

2:34 p.m.

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll officially begin and welcome members.

Bob, you have several pieces of correspondence which need to be read into the record. Would you like to proceed, please?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, I will. We have a written submission from the mayor of the village of Onoway, Lorne Olsvik, that is dated September 1, 1992:

On behalf of the Village of Onoway Council I wish to submit the following proposal concerning the development or realignment of electoral boundaries in the Province of Alberta.

It is the position of the Village of Onoway that the needs and interests of the residents of Onoway and the County of Lac Ste. Anne will be best served through the inclusion of the entire County within one electoral boundary. It is our recommendation that the County of Lac Ste. Anne be included in the existing Barrhead Constituency or included with the County of Barrhead in the development of any proposed constituency. At present a portion of the northwest part of the County of Lac Ste. Anne is included in the Whitecourt Constituency.

Our rationale for this proposal is based on the present trade patterns within the Lac Ste. Anne/Barrhead area, the similarities in the business and agricultural communities, and the geographic proximity of communities within this area support our proposal. We also feel that regionalized or coordinated programs between municipalities will be better facilitated by MLA's if they are dealing with rural governments and all the urban municipalities within those areas.

I would also like to highlight that the combined populations of the County of Lac Ste. Anne and County of Barrhead meet the population requirements for a constituency.

I encourage the Electoral Boundaries Commission to support this recommendation. I believe that this change will benefit the constituents of Onoway and County of Lac Ste. Anne.

Sincerely,
Lorne Olsvik
Mayor.

We have received a telephone call from Tony Koopmans, 1146 201 Abasand Drive, Fort McMurray, Alberta, who made two suggestions: one, reduce the number of ridings by 25, and two, the population in each riding should be the same. That was received on September 4, 1992.

We have a written submission from John McInnis, MLA, dated September 2, 1992:

Dear Mr. Bogle

Thank you for your memorandum requesting input from MLAs on new electoral boundaries.

I would simply ask that your committee consider the opinions of Albertans as expressed in the public hearings held into the first interim report of the previous Electoral Boundaries Commission. In its first report the Commission proposed a radical and unpopular restructuring of the four west Edmonton ridings – Kingsway, Glenora, Jasper Place and Meadowlark. It was interesting that the total area of the four remained unchanged in the first report proposal. The changes were made strictly within the block.

Several citizens at the hearing noted that the changes proposed were unfortunate and had the effect of dividing communities with a long association. Most were thoroughly perplexed by the extension of Jasper Place to the municipal airport. In fact, none supported the first commission proposal at the hearings.

As a consequence, there were substantial corrections made in the proposals made in the Electoral Boundaries Commission final report. Please refer to schedule III and schedule IV of the final report.

For reference I am attaching a submission presented by the vice president of the Edmonton Jasper Place New Democrats. This was the

only submission which suggested an alternative map. It also covered the whole area, i.e. all four electoral districts. This particular map was endorsed by several of the local community leagues, including three who came to the hearings. For this reason I thought it should be drawn directly to the attention of your committee.

As you know, the New Democrats have expressed several concerns about the way the redistribution process has unfolded. It is not my desire to repeat old arguments. I would simply observe that there must be a role for the Alberta public in consideration of major changes in the electoral map. At some point the committee may wish to consider whether the solutions it is proposing require a new round of input from the general public.

Sincerely,
John McInnis, MLA
Edmonton Jasper Place.

There are two pages of notes attached to the submission. Would you like me to read those as well?

MR. CARDINAL: Go ahead.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay.

Notes for a Submission to the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

- I. In brief, the commission proposal for west Edmonton can be described as follows:
 - A. Elimination of Kingsway.
 - B. Creation of a West District consisting of parts of Jasper Place and Meadowlark.
 - C. Expansion of Glenora to include part of Kingsway.
 - D. Reduction of Meadowlark, renamed Willowdale.
 - E. Pushing Jasper Place from its boundaries to include most of Kingsway, including the municipal airport.
- II. The proposed boundaries for west Edmonton are not well conceived. The commission mandate to promote electoral fairness under the legislation should be applied in a manner consistent with:
 - A. The integrity of communities and neighbourhoods.
 - B. Historical relationships, particularly long standing relationships.
 - C. Community of interest and identity of districts.
- III. The proposed Jasper Place electoral division is the focus of this submission. We ask the commission to consider the following:
 - A. The eastern boundary of Jasper Place was 149 Street at the time of amalgamation. This boundary has been an important part of our history and is recognized in the commission report. The extension of this boundary to 106 Street – a distance of several miles – is not supported by Jasper Place residents.
 - B. The relationship between Jasper Place and west Edmonton, on the other hand, is long-standing and widely supported. Most people, in fact, refer to this area as "West Jasper Place".
 - C. The commission decision to attach West Jasper Place to the old Meadowlark and to attach Jasper Place to Kingsway is at issue here. There is no valid policy objective served by severing Jasper Place from West Jasper Place in this way.
 - D. The area of West Jasper Place, west of 170 Street, forecasts future growth and will eventually merit its own M.L.A. Until that time, however, it makes sense to combine west Jasper Place with Jasper Place rather than develop a new and unfamiliar alignment to accomplish the same thing. This is a crucial point: the West-Meadowlark connection creates far more disruption than necessary to meet the commission's goals.
- IV. Attached is an alternative proposal which meets the commission's guidelines. The proposal changes only the alignment of the four west Edmonton electoral divisions. Obviously there is more flexibility if more changes are contemplated. This alternative proposal accomplishes the following things:
 - A. It evens out population disparity among the districts.

- B. It restores representation for Edmonton Kingsway.
- C. It restores the integrity of community league boundaries.
- D. It uses recognized major commuter roads as boundaries.
- E. It re-unites Jasper Place and West Jasper Place, which has been uninterrupted since the west area was built.
- F. It has support from the communities affected.
- V. This submission respectfully submits that the commission ought to recommend a less disruptive approach if it is to meet the commission's targets and objectives. There is a far greater community of interest in the attached proposal. We ask, therefore, that the commission put our Jasper Place neighbourhoods back together where they belong.

There's an attached map which I'll circulate to each committee member.

The final submission that I'd like to read in today is dated August 28, 1992. It's from Tom Sigurdson, MLA, Edmonton-Belmont, to Mr. Bogle.

Thank you for your recent memo requesting input from New Democrat Official Opposition members to changes in the constituency boundaries being discussed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. As Chair of our Caucus, I am responding on behalf of all my colleagues.

A number of ND members made submissions to the Virtue Commission. The New Democrat position has not changed since those public hearings, and I would refer you to those previous submissions which have been recorded in *Hansard*. I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from Derek Fox to Justice Virtue for your information regarding his position on the matter.

Should you have any questions that need clarification, please do not hesitate to call me at 427-2236.

Sincerely yours,
Tom Sigurdson, MLA
Edmonton-Belmont.

cc. Ray Martin, Leader of the Official Opposition
All New Democrat MLAs.

The attached submission from Derek Fox, MLA for Vegreville, was read into the record earlier, as it was received here directly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Bob. Does that complete the correspondence?

MR. PRITCHARD: Those are our written submissions for today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Then we can excuse *Hansard* until 3:45.

MR. PRITCHARD: Stan Schumacher is coming.

[The committee adjourned from 2:43 p.m. to 3:52 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We're ready to reconvene.

Stan, welcome to our committee. With your permission we'll stay on the record.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The process we've followed to date is to listen to the presentation and then have a general question-and-answer session. If that's agreeable with you, please proceed.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, I want to express my appreciation to the committee for being so flexible and accommodating my duties and for listening to what I have to say. I don't have very much to say because I believe the present makeup of the Drumheller constituency meets the criteria pretty well except for the fact that it doesn't have coterminous boundaries with all the municipalities that are involved.

The Drumheller constituency contains almost all of the county of Wheatland, most of the MD of Starland, and some of the MD of Kneehill. The population of the Drumheller constituency is a growing population. The summer village of Chestermere Lake is the third largest centre. That community is going to receive town status probably this month, and its population will exceed 1,500 people within the next 12 months. The town of Strathmore has been growing at 10 percent a year for the last couple of years and shows no sign of slowing up. So population is not a problem for the constituency of Drumheller.

What I would like to propose is a little bit of fine-tuning to accommodate people who have approached me over the last six years saying that they would like minor changes made.

Primarily what I'm proposing that the committee consider is on the east side of the constituency, to draw a line going north from the eastern boundary of the county of Wheatland so that the eastern boundary of the constituency would include all of the county of Wheatland. Then across the river I would like to see a small portion of the special areas incorporated in the constituency. I know that flies in the face of a principle of coterminous boundaries, but there's also the principle of trying to accommodate the interests of the people living there. These people who are in the Dorothy area really look to Drumheller as their centre. The present boundary is, I believe, four miles from Dorothy. They just consider themselves part of this constituency. They are also right on the extreme edge of Chinook, which is a huge constituency in area. In order to make up for the loss of those people – and there aren't very many there in that eastern part of the county of Wheatland and around Dorothy and Little Fish Lake – I would propose to move the eastern boundary of Drumheller and the western boundary of Chinook north of the river inside the MD of Starland west about four miles.

MR. DAY: North of the river about four miles?

MR. SCHUMACHER: No, this area that lies to the north of the river. I can give you a little map. That's the existing boundary of Drumheller. The proposed one would be this one.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. CARDINAL: Could you also use the numbers, Stan?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Of the townships?

MR. CARDINAL: No, the MDs. When you say Starland, could you say what number it is?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Starland is No. 47.

MR. CARDINAL: Okay.

MR. SCHUMACHER: And Wheatland is county 16.

MR. CARDINAL: Okay.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That would give Chinook about 300 people, a slight adjustment. It would also make it handier with the MD of Starland No. 47 in that it would then make the boundary of the constituency coterminous with the boundaries of their divisions within their MD, so the net result would be that two complete council divisions would be in Chinook and three complete council divisions would be in Drumheller. This MD has traditionally been split between the two constituencies, and there doesn't seem to be any possibility – well, I do not recommend putting Morrin and

Munson and Michichi and Rumsey and Rowley into Chinook. That would be a major population loss for Drumheller, which I think could have an effect even though it's growing substantially at the south end. I think we would create quite an uproar amongst the people of the western part of the MD of Starland No. 47 if we said that the whole MD was going to go into Chinook. This would not, I think, create any problems, but I think 300 people is a significant adjustment.

Basically, that's my – except for this: I know the town of Gleichen and the village of Cluny would like to be in the Drumheller constituency. I've heard that traditionally these two communities were in the constituency. In fact, at one stage for a significant period of time the constituency was called Drumheller-Gleichen before it was called Drumheller. I have no objection to that, although I can see where it might have an adverse effect on Little Bow. I do believe, though, that the bulk of the Siksika Nation is in the Little Bow constituency. I would not recommend taking that because it's on both sides of the river. I think if there was a change in the boundary there, the boundary could be extended to the reserve boundaries rather than the Trans-Canada Highway, as it is now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments? Pat?

MRS. BLACK: No, I don't think so.

MR. CARDINAL: What about the west boundary? I see that in addition to county 16, it goes into a part of MD 44 also.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, if it didn't, I don't know what constituency you'd want to put it in. I don't think it's a case of adding on to Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Mike's point may be just straightening out and following the MD county border.

MR. CARDINAL: Yes. That's what I wondered.

MR. SCHUMACHER: And giving that area to Three Hills?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Giving it that small corner. That's what you were referring to, Mike? To Three Hills?

MR. CARDINAL: Yes. Or to Little Bow or to them both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just so that you follow along the line.

4:02

MR. SCHUMACHER: The trouble with Little Bow is that there are no river crossings there. It's very difficult. That was the big objection to the commission's interim report: those people definitely did not want to be in Little Bow because there's no way of crossing the river and getting communication.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Mike?

MR. CARDINAL: No, I don't think so.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That area from Rocky View that you referred to, Mike, used to be in the Three Hills constituency before the '79 redistribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Stock?

MR. DAY: Stan, what's the county number for the county of Wheatland?

MR. SCHUMACHER: It's 16.

MR. DAY: Okay. I just wanted a little clarification. So the east side of the constituency, then, goes north to the east side of the county of Wheatland.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah. The north-south line.

MR. DAY: I see. It jogs out. Okay. Where it's presently divided, then, where you meet right now with Chinook – you're saying move that eastern boundary north of the Red Deer River?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah. I want it to go north across the river a distance, and then we'll go back west to this new boundary.

MR. DAY: Yeah; okay. Is the Siksika Nation in the enumeration?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, they were enumerated in Little Bow.

MRS. BLACK: In the census though?

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're not on our list of bands, Bob.

MRS. BLACK: Some of the bands weren't taken into the census.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Oh, for the '91 census?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, they're included.
Anything else, Stock?

MR. DAY: No. That's good, thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the only other observation I have is that we do have some real problems in east-central Alberta, as you know, Stan. Comparing the 1986 to the 1991 census, it appears that east-central Alberta had a population decrease whereas all other areas have had either a very modest growth or ranging up to a high growth. So we've got a problem. It's fair to say that your constituency is right on the edge of that. If you're in a high-growth area along Calgary . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: And slow growth or no growth on the east side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . and then quickly getting into the area where there's a loss of population, we are . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, I'm just saying that these suggestions can give a net increase to Chinook without upsetting anybody. You could get more from the MD of Starland into Chinook, but the more you take, the more people you're going to upset.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that, and we thank you very much for coming in and giving us your thoughts. Going to the division boundary in the MD is certainly helpful.

MR. SCHUMACHER: If we can't have the actual boundary, the outside boundary of the division certainly helps. Then those councillors can more closely identify with an MLA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I recall from the hearing the commission had down in Drumheller that there were a lot of concerns by individuals and municipal leaders from the county of Wheatland

who did not wish to be part of the Bow Valley constituency and indeed wanted the eastern boundary of the county to be the southeast boundary of the Drumheller constituency.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 4:07 p.m.]