been placed into the provincial riding of Calgary-North Hill. They have no relationship in any way, shape, or form with the communities farther to the west. They're separated by Deerfoot Trail, by the Elks golf course, and beyond that. To go from Vista Heights into the other communities of Calgary-North Hill must be a mile or two in length as a minimum, whereas just across 16th Avenue, the Trans-Canada, is a community that they historically identify with. The amendment in front of us, Mr. Chairman, would have the effect of restoring to the provincial constituency of Calgary-Mountain View the community of Vista Heights.

Now, as I went through the population figures as provided to me by the electoral boundaries group, the offices up on the 10th floor of the annex, they indicated to me that the population figure they are using for Vista Heights is approximately 2,400 people. As you can see, it's a relatively small group of people. Certainly, given all the other communities in the Calgary-Mountain View constituency, it's the smallest, and restoring it to its historical boundaries would have the least impact.

I should point out that with the proposed population in the proposed boundaries of Calgary-Mountain View of about 36,500, adding these 2,400 people would give us a population of close to 39,000 people, just shy of 39,000 people. It would be above the deviation from the mean to approximately 26 percent, so it's very close to fitting within the overall guidelines, the overall tolerances contemplated in the electoral boundaries legislation. On the other hand, for the riding of Calgary-North Hill, Mr. Chairman, the current population in the proposed boundaries is also about 37,000 people, just shy of that. For them to lose 2,400 people would leave Calgary-North Hill with a population of about 34 and a half thousand people, 12 percent or so above the mean, well within the expressed tolerances of deviations available under the legislation.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, it works barely, but it still works. Certainly, given the injustice or the wrong of separating Vista Heights from the community to the south, it restores something that's good and right and proper. If it puts Calgary-Mountain View ever so slightly above the 25 percent guideline, so be it. To my mind that's the lesser of the difficulties. I would invite or request the support of the members in the Assembly and would have you seriously consider this alternative.

Now, in looking at the other communities in Calgary-Mountain View that might be deleted or amended or put back into Calgary-North Hill or into some other constituency, Mr. Chairman, it just doesn't work. I considered some of those alternatives, but the communities that are currently within the proposed boundaries of Calgary-Mountain View are of a population in the order of 5,000 or 6,000 individuals. To keep those communities intact and to try and put them into another constituency to balance off taking Vista Heights in just doesn't work, the problem being that the deviations in Calgary ridings are so high that to make any kind of amendment to the boundaries proposed is next to impossible.

If the city had only one more riding as a minimum throughout the entire city, the overall deviations in any given constituency

would be much smaller. Therefore, an amendment like reincluding Vista Heights in the Calgary-Mountain View constituency could be done, could be accommodated, and there would be no second-guessing about it. It would just be able to happen immediately with a snap of the fingers, and that kind of accommodation could be made. Because the ridings have so many people in them, are so above the mean overall, the minute you start shifting even a small population of 2,500 people, you hit these ceilings and maximums and guidelines of 25 percent, and it makes it very difficult to achieve.

My comments, Mr. Chairman, are simply these. The Vista Heights community has traditionally functioned as part of the Crossroads community in the constituency of Calgary-Mountain View. Reincorporating Vista into the Calgary-Mountain View constituency could be accommodated. It would put Calgary-Mountain View only very slightly above the 25 percent deviation. Calgary-North Hill is not adversely impacted.

I would ask that the Assembly would recognize the injustice in the current proposed boundaries and would accept the amendment to correct this difficulty and reunite a community that has been severed by the proposals brought before us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any additional comments with respect to this amendment brought forward by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View? Is the committee then ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment 5 lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of amendments to sponsor this evening, all of which have been distributed to members of the Assembly, the first of which is in written form, amendment to Bill 55, electoral divisions. It's a three-page document. I refer members to it.

Mr. Chairman, when they're looking at this document, I'd ask them to go to page 2 of the document and the 27th line. The commencement of the 27th line says, "thence southwesterly along the said . . . line to the west Edmonton City Boundary." I'd ask members, if they would agree, to please note a change. That should not read "west"; it should read "east." Of course, it would make sense after that because you don't go to the west boundary and then proceed in a westerly direction thereafter; you go to the east boundary and proceed in a westerly direction. So in a moment I will ask the members for concurrence with this amendment.

I would like to point out the consequences of the amendment that I'm sponsoring here. It will have two consequential amendments to follow, which are name changes for the two ridings involved. The first amendment reflected herein is to reinclude the community of Montrose in the community of Edmonton-Highlands. This is at the express and, I should say, vociferous request of not only the Montrose Community League, not only Newton, its neighbour, but all of the community leagues in the area three council of leagues with which I have met on several occasions at their request. The other change is that it would bring Riverdale back into the riding of Edmonton-Highlands, again at the request of the community league and the contiguous communities, I might add. It leaves Rosedale in the riding of Edmonton-Centre. I should point out that Rosedale continues to grow as a community,

but more importantly the riding of Edmonton-Centre will continue to grow. There are already new housing developments just south of the strip mall on 104th Avenue very near the Grant MacEwan College. As well, there is conversion of warehouse buildings and the development of student housing on the campus, so that the numbers themselves would not be adversely affected.

10:10

Mr. Chairman, this set of recommendations has the unanimous concurrence of all of the communities involved, and in fact it is at their request that I bring the recommendation to the Assembly. The Member for Edmonton-Beverly also concurs with this request. It splits the old Beverly component of the riding of Edmonton-Beverly, but the people in Beverly Heights and Beacon Heights have come to understand that there were only minor changes that we could sponsor based upon the government proposal in front of us.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would ask, first, if I can have concurrence of the Assembly on page 2 of the amendment I'm sponsoring before I sponsor it, to strike the word "west" on line 20* and substitute the word "east." I'll sit while you call that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?

MS BARRETT: I'd like to deal with a technical question before I move the amendment, Mr. Chairman, which would be to strike the word "west" on the 20th line of page 2 and substitute the word "east."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the committee concur with the technical change just mentioned before we deal with the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? All right.
We're now dealing with the amendment as technically altered.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've given the reasons for the desire for this amendment. I ask approval of all members of the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready, then, for the question on the amendment as proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the consequential amendment.

MS BARRETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have two consequential amendments. I'll move the one on behalf of my colleague, the Member for Edmonton-Beverly, first. I believe copies were circulated yesterday. It reads that the schedule is amended by striking out "26 Edmonton-Belmont" and substituting "26 Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont," the reason being the identity of the community, which was for many, many decades its own municipality.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If I may, the amendment that I have before me spoke of Edmonton-Highlands and Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, that's correct. That's the second one that I would sponsor. We're sponsoring two, again at the request of the communities. I have my own copy. I could send it over to the chairman if someone would like to bring it. Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that's the one I'm sponsoring on behalf of the Member for Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We don't have that. I have a consequential amendment that talks about Edmonton-Highlands and Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly. This is the one before the committee now.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, yes. It was distributed, I believe, in the House today or yesterday and, as I say, it has the unanimous support of all the groups involved in recommending the changes, the net result of which is that there would be two ridings. If the two pass, one would be called Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont; the other would be called Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm with you now. Thank you.

The committee, then, will deal with the amendment, the "26 Edmonton-Belmont," substituting "26 Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont." Is the committee ready for the question on that?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The last of the amendments that I would like to sponsor is a name change for the riding of Edmonton-Highlands, again at the request of the east end of the community which has an historical identity with the name of Beverly. Therefore, I propose, as I've distributed to the House, that the schedule be amended by striking 32 Edmonton-Highlands and substituting 32 Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question on the second consequential amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, my apologies. I have just been advised that the technical amendment I moved to the first amendment refers to line 29 on page 2, not page 20.* That clarifies everything, I understand. I'd better clarify this, at the will of the committee. Line 28 at the very end says, "thence southwesterly along the said centre line to the west Edmonton City Boundary." That's on line 29 and not on line 20. The request that had been approved was to change that word to "east". I ask concurrence that this is understood.

*see page 2220, right col., para. 15, line 3

*see page 2220, left col., para. 3, line 4

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, just a question on the map that was distributed. Possibly the Member for Edmonton-Highlands may want to respond. On the map that was distributed – and now she's made this further clarification – is it now the way it was originally proposed?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think what we want to do is clear up the technical matter first with respect to changing the word “west” as circulated to “east”. The Chair is comfortable that this change is roughly in the centre of the Edmonton-Highlands portion of the amendment and the word “west Edmonton” should be “east Edmonton” city boundary. That was the question that was put to the House, and that was agreed to on a technicality.

Now, Edmonton-Whitemud's question is?

MR. WICKMAN: My question now is: with these series of amendments and the further point made by the member, can Edmonton-Highlands be exactly described to me? Is it as per the map distributed?

MS BARRETT: Yes, it is as per the map distributed. The areas highlighted with the pink highlighter indicate the changes compared to the ones that were in front of us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe the matter has been voted on and resolved now technically and in other ways to the satisfaction of the members of the committee.

The next matter before us is an amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

10:20

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The committee has before it this evening a number of documents, the first of which is the amendment described in legal form – I must say, not in plain language – in accordance with the rules required for this particular Bill. The committee also has two maps stapled together. The first is the current Calgary-Currie riding, and the second is the proposed amendment. Being distributed to all members is a map of what the committee proposed in terms of Calgary-Currie's boundary changes.

Last evening in second reading I indicated to the House my concerns in general with the boundaries defined for the Calgary-Currie constituency by the established committee. I must reiterate this evening that the boundaries that are changed fundamentally change the character of the community and disregard the historic transportation routes and the community history that has evolved in Calgary-Currie.

I can briefly explain that for the committee, Mr. Chairman. It's the first map on the stapled copy, and I hope hon. members will take a look at it. In the left-hand lower portion it says 1989 boundaries. It's in fact the boundaries of the Calgary-Currie riding for the time I've been a member since 1979. They were changed in 1978. In fact, they represent very well drawn boundaries in terms of recognizing main transportation routes in the city of Calgary and natural landmarks. They also represent a community which has grown together over the years and has become interdependent in many respects. The north part of the riding, the upper part, which is Killarney, Glengarry, Rutland Park, and then, over on the right-hand side of your sheet, the Altadore regions, consists of many of our senior citizens in the province, many individuals who are employees in our province, and some who have social assistance needs, in that upper Altadore region. Consequently, the

community associations in that part of the riding have depended for a long period of time on assistance from the rest of the riding: assistance in their hockey planning, assistance in dealing with school problems, assistance in leadership in general in the community because of the age and the problems people have in other parts of the community.

The lower portion is the Lakeview-North Glenmore community. That part of the riding has in essence been the engine of Calgary-Currie for the past number of years. That's not to say there aren't able and capable people in other parts of the riding, that there are not great assets, but in terms of those in their time of life when they can take leadership roles in the community, for students, for seniors, for others in the community, this particular area depends very much on impetus from many of the activities in the Lakeview-North Glenmore area. I would cite only as examples the Twin Arenas, which serve the entire community, and the military museum and other projects which have taken place there.

I might also mention that Canadian Forces Base Calgary is located in the centre of this riding, and they too have integrated with the various communities to supply the various needs that the community has as a whole.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that known as Currie barracks?

MR. ANDERSON: To the hon. member, it is indeed known as Currie barracks. This current Calgary-Currie constituency has the largest percentage of those military voters and military families within its boundaries. There are some in Calgary-West, across 37th Street.

Mr. Chairman, when it proposed the changes in boundaries, the committee made a number of changes which have never – and I have to repeat: never – been recommended by the commission report in the past, the minority reports, or any other suggestions that I have ever been aware of. So when they read those commission reports and interim reports and committee reports, Calgary-Currie residents did discuss the issues, did even send in a letter or two. But by and large, this basic community that I've just described to you was kept intact, and therefore the citizens of the riding did not have major problems, major difficulties with other proposals for change.

It was with some considerable surprise that the citizens and the Member for Calgary-Currie saw the proposals from this particular committee and noted dramatic changes which were not ever considered. There are many of those. First, on the north part, that natural, major transportation boundary of 17th Avenue, that has been Calgary-Currie's most northerly boundary, has been disregarded, and the boundary has been moved all the way down to the Bow River. Those communities have not had considerable contact. They do not share the community hockey rinks, the school districts, or other items in common with the rest of the riding. However, we know that from time to time there have to be additions to ridings which don't necessarily meet all the logic of the rest of the communities given the numbers that have to be balanced.

On the right-hand side of the map, the single sheet of paper, which is the Bill's recommendations to this committee, there are very significant additions in a fairly high-density area, which include the communities of Bankview, South Calgary, and Richmond, which have in the past been in Calgary-Bow and are now put in Calgary-Currie. Then the addition of the item furthest east, or on your right-hand side, Upper Mount Royal. I might say that in terms of commonality the communities of South Calgary and Richmond and Bankview are not that different from that of Altadore, and if that was the only change, it would not be an

illogical one, although it historically has not been part of the rest of the community.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

I cannot understand, I have yet to be given an explanation as to why the community of Upper Mount Royal was included: across a major transportation artery, taken out of a community of interest that's clearly there overall in the Mount Royal area, and added without explanation to Calgary-Currie.

However, I say to the committee that my major concern and the major concern of the residents of Calgary-Currie is once again with that south end of the riding where Lakeview and North Glenmore residents represent the majority on most of the boards with hockey, with the Twin Arenas in our riding, with other community activities. They represent the majority, frankly, on my own board of directors, and I believe that they likely do on opposition boards in the constituency as a whole, because that is the area where the people have the most time to spend and are most active in community activities.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment this evening is not a perfect amendment. If you were to make the most logical Calgary-Currie boundaries, you would have to readjust probably nine of the riding boundaries suggested in this Bill. Rather, it attempts in the spirit of compromise to do what is best for the Calgary-Currie residents and, I would hope, for the one affected riding beside us, Calgary-Elbow.

I'm not a cartographer, but if you look at the map which is second on the stapled-together sheets, you'll see the diagonal strokes covering the newly suggested Calgary-Currie riding. What I do in this proposed amendment, detailed in legal form before you, is add once again the Lakeview and North Glenmore areas to the riding. Recognizing that the committee had recommended changes with Glamorgan, which is the one on your left-hand side of the map, that area cannot be left out, and if you added it back to Calgary-West, you'd have to change many of the riding boundaries to the north. So I have taken and added it to Calgary-Currie, and it is not an illogical fit. It does cross a major artery, 37th Street, but that's where the rest of the military community in Calgary is centred. They have many interests in common with the Lakeview, Killarney, Glengarry, Rutland Park, and North Glenmore communities. They, in fact, share in the hockey arenas and other activities and become a logical group to be represented.

In order that Calgary-Elbow then achieves an equal number of citizens roughly or fits into the guidelines, I have recommended that the communities of Richmond Park, Bankview, and South Calgary, formerly in Calgary-Bow and then suggested for Calgary-Currie, are added to the Calgary-Elbow riding as well as giving back that Upper Mount Royal region. On the surface of it and unless anyone can tell me differently, this riding of Calgary-Elbow would seem to be more logical in terms of transportation routes, natural boundaries, and community of interest than the one suggested by the committee.

It is not for me to speak for another riding but rather to say that for Calgary-Currie the history, the essence, and the beliefs that are there with respect to how a community needs to operate are back in tune with one another, and the constituency would have to amalgamate into those concerns the areas of Springbank and Shaganappi to the north.

10:30

Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is an important one. I hope members will seriously consider it. It is not just a minor boundary change or a concern of one community for or against another community. This change was fundamental. My major concern, again, is that we have the ability to interact in that way and that Calgary-Currie citizens be heard in this Assembly. To the best of my knowledge, unless a member of the committee can tell me differently, I don't know that any Calgary-Currie citizens had any input into these proposed boundaries. I know that this member of the Legislature did not have any input into these proposed boundaries. Because they are so fundamentally different, I ask this committee to give serious consideration to the consequences of changing them in the manner the Bill suggests without considering this, I believe, very reasonable alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I do ask that members take these maps home with them tonight. I know that at 10:30 at night you have better things to do than look over maps of Calgary-Currie; however, it is seriously an important issue. I hope that when we come together again tomorrow at 2:30 and debate this further, you will have decided that the boundaries suggested in the new amendment that I put forward and officially move are those which are most reasonable for the constituency.

I say once again: they're a compromise. They are boundaries which live within the guidelines established by the Act. In fact, the basic populations under my revised motion would be for Calgary-Currie, 37,245, or a 21 percent variance, better than the 22.9 percent variance suggested in the Bill; and for Calgary-Elbow, 37,210, a 20.89 percent variance: again, I think a reasonable balance for the ridings that exist in Calgary.

Mr. Chairman, given the time, I will soon move that the committee rise and report but in the meantime would ask that overnight once again the members seriously consider the options given, that they look at this as something that is needed by a group of citizens in terms of their input and in terms of the logic that exists for these boundaries in the amendment proposed to you.

Mr. Chairman, I would, then, move that we adjourn this debate and that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. members.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports progress on the following: Bill 55, Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House concur with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

[At 10:36 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]