

[ Reports | Hansard Transcripts ]

[Maps] [FAQs]

The 2002/2003 Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission

#### Final Report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries and Names for Alberta February 2003

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- Letter of Transmittal
- Acknowledgements

Part I - Introduction

- Establishing the Commission
- The Law
- 2001 Canada Census Results

#### Part II - Issues for the Legislative Assembly

- Future Trends
- Constituency Offices
- Frequency of Review
- Future Commissions

## Part III - The Existing Divisions

- Population Distribution
- Effective Representation
- The Matrix

#### **Appendices**

- Appendix A- List of Persons Making Submissions at Hearings and in Writing
  - First Round
  - Second Round
- Appendix B Minority Position of Ms. Bauni Mackay
- Appendix C Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission Act
- Appendix D Excerpt from 2002 Yukon Electoral Boundaries Commission Report
- Appendix E Technical Description of the Matrix
- Appendix F Description of Boundaries of Recommended Electoral Divisions
- Appendix G Recommended Electoral Division Maps

- Part IV Interim Report
- Interim Distribution Decisions
- The Matrix Applied

Part V - Second Round Hearings

- Submission Highlights
- Municpal Boundaries
  - Athabasca
  - Edmonton
- Summary of Decisions

Part VI - Recommended Divisions Applying the Matrix

#### Letter of Transmittal...

The Honourable Ken Kowalski Speaker of the Legislative Assembly Room 325, Legislature Building 10800 - 97 Avenue Edmonton, AB T5K 2B6

Dear Mr. Speaker:

We have the honour to submit to you our final report in accordance with section 8(1) of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, R.S.A. 2000, c.E-3 as amended. This report sets out the areas, boundaries and names of the 83 electoral divisions we propose for Alberta, together with our reasons for the proposals and includes the minority position of Ms. Bauni Mackay regarding the City of Edmonton.

The Commission was established March 25, 2002. We are required to submit our report within five months of the date of our interim report. We have therefore completed our mandate in regard to section 8(1) of the Act.

Dated at Edmonton, Alberta, this 3rd day of February, 2003.

Robert C. Clark, Chairman Glenn Clegg, Member Doug Graham, Member Bauni Mackay, Member Ernie Patterson, Member

#### Acknowledgements...

A report such as this results from the combined efforts of a great variety of people.

The Commission acknowledges the time, energy and talents contributed to its work by everyone who provided advice and suggestions at the hearings and in written submissions.

The Commission also wishes to acknowledge the support services provided by:

- O. Brian Fjeldheim, Bill Sage and the staff of Elections Alberta;
- Bill Hyshka, Pamela Steppan, Todd Chorney and Kerstin Bzdel of the Statistics Section, Office of Budget and Management, Alberta Finance;
- Eugene Kletke and Ried Zittlau for assistance with mapping and boundary descriptions
- Ken Lowe, Kevin Tripp, Yves Laurent, Michael Currie and Robert Mason of the Resource Data Branch, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development;
- Stephen Pelech and the staff of Roadways Design Section, Streets Engineering Branch, Transportation & Streets Department, City of Edmonton;
- the Hansard staff of the Public Information Branch, Legislative Assembly Office;
- the staff of the Air Transportation Service, Alberta Infrastructure; and
- Teresa Griffiths, Doug Olthof and Benedicta Pui for administrative support and Tom Forgrave for assembling this report.

#### ADDITIONAL COPIES

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from:

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer Suite 100, 11510 Kingsway Avenue Edmonton, Alberta T5G 2Y5 Phone: (780) 427-7191 Fax: (780) 422-2900 (For toll-free service, dial 310-0000 and the number above) Email: <u>elections.alberta@gov.ab.ca</u>

#### PART I - INTRODUCTION Establishing the Commission...

This Electoral Boundaries Commission was established on March 25, 2002. *Robert C. Clark, Alberta Ethics Commissioner* was appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council as Chair. Appointed as members, by the Honourable Ken Kowalski, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, were:

Glen Clegg, Fairview Doug Graham, Calgary Bauni Mackay, Edmonton Ernie Patterson, Claresholm

The Commission was appointed and has carried out its work, under the provisions of the *Electoral Boundaries Commission Act* (Revised Statutes of Alberta, 2000, Chapter E-3 as amended and referred to in this report as the *Act*). Also under the *Act*, O. Brian Fjeldheim, Chief Electoral Officer of Alberta, was responsible for providing advice, information and assistance to the Commission.

The first meeting of the Commission was held on Wednesday, March 27, 2002 and deliberations have continued since then.

As required by the *Act*, the Commission held an initial series of public hearings across the province in May and June 2002. The Commission considered the submissions made to it in writing and during the hearings and issued its Interim Report. A second series of public hearings was held in December 2002. The Commission considered the comments provided at these hearings and in writing and is now issuing its Final Report. Complete transcripts of the hearings (with the exception of Red Deer where technical difficulties were experienced) are available on the Commission's website <u>www.altaebc.ab.ca</u>. A list of persons making presentations at the hearings and who made submissions in writing is provided in <u>Appendix A</u>.

In undertaking its work, the Commission has been guided by the requirements of the *Act*, relevant decisions of the courts, advice received at the public hearings and in written submissions and by common sense.

#### The Law...

The *Act* (see <u>Appendix C</u>) directs the Commission to divide the province into 83 electoral divisions, with a population within 25% of the provincial average, in a way that will ensure effective representation for Albertans.

The relevant sections of the Act are:

13 The Commission is to divide Alberta into 83 proposed electoral divisions. 15(1) The population of a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25% above nor more than 25% below the average population of all the proposed electoral divisions. To assist in ensuring effective representation, up to four special consideration electoral divisions may have populations as much as 50% below the provincial average:

15(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), in the case of no more than 4 of the proposed electoral divisions, if the Commission is of the opinion that at least 3 of the following criteria exist in a proposed electoral division, the proposed electoral division may have a population that is as much as 50% below the average population of all the proposed electoral divisions:

(a) the area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 20,000 square kilometres or the total surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15,000 square kilometres;

(b) the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres;

(c) there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people; (d) the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Metis settlement;

(e) the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the Province of Alberta.

The five "special considerations" are area, distance from the Legislature, no town of more than 4,000 population, presence of an Indian Reserve or Metis Settlement and a portion of the division boundary contiguous with the boundary of the province.

The *Act* references the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantee of effective representation and lists factors which must be considered.

14 In determining the area to be included in and in fixing the boundaries of the proposed electoral divisions, the Commission, subject to section 15, may take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but shall take into consideration

(a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,

(b) scarcity and density of population,

(c) common community interests and community organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Metis settlements,

(d) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary,

(e) wherever possible, the existing municipal boundaries,

(f) the number of municipalities and other local authorities,

(g) geographical features, including existing road systems, and

(h) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

Section 3 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* states: "Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein."

The *Final Report of the Yukon Electoral Boundaries Commission* (January 2002) provides an excellent review of the relevant court decisions (see <u>Appendix D</u>).

In discharging its function, the Commission has been particularly mindful of the two leading cases in which the legal principles dealing with the issues it faces have been defined. They are *The Attorney General for Saskatchewan v. Roger Carter, Q.C.* [1991] 2 S.C.R., a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada; and *Reference re: Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act*, 1993 (*Alta.*) [1994] A.J. No. 768, DRS 95-02966, Appeal No. 9303-0228AC, a decision of the Court of Appeal of Alberta. These two cases together define the principles of "effective representation."

The Supreme Court of Canada in *The Attorney General for Saskatchewan* case sets out the principles of effective representation and we quote pertinent passages from the majority decision of Madam Justice McLachlin, as follows:

The framers of the Charter had two distinct electoral models before them-the 'one person-one vote' model espoused by the United States Supreme Court in Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983), and Kirkpatrick v. Preisler, 394 U.S. 526 (1969), and the less radical, more pragmatic

approach which had developed in England and in this country through the centuries and which was actually in place. In the absence of any supportive evidence to the contrary (as may be found in the United States in the speeches of the founding fathers), it would be wrong to infer that in enshrining the right to vote in our written constitution the intention was to adopt the American model. On the contrary, we should assume that the goal was to recognize the right affirmed in this country since the time of our first Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, to effective representation in a system which gives due weight to voter parity but admits other considerations where necessary....

What is that tradition? It was a tradition of evolutionary democracy, of increasing widening of representation through the centuries. But it was also a tradition which, even in its more modern phases, accommodates significant deviation from the ideals of equal representation. Pragmatism, rather than conformity to a philosophical ideal, has been its watchword.

#### C. The Meaning of the Right to Vote

It is my conclusion that the purpose of the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the Charter is not equality of voting power per se, but the right to 'effective representation.' Ours is a representative democracy. Each citizen is entitled to be <u>represented</u> in government. Representation comprehends the idea of having a voice in the deliberations of government as well as the idea of the right to bring one's grievances and concerns to the attention of one's government representative; as noted in Dixon v. B.C. (A.G.), [1989] 4 W.W.R. 393, at p. 413, elected representatives function in two roles-legislative and what has been termed the 'ombudsman role.'

What are the conditions of effective representation? The first is relative parity of voting power. A system which dilutes one citizen's vote unduly as compared with another citizen's vote runs the risk of providing inadequate representation to the citizen whose vote is diluted. The legislative power of the citizen whose vote is diluted will be reduced, as may be access to and assistance from his or her representative. The result will be uneven and unfair representation.

But parity of voting power, though of prime importance, is not the only factor to be taken into account in ensuring effective representation. Sir John A. Macdonald in introducing the Act to re-adjust the Representation in the House of Commons, S.C. 1872, c. 13, recognized this fundamental fact (House of Commons Debates, Vol. III, 4th Sess., p. 926 (June 1, 1872)):

...it will be found that,... while the principle of population was considered to a very great extent, other considerations were also held to have weight; so that different interests, classes and localities should be fairly represented, that the principle of numbers should not be the only one.

Notwithstanding the fact that the value of a citizen's vote should not be unduly diluted, it is a practical fact that effective representation often cannot be achieved without taking into account countervailing factors.

The Court then went on to define some of the countervailing factors, as follows:

First, absolute parity is impossible. It is impossible to draw boundary lines which guarantee exactly the same number of voters in each district. Voters die, voters move. Even with the aid of frequent censuses, voter parity is impossible.

Secondly, such relative parity as may be possible of achievement may prove undesirable because it has the effect of detracting from the primary goal of effective representation. Factors like geography, community history, community interests and minority representation may need to be taken into account to ensure that our legislative assemblies effectively represent the diversity of our social mosaic. These are but examples of considerations which may justify departure from absolute voter parity in the pursuit of more effective representation; the list is not closed.

It emerges therefore that deviations from absolute voter parity may be justified on the grounds of practical impossibility or the provision of more effective representation. Beyond this, dilution of one citizen's vote as compared with another's should not be countenanced. I adhere to the proposition asserted in Dixon, supra, at p. 414, that 'only those deviations should be admitted which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populace as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the

populace and geographic factors within the territory governed.'

...this is not to suggest, however, that inequities in our voting system are to be accepted merely because they have historical precedent. History is important in so far as it suggests that the philosophy underlying the development of the right to vote in this country is the broad goal of effective representation. It has nothing to do with specious arguments that historical anomalies and abuses can be used to justify continued anomalies and abuses, or to suggest that the right to vote should not be interpreted broadly and remedially as befits Charter rights...

I turn finally to the admonition that courts must be sensitive to practical considerations in interpreting Charter rights. The 'practical living fact,' to borrow Frankfurter J.'s phrase, is that effective representation and good government in this country compel those charged with setting electoral boundaries sometimes to take into account factors other than voting parity, such as geography and community interests. The problems of representing vast, sparsely populated territories, for example, may dictate somewhat lower voter populations in these districts; to insist on voter parity might deprive citizens with distinct interests of an effective voice in the legislative process as well as of effective assistance from their representatives in the 'ombudsman' role. This is only one of a number of factors which may necessitate deviation from the 'one person - one vote' rule in the interests of effective representation.

and in commenting on the boundaries set, the Court said:

The material before us suggests that not only are rural ridings harder to serve because of difficulty in transport and communications, but that rural voters make greater demands on their elected representatives, whether because of the absence of alternative resources to be found in urban centres or for other reasons. Thus the goal of effective representation may justify somewhat lower voter populations in rural areas. Another factor which figured prominently in the argument before us is geographic boundaries; rivers and municipal boundaries form natural community dividing lines and hence natural electoral boundaries. Yet another factor is growth projections. Given that the boundaries will govern for a number of years-the boundaries set in 1989, for example, may be in place until 1996-projected population changes within that period may justify a deviation from strict equality at the time the boundaries are drawn.

The Court of Appeal of Alberta case cited above (*Reference re: Electoral Divisions Statutes Amendment Act*, 1993 (*Alta*.)) dealt specifically with the situation in Alberta in the context of the Supreme Court of Canada decision and therefore was particularly pertinent to the Commission's task.

The principles set down by the Court of Appeal of Alberta were:

37. In the 1991 Reference we offered this summary of constitutional rights held by all Albertans (Reference Re: Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, Alberta, [1992] 1 W.W.R. 481 (Alta. C.A.)):

(a) the right to cast a ballot;

(b) the right not to have the political force of one's vote unduly diluted;

(c) the right to effective representation; and

(d) the right to have the parity of the votes of others diluted, but not unduly,

*in order to gain effective representation or in the name of practical necessity. [p. 486]* 

38. Before this panel, we heard no suggestions or a re-statement of these rules. The argument, rather, turned over what amounts to 'undue' dilution....

43. It is one thing to say that the effective representation of a specific community requires an electoral division of a below-average population. That approach invites specific reasons, and specific facts. The constitution of Canada is sufficiently flexible to permit disparity to serve geographical an demographic reality.

44. It is quite another to say that any electoral division, for no specific reason, may be smaller than average. In the 1991 Reference, we affirmed the first, not the second. We affirm again that there is no permissible variation if there is no justification. And the onus to establish justification lies with those who suggest the variation...." 64. With respect, this very natural concern of an elected official for the 'comfort zone' of a vocal portion of the electorate is not a valid Charter consideration. The essence of constitutionally entrenched right is that it permits an individual to stand against even a majority of the people. Put another way, Canadians entrenched certain traditional rights for minorities in the Constitution because they do not trust themselves, in all times and circumstances, to respect those rights. The fact, then, that a significant number of Albertans do not like the result of an equal distribution of electoral divisions is no reason to flinch from insisting that they take the burden as well as the benefit of democracy as we know it.

76. ...That review must identify communities, in every sense of the word. It must look in depth at social history as well as demography and geography. Moreover, that review is unlikely to be effective unless the reviewer gives ordinary Albertans ample opportunity to come forward and describe the communities of interest they see in their lives. It is time-consuming and not inexpensive, but essential to a healthy democratic life.

In summary, the principles of effective representation seem to the Commission to be as follows:

1. The tradition of Canada is "effective representation", not absolute parity as in the U.S.

2. The process of achieving effective representation may involve diluting the political force of some votes but not unduly and not without reason.

3. The balancing of these interests is a delicate one, which involves an examination in depth of the social history, geography and demography of communities in every sense of the word.

The Commission has been guided by the principles set out by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Court of Appeal of Alberta. In being guided by these principles, it has been mindful of the principles of "effective representation" as opposed to absolute parity.

In determining these issues, the Commission has heard and read the representations and reviewed the circumstances of numerous groups and constituencies who made more than 400 representations to it.

The Commission reviewed numerous complex factors, including but not limited to those mentioned in the Court decisions, and including geography, demography and social history of the various areas and constituencies which we have visited.

#### 2001 Canada Census Results...

In determining population, the Act (Section 12(1)) requires the Commission to use "the most recent decennial census of population referred to in section 19(3) of the Statistics Act (Canada)" plus "the population on Indian Reserves that were not included in the census, as provided by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (Canada)." If a more recent province-wide census has been conducted the Commission is authorized to use it. There has been no more recent province-wide census than the most recent decennial census.

The 2001 Canada Census resulted in an Alberta population of 2,974,807. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada indicated that 9,113 persons resident on Indian Reserves were not included in the census count. Therefore, the total Alberta population to be used by the Commission in recommending the boundaries of electoral divisions is 2,983,920.

The "provincial quotient", or the average population per electoral division, is

<u>Population</u> 2,983,920 # Electoral Divisions = 83 = 35,951

The allowable range for standard electoral divisions under the *Act* is 44,939 to 26,963 (+/-25%). Any special consideration electoral division could have a population as low as 17,976 (-50%).

#### PART II - MAJOR ISSUES FOR THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Before dealing with the distribution of electoral divisions, the Commission wishes to bring to the attention of the Legislative Assembly various issues that were raised, in both written and oral submissions, which are beyond its current terms of reference. Many of these submissions dealt with provisions of the *Act*. The Commission consistently pointed this out but also undertook to raise these as matters the Legislative Assembly needs to consider.

#### Future Trends...

If demographic projections are correct, by far the most significant issue for future Electoral Boundaries Commissions will be the concentration of population in the Calgary/Edmonton corridor. Projections reported to this Commission suggest that Alberta will have a population of at least 4 million by 2030, living mostly in that corridor.

The Legislative Assembly decided to maintain the total number of electoral divisions at 83 for the current review. A few submissions to the Commission suggested that, in order to address the urban/rural split issue, this number should be increased. However, many more submissions, particularly those sent in writing, suggested that the number of electoral divisions should be reduced, generally suggesting that in the order of 60 Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) would be sufficient.

The combined effect of the projected population growth in the corridor and the same or a reduced number of electoral divisions is that there will be fewer and much geographically larger rural electoral divisions in the future. It was suggested to the Commission that the existing four northern electoral divisions (excluding Fort McMurray) cover 49% of the province's land area but only have slightly more than 3% of the population. This raises questions of how big the rural electoral divisions will be and how large a division can be before it involves so many non-common interests that it is both impossible for the disparate issues of the electors to be represented and for the MLA to represent them. In addition, some submissions suggested that MLAs in the major cities could effectively represent more people.

Some submissions suggested that the representation by population issue and the "rural alienation" issue might be addressed by introducing either proportional representation or a mixed system with some MLAs elected by division and some by proportional representation. The suggested advantage here, in addition to party representation in the Legislative Assembly more closely reflecting the popular vote, would be that the parties could ensure that all areas of Alberta were represented by the MLAs they would appoint under the proportional system.

Others suggested that Alberta might introduce a "second house" or senate. The Commission understands that the composition of the Legislative Assembly falls within the concept of "the constitution of the province" which the Legislature can amend (except with respect to the Office of the Lieutenant Governor and language rights). So the Legislature of Alberta could amend the structure of the Legislature itself to create upper and lower houses. Historically, several provinces have had bicameral legislatures. Over the years, all of them abolished the upper house (Quebec being the last to do so). Alberta has never had an upper house.

Others suggested that initiatives should be considered to limit growth in the two major cities and to direct residential development to the resource areas. Still others suggested that the provision for special consideration electoral divisions be expanded to allow for divisions up to 50% above the average population, as well as 50% below.

The summary of submissions on this issue is that Alberta needs to "get outside the box" in considering representation by population and the appropriate variation. There need to be new and refreshing approaches to this issue which should avoid continued marginalization and separation of the rest of Alberta from the corridor. It was generally acknowledged that this broad discussion should take place outside the boundary review.

The Legislative Assembly needs to give priority consideration to the effect of the emerging population distribution (Calgary/Edmonton corridor compared to the remainder of the province) on the electoral system in the province. The Commission believes that this is an Alberta issue which must be addressed in the near future and that it will pose an even more significant challenge for the next Commission and in the long term for the province.

#### Constituency Offices...

Despite the increasing availability of electronic communication modes, people want to be able to make personal contact with their MLA, or at least with someone who will review their documentation, and provide information and assistance in dealing with their issues. On a day-to-day basis, that contact happens through the constituency offices.

The major cities are magnets for people with social problems and for immigrants. The constituency offices in the major cities, although often easily accessible to most constituents, face challenges related to language, culture, social problem caseloads and the ability to provide competitive compensation for staff. These present major challenges for MLAs in the major cities. For example, MLA Brian Mason pointed out to the Commission that in an Edmonton division:

residents there have family incomes 38 percent below the provincial average and therefore are more dependent on government services and therefore more dependent on the office of the MLA. By contrast, Edmonton-Whitemud residents have family incomes 56 percent above the provincial average. All other things being equal, it may be more difficult to effectively represent a constituency like Edmonton-Norwood than Edmonton-Whitemud, for example. The commission should therefore also take into account ethnic and linguistic diversity as well as the incidence of poverty and unemployment when establishing boundaries for electoral divisions.

Another difference, pointed out to the Commission, is that local officials in the major cities tend to make direct contact with Ministers and senior appointed officials. The challenge for the urban MLA is to keep informed on the city's issues. In the rural areas the MLA is expected to make the contact with Ministers and senior officials on behalf of municipalities. So the challenge for the rural MLA is to become an instant expert on a great variety of issues in order to present them to the Ministers. As Reeve Emma Hulit of the County of Warner put it:

Travel time for ... delegations wishing to make presentations to government is an added cost and a loss of effectiveness as well as timeliness. Rural municipalities then attempt to present issues at convention time, and as a municipality we've been faced with that many times. ... you do try to cram it in at convention time. It loses its effectiveness. It's not as timely. Rural communities have a strong grassroots involvement in government affairs and place great importance on maintaining contact with their MLA. This increases pressure on the workload of the rural MLAs to effectively represent the citizens.

In the large rural electoral divisions, an issue may be the significant travel time imposed on the constituents to attend a constituency office, even if the office is located in the geographic centre of the division. Multiple constituency offices are required to provide reasonable opportunity of access for the residents of the large rural electoral divisions.

The Legislative Assembly needs to give priority to providing resources for constituency offices appropriate to the circumstances of each division.

One submission, by Bruce Rutley, speaking at the Peace River first round hearing, even suggested a method for calculating the budget entitlement:

So basically the formula would read that the amount of money made available to a constituency office for

its operations would be equal to the current funds, or whatever base fund the government feels is appropriate, multiplied by a ratio. The ratio is to take the ranking of the constituency association, divide it by the average of the matrix ranking, and that's the ratio. For example, Dunvegan has a ranking of 68. The current provincial average is 36. That's 1.88. Then in order to operate this constituency, a factor of the base times 1.88 would provide additional dollars to run a constituency. There are a number of ways in which you can cut that, but the concept is the important part for you to consider.

This suggestion does not take account of the urban factors. It does provide, however, an example of the type of formula which could be developed to allocate constituency office budgets. This should be a priority activity as one method of dealing with the developing sense of remote/rural/urban alienation.

#### Frequency of Review...

Sections 5(2) and 5(3) of the Act provide that
(2) Subsequent Commissions are to be appointed during the first session of the Legislature following every 2nd general election after the appointment of the last Commission.
(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), if less than 8 years has elapsed since the appointment of the last Commission, the Commission is to be appointed
(a) no sooner than 8 years, and
(b) no later than 10 years
after the appointment of the last Commission.

Some submissions suggested the Act should simply say that a commission will be appointed within a year of the results of each decennial census becoming available.

#### Future Commissions...

This Commission believes that future Commissions should implement a process which would allow people in the Calgary/Edmonton corridor to hear people outside the corridor express the realities of their lives and vice versa. This Commission at times attempted to explain what it had heard at other locations but it would be in the interests of Alberta if Albertans could talk with each other regarding representation issues. For example, a future Commission might consider teleconferencing, or other technologies, as tools to facilitate this communication.

If population trends hold true, the next Commission will also have to deal in northeastern Alberta with splitting the proposed Wood Buffalo Division and in northwestern Alberta with some major realignment which would recognize the population centres in the southern parts of the Dunvegan, Peace River and Lesser Slave Lake divisions. The vast area north of the Town of Manning could be considered, in the future, as a special electoral division as defined by Section 15 of the *Act*.

#### PART III - THE EXISTING DIVISIONS Population Distribution...

During the period since the report of the 1995/1996 Commission, Alberta's robust economy has resulted in significant population growth. <u>Table 1</u> shows the population of the existing electoral divisions in 1996 and 2001.

During the ten-year period, 1991 to 2001, the population increased in 68 of the 83 electoral divisions. The population growth was spread throughout the province. The cities of Calgary and Edmonton (40 existing electoral divisions) increased by 217,434 and the rest of Alberta (43 existing electoral divisions) increased by 211,707. The significant factor for this Commission is that Calgary (21 existing electoral divisions) increased by 168,071 (39% of the total growth).

At the time of the 2001 Canada Census, 52% percent of the population of the province was resident in Edmonton and Calgary. If one considers the electoral divisions within and adjacent to the two major cities as representing the "metropolitan community", nearly 66% of the population resided in the Calgary and Edmonton metropolitan electoral divisions.

Dr. Roger Gibbins, Canada West Foundation, told the Commission that the Calgary/Edmonton corridor is now "one of Canada's four metropolitan heartlands. The corridor not only joins the ranks of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver; it is also the fastest growing of the four."

A considerable number of submissions to the Commission indicated that this population concentration is giving rise to feelings of marginalization in areas of Alberta outside the corridor. This was reflected in the comment by the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties: "*It seems that every few years, we're back trying to defend the right of rural citizens to have a meaningful voice in provincial decision making*". As noted in Part II of this Report, the Commission believes this is better described in terms of density/sparsity of population or the Calgary/Edmonton corridor compared to the rest of the province.

Albertans increasingly live in areas of population concentration. At the time of the 2001 Canada Census, almost 2.3 million Albertans lived in municipalities of 10,000 or more people. Twelve of these municipalities are counties, which have traditionally been considered "rural", but now have populations greater than 10,000. About 1.9 million people lived in municipalities of 40,000 or more. These communities are spread throughout the province. Almost 95% of Albertans live in municipalities with a population of 2,000 or more.

Several submissions urged the Commission to recognize the projected growth areas, or at least the known growth since the 2001 Canada Census. As noted in Part I, the *Act* requires the Commission to determine population using either the 2001 Canada Census information or a later, reliable province-wide census. Since there is no more recent province-wide census, the Commission was required to use the 2001 Canada Census in determining population. The Commission has some sympathy for the views expressed at the hearings regarding growth since the 2001 Canada Census, but the law is very clear.

Also as noted in Part I, the *Act* allows variations of up to +/-25% from the electoral division average population of 35,951. In the extreme this would allow electoral divisions as low as 26,963 and as high as 44,939. The Commission established a target that variations should be in the range of +/-15% if at all possible.

ectoral Division	1996*	2001	%CH	Electoral Division	1996*	2001	%CH
ALGARY				01Athabasca-Wabasca	16,621	20,752	25
03Calgary-Bow	32,611	35,147	8	02Lesser Slave Lake	19,734	25,919	31
04Calgary-Buffalo	34,639	37,807	9	43Airdrie-Rocky view	28,664	47,335	65
05Calgary-Cross	35,208	39,454	12	44Banff-Cochrane	30,325	48,517	60
06Calgary-Currie	34,774	34,694	0	45Barrhead-Westlock	25,723	24,976	-3
ට 07Calgary-East	35,136	31,856	-9	46Bonnyville-Cold Lake	27,647	29,002	5
08Calgary-Egmont	33,057	36,603	11	47Cardston-Taber-Warner	28,880	30,588	6
09Calgary-Elbow	34,348	34,499	0	48Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	33,075	38,294	16
> 10Calgary-Fish Creek	35,666	33,038	-7	49Cypress-Medicine Hat	25,983	31,513	21
3 11Calgary-Foothills	33,461	55,315	65	50Drayton Valley-Calmar	25,763	28,149	9
ိုင်္င 12Calgary-Fort	34,184	36,883	8	51Drumheller-Chinook	24,610	25,062	2
13Calgary-Glenmore	35,533	33,756	-5	52Dunvegan	25,656	24,657	-4
14Calgary-Lougheed	33,604	34,443	2	53Fort McMurray	34,706	38,667	11
15Calgary-McCall	34,384	48,756	42	54Grande Prairie-Smoky	27,640	36,158	31
16Calgary-Montrose	29,887	37,086	24	55Grande Prairie-Wapiti	28,127	33,007	17
17Calgary-Mountain View	32,117	32,529	1	56Highwood	32,310	46,549	44
18Calgary-North Hill	33,415	33,379	0	57Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	28,496	37,378	31
19Calgary-North West	32,453	62,849	94	58Lac La Biche-St. Paul	27,531	32,278	17
20Calgary-Nose Creek	34,583	55,393	60	59Lacombe-Stettler	27,565	32,530	18
21Calgary-Shaw	34,216	82,516	141	60Leduc	32,686	37,363	14
22Calgary-Varsity	33,521	32,339	-4	61Lethbridge-East	31,483	31,675	1
23Calgary-West	33,998	50,524	49	62Lethbridge-West	29,491	35,704	21

#### TABLE 1 -POPULATION OF EXISTING ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission Final Report

Total	710,795	878,866	24	63Little Bow	26,842	30,130	12
				64Livingstone-Macleod	29,731	30,250	2
DMONTON				65Medicine Hat	32,196	35,889	11
24Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	33,716	34,817	3	66Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	27,863	31,781	14
25Edmonton-Calder	32,995	34,075	3	67Peace River	26,777	28,072	5
26Edmonton-Castle Downs	33,275	37,570	13	68Ponoka-Rimbey	27,810	30,876	11
27Edmonton-Centre	33,124	33,423	1	69Red Deer-North	29,976	31,283	4
28Edmonton-Ellerslie	31,361	32,280	3	70Red Deer-South	28,169	36,424	29
29Edmonton-Glengarry	32,328	34,584	7	71Redwater	30,633	33,342	9
30Edmonton-Glenora	32,102	31,777	-1	72Rocky Mountain House	26,025	31,157	20
31Edmonton-Gold Bar	32,827	31,344	-5	73St. Albert	32,136	41,001	28
32Edmonton-Highlands	33,654	32,039	-5	74Sherwood Park	35,576	46,818	32
33Edmonton-Manning	33,867	41,129	21	75Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	30,180	36,628	21
o 34Edmonton-McClung	31,682	38,266	21	76Stony Plain	30,432	37,480	23
35Edmonton-Meadowlark	31,353	34,646	11	77Strathmore-Brooks	29,413	39,099	33
36Edmonton-Mill Creek	31,271	42,217	35	78Vegreville-Viking	27,606	27,931	1
37Edmonton-Mill Woods	30,476	30,699	1	79Vermilion-Lloydminster	27,675	30,436	10
0 38Edmonton-Norwood	32,045	31,036	-3	80Wainwright	28,714	28,908	1
39Edmonton-Riverview	32,180	32,267	0	81West Yellowhead	27,857	29,349	5
40Edmonton-Rutherford	34,736	34,470	-1	82Wetaskiwin-Camrose	31,918	34,611	8
41Edmonton-Strathcona	32,688	32,945	1	83Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	26,998	31,412	16
42Edmonton-Whitemud	31,061	46,520	50	Total	1,227,243	1,438,950	17
Total	616,741	666,104	8				

\*The 1996 Populations are from the Final Report of the 1995/1996 Commission and are based on the 1991 Canada Census. "%CH" is the % change from 1991 to 2001.

In addition, up to four electoral divisions, which meet special conditions specified in the Act, may have populations as much as 50% below the average. These could have populations as low as 17,976. The Commission concluded that despite the legislative provisions, the potential range from 18,000 to 45,000 is too great.

#### Effective Representation...

<u>Table 2</u> compares the population of the existing electoral divisions to the "quotient", the average population per division of 35,951.

The Commission concluded, with regard to effective representation, that population density has a major impact on effective representation. In this regard, there appear to be three distinct types of electoral divisions: Major Cities, Urbanized (a population centre of 10,000 or more) and Rural.

The "Major Cities" group includes Edmonton and Calgary. Arising from the population density, the geographic area of electoral divisions in the two cities is relatively small. There is one municipality, one regional health authority and one of each type of school authority. Both cities are major regional service centres for a large area of the province, in which most provincial services are delivered including specialized services. Both major cities also tend to be the initial entry point both for Canadians from other parts of the country and for immigrants from other countries coming to Alberta. In both cities there are more MLAs than there are members of the city council.

The "Urbanized" group includes the electoral divisions in which there are communities with a population of 10,000 or greater. Generally, these electoral divisions include both an urban centre of population and a less densely populated area. The geographical area of these electoral divisions is larger than in the major cities and the division may include more than one of each type of local authority. Exceptions to this general description are the electoral divisions contained entirely within the medium-sized cities.

The "Rural" group includes the electoral divisions in which all the urban centres have less than 10,000 population. These electoral divisions generally include several urban centres of medium density population

and a significant more sparsely populated area of farmland. The geographical area of these electoral divisions may limit the opportunities for interaction between the residents and the MLA and there may be several local authorities responsible for parts of the division.

<u>Table 3</u> groups the existing electoral divisions by four types: major cities, urbanized (electoral divisions including an urban centre of 10,000 or more population), rural and special.

Several submissions, particularly at hearings away from the major centres, emphasized the time spent by an MLA from a geographically large division in travelling has a negative effect on effective representation. Significant time may be required for travel within the division and to and from the division and the Legislative Assembly. Some estimated that MLAs spend up to 800 hours per year in such travel.

Electoral Division	Population	%AV*	
CALGARY			
03Calgary-Bow	35,147	98	
04Calgary-Buffalo	37,807	105	
05Calgary-Cross	39,454	110	
06Calgary-Currie	34,694	97	
07Calgary-East	31,856	89	
08Calgary-Egmont	36,603	102	
09Calgary-Elbow	34,499	96	
10Calgary-Fish Creek	33,038	92	
11Calgary-Foothills	55,315	154	
12Calgary-Fort	36,883	103	
13Calgary-Glenmore	33,756	94	
14Calgary-Lougheed	34,443	96	
15Calgary-McCall	48,756	136	
16Calgary-Montrose	37,086	103	
17Calgary-Mountain View	32,529	90	
18Calgary-North Hill	33,379	93	
19Calgary-North West	62,849	175	
20Calgary-Nose Creek	55,393	154	
21Calgary-Shaw	82,516	230	
22Calgary-Varsity	32,339	90	
23Calgary-West	50,524	141	
Total	878,866		

#### TABLE 2 - EXISTING ELECTORAL DIVISIONS COMPARED TO AVERAGE

EDM	EDMONTON					
	24Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	34,817	97			
	25Edmonton-Calder	34,075	95			
	26Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570	105			
	27Edmonton-Centre	33,423	93			
	28Edmonton-Ellerslie	32,280	90			
	29Edmonton-Glengarry	34,584	96			
	30Edmonton-Glenora	31,777	88			
	31Edmonton-Gold Bar	31,344	87			
	32Edmonton-Highlands	32,039	89			
	33Edmonton-Manning	41,129	114			
	34Edmonton-McClung	38,266	106			
	35Edmonton-Meadowlark	34,646	96			
	36Edmonton-Mill Creek	42,217	117			

ectoral Division	Population	%AV*
01Athabasca-Wabasca	20,752	58
02Lesser Slave Lake	25,919	72
43Airdrie-Rocky View	47,335	132
44Banff-Cochrane	48,517	135
45Barrhead-Westlock	24,976	69
46Bonnyville-Cold Lake	29,002	81
47Cardston-Taber-Warner	30,588	85
48Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	38,294	107
49Cypress-Medicine Hat	31,513	88
50Drayton Valley-Calmar	28,149	78
51Drumheller-Chinook	25,062	70
52Dunvegan	24,657	69
53Fort McMurray	38,667	108
54Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,158	101
55Grande Prairie-Wapiti	33,007	92
56Highwood	46,549	129
57Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	37,378	104
58Lac La Biche-St. Paul	32,278	90
59Lacombe-Stettler	32,530	90
60Leduc	37,363	104
61Lethbridge-East	31,675	88
62Lethbridge-West	35,704	99
63Little Bow	30,130	84
64Livingstone-Macleod	30,250	84
65Medicine Hat	35,889	100
66Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	31,781	88
67Peace River	28,072	78
68Ponoka-Rimbey	30,876	86
69Red Deer-North	31,283	87
70Red Deer-South	36,424	101
71Redwater	33,342	93
72Rocky Mountain House	31,157	87
73St. Albert	41,001	114
74Sherwood Park	46,818	130
75Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	36,628	102
76Stony Plain	37,480	104
77Strathmore-Brooks	39,099	109
78Vegreville-Viking	27,931	78

Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission Final Report

37Edmonton-Mill Woods	30,699	85	79Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,436 85
38Edmonton-Norwood	31,036	86	80Wainwright	28,908 80
39Edmonton-Riverview	32,267	90	81West Yellowhead	29,349 82
40Edmonton-Rutherford	34,470	96	82Wetaskiwin-Camrose	34,611 96
41Edmonton-Strathcona	32,945	92	83Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	31,412 87
42Edmonton-Whitemud	46,520	129	Total	1,438,950
Total	666,104		L	

\*%AV means the population of the electoral division as a percentage of the electoral division average population of 35,951. This is often expressed in terms of the variation from average. For example, Calgary-Shaw is 230% of the average population which means it is 130% above average. Athabasca-Wabasca is 58% of the average which means it is 42% below average.

Former MLA Walter Paszkowski told the Commission at its Grande Prairie hearing:

During my time in the Legislature I drove over a million miles by car. I flew commercially over a million miles and probably flew with the government plane somewhere close to what was traveled with commercial air. This of course consumes a great deal of the MLA's time, time Edmonton and Calgary MLAs can spend with their constituents. Travel in and out of Edmonton has become much more of a challenge by air with the almost closure of the municipal airport, and certainly the use of the International Airport is not conducive to rapid movement in and out...

Submissions by people from the major centres noted that MLAs in these locations are faced with a great variety of special interest groups, of individuals with special needs, and with a variety of cultural and language traditions. While travel time may be less than in the geographically large electoral divisions, this diversity of interests poses challenges for effective representation. In particular, the concentration of persons needing specialized government services affects both the case load and the types of cases handled in the constituency offices.

The inability to meet personally with MLAs was often referenced in submissions related to electoral divisions with large geographical areas. However, a 1999 poll by the Environics West Research Group indicated that the most important ways that MLAs can make themselves available to their constituents are by participating in town hall meetings, attending community events, one-on-one meetings and telephone conversations. Roughly half the respondents in the poll were from Edmonton and Calgary, indicating that the desire for seeing the MLA in person is not just a rural phenomenon.

Submissions from MLAs and from the public both mentioned the increased workload in constituency offices. The suggested reasons for this include decreases in government local offices and limited contact numbers in telephone directories. In other words, the submissions suggested that government generally has become more distant and impersonal and the place for local, personal contact is the MLA's office. These submissions at least implied that more support staff should be available in the constituency offices and that improved staff compensation packages are desirable in some locations. (See "Major Issues for the Legislative Assembly" in Part II of this Report).

Some submissions suggested that MLAs from urban electoral divisions may have little understanding of rural issues, particularly since there are now many people in the major cities who do not have a farm background. MLAs addressing the Commission observed that they could not recall any issue that was decided on a purely urban/rural split.

LeRoy Johnson, MLA, Wetaskiwin-Camrose, observed to the Commission:

... when I hear things like one MLA is representing rural Alberta and another MLA is representing urban Alberta, I would like to say that I'm representing 'rurban' Alberta. I have two cities and I have a lot of rural Alberta here; that is, agricultural Alberta ... I think it is possible to represent both rural and urban Alberta as an MLA, and when I hear that one MLA can only represent urban Alberta or another MLA only represent rural Alberta, I don't really like to hear that, because I think that we as MLAs are here to form a government from Alberta. It is not a case of one side that is urban and another side that is rural coming to a table and fighting things out to see who has the greatest vote in the end. I should have a mind-set so that I have a good concept of what Alberta is like. That means I should have made up my mind what is good for Alberta, and that means both rural and urban ... if I'm going to do that, I have to be in contact with all of Alberta. So if I have many organizations that I have to be in contact with in my constituency and then also as an MLA have to be in contact with all of Alberta to know what's going on, that's a pretty horrendous job. I think it's important that the rural areas not be too large so that we do not have too many groups to represent because the more we have to represent, the narrower we would tend to be in our thinking that's in relation to the rest of Alberta, and I don't think that's good.

#### The Matrix...

The 1995/1996 Commission developed a "matrix" which it used to apply a variety of factors reflecting effective representation. The matrix took into account the following variables, each scored on a scale of 1 to 10:

- Geographic area
- Population
- Population density
- Number of households
- Elected/Appointed Bodies, Indian Reserves and Metis Settlements, and
- Distance from the Legislature

The 2002/2003 Commission decided to build on and refine that matrix to assist in developing its recommendations.

Former MLA Walter Paszkowski outlined to the Commission the factors he thinks impact effective representation:

I'd like to name 10 points that I consider as critical and important points in fair representation. The number of constituents is a critical factor. The number of groups you need to work with: municipalities, school boards, hospital boards, library boards, senior and youth groups, and recreation groups just as examples. The nature of the economy of the constituency - active, static, or failing - is a very critical factor. We dealt with some of those through the period of time when indeed local communities were in a failing mode, and it becomes very, very challenging to find solutions to their particular needs. The diversification of the economy: is the constituency a one- industry economy, or is it broad based through various types of activities? The services provided: here I refer to the infrastructure. Generally, the further north you go, the more recent the settlement and the less infrastructure there is in place for the constituents. The social demographics and geographical distances, or size of the constituencies. Physical geographical challenges: by that I refer to river crossings - how many river crossings are there in order to serve the entire constituency? - and the number of isolated communities and the difficulty of reaching those isolated communities. The location of the constituency to the Alberta Legislature is certainly very, very important. The 10th point is the density of population. Though there are many other factors, these are the ones that I consider very important.

Electoral Division	Population
MAJOR CITIES	
CALGARY	
03 Calgary-Bow	35,147
04 Calgary-Buffalo	37,807
05 Calgary-Cross	39,454
06 Calgary-Currie	34,694
07 Calgary-East	31,856
08 Calgary-Egmont	36,603
09 Calgary-Elbow	34,499
10 Calgary-Fish Creek	33,038
11 Calgary-Foothills	55,315
12 Calgary-Fort	36,883
13 Calgary-Glenmore	33,756

#### **TABLE 3 - EXISTING ELECTORAL DIVISIONS BY CATEGORY**

lectoral Division Populatio			
JRBANIZ			
44	Airdrie-Rocky View	47,335	
43	Banff-Cochrane	48,517	
46	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	29,002	
48	Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	38,294	
49	Cypress-Medicine Hat	31,513	
53	Fort McMurray	38,667	
54	Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,158	
55	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	33,007	
56	Highwood	46,549	
60	Leduc	37,363	
61	Lethbridge-East	31,675	
62	Lethbridge-West	35,704	

14 Calgary-Lougheed	34,443
15 Calgary-McCall	48,756
16 Calgary-Montrose	37,086
17 Calgary-Mountain View	32,529
18 Calgary-North Hill	33,379
19 Calgary-North West	62,849
20 Calgary-Nose Creek	55,393
21 Calgary-Shaw	82,516
22 Calgary-Varsity	32,339
23 Calgary-West	50,524
Existing 21	878,866
Average	41,851

EDMONTON	
24 Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	34,817
25 Edmonton-Calder	34,075
26 Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570
27 Edmonton-Centre	33,423
28 Edmonton-Ellerslie	32,280
29 Edmonton-Glengarry	34,584
30 Edmonton-Glenora	31,777
31 Edmonton-Gold Bar	31,344
32 Edmonton-Highlands	32,039
33 Edmonton-Manning	41,129
34 Edmonton-McClung	38,266
35 Edmonton-Meadowlark	34,646
36 Edmonton-Mill Creek	42,217
37 Edmonton-Mill Woods	30,699
38 Edmonton-Norwood	31,036
39 Edmonton-Riverview	32,267
40 Edmonton-Rutherford	34,470
41 Edmonton-Strathcona	32,945
42 Edmonton-Whitemud	46,520
Existing 19	666,104
Average	35,058
Total - Existing 40	1,544,970
Major City Average	38,624

65	Medicine Hat	35,889
69	Red Deer-North	31,283
70	Red Deer-South	36,424
73	St. Albert	41,001
74	Sherwood Park	46,818
75	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	36,628
77	Strathmore-Brooks	39,099
79	Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,436
82	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	34,611
	Existing 21	785,973
	Average	37,427

#### RURAL 24,976 45 Barrhead-Westlock 47 Cardston-Taber-Warner 30,588 50 Drayton Valley-Calmar 28,149 51 Drumheller-Chinook 25,062 52 Dunvegan 24,657 57 Innisfail-Sylvan Lake 37,378 58 Lac La Biche-St. Paul 32,278 59 Lacombe-Stettler 32,530 63 Little Bow 30,130 64 Livingstone-Macleod 30,250 66 Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills 31,781 28,072 67 Peace River 68 Ponoka-Rimbey 30,876 33,342 71 Redwater 72 Rocky Mountain House 31,157 76 Stony Plain 37,480 78 Vegreville-Viking 27,931 80 Wainwright 28,908 81 West Yellowhead 29,349 83 Whitecourt-Ste. Anne 31,412 Existing 20 606,306 Average 30,315

SPECIAL		
01	Athabasca-Wabasca	20,752
02	Lesser Slave Lake	25,919
	Existing 2	46,671
	Average	23,336

#### TABLE 4 - 2002/2003 MATRIX APPLIED TO EXISTING ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

Electoral Division	Total
MAJOR CITIES	
CALGARY	
03 Calgary-Bow	-9
04 Calgary-Buffalo	-12
05 Calgary-Cross	-10
06 Calgary-Currie	-11
07 Calgary-East	-9

Electo	ral Division	Total
JRBAN	IZED	
43	Airdrie-Rocky View	4
44	Banff-Cochrane	10
46	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	12
48	Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	-3
49	Cypress-Medicine Hat	9
53	Fort McMurray	-5

08 Calgary-Egmont	-9
09 Calgary-Elbow	-9
10 Calgary-Fish Creek	-10
11 Calgary-Foothills	-9
12 Calgary-Fort	-4
13 Calgary-Glenmore	-9
14 Calgary-Lougheed	-7
15 Calgary-McCall	-3
16 Calgary-Montrose	-9
17 Calgary-Mountain View	-11
18 Calgary-North Hill	-10
19 Calgary-North West	-8
20 Calgary-Nose Creek	-8
21 Calgary-Shaw	-4
22 Calgary-Varsity	-9
23 Calgary-West	-9

EDMO	NTON	
24	Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	-13
25	Edmonton-Calder	-9
26	Edmonton-Castle Downs	-13
27	Edmonton-Centre	-18
28	Edmonton-Ellerslie	-9
29	Edmonton-Glengarry	-15
30	Edmonton-Glenora	-15
31	Edmonton-Gold Bar	-14
32	Edmonton-Highlands	-15
33	Edmonton-Manning	-9
34	Edmonton-McClung	-11
35	Edmonton-Meadowlark	-15
36	Edmonton-Mill Creek	-12
37	Edmonton-Mill Woods	-15
38	Edmonton-Norwood	-15
39	Edmonton-Riverview	-15
40	Edmonton-Rutherford	-15
41	Edmonton-Strathcona	-18
42	Edmonton-Whitemud	-9

54	Grande Prairie-Smoky	12
55	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	10
56	Highwood	12
60	Leduc	-2
61	Lethbridge-East	-3
62	Lethbridge-West	-3
65	Medicine Hat	-2
69	Red Deer-North	-12
70	Red Deer-South	-14
73	St. Albert	-15
74	Sherwood Park	-10
75	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	-3
77	Strathmore-Brooks	13
79	Vermilion-Lloydminster	11
82	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	-3

URAL	-		
45	Barrhead-Westlock	8	
47	Cardston-Taber-Warner	16	
50	Drayton Valley-Calmar	7	
51	Drumheller-Chinook	16	
52	Dunvegan	16	
57	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	5	
58	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	12	
59	Lacombe-Stettler	6	
63	Little Bow	16	
64	Livingstone-Macleod	10	
66	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	8	
67	Peace River	16	
68	Ponoka-Rimbey	5	
71	Redwater	3	
72	Rocky Mountain House	12	
76	Stony Plain	3	
78	Vegreville-Viking	9	
80	Wainwright	13	
81	West Yellowhead	9	
83	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	9	

SPECI	<u>AL</u>	
01	Athabasca-Wabasca	16
02	Lesser Slave Lake	16

Note: Since the Interim Report was released, the number of regional health authorities has been reduced and the matrix has been adjusted accordingly.

#### PART IV - INTERIM REPORT Interim Distribution Decisions...

Early in its deliberations, the Commission concluded that Albertans would be closely examining two major features of its recommendations: the distribution of electoral divisions between Edmonton, Calgary and the rest of the province; and, the boundaries and names of individual electoral divisions. The approach adopted by the Commission was to decide on the distribution before worrying about individual boundaries.

A cursory review of the 2001 population of the existing electoral divisions shows that, in the majority of cases,

the constituencies which are significantly above average are in or adjacent to Calgary and Edmonton (see Table 2). Those which are significantly below average are outside the metropolitan regions. For the existing electoral divisions, the highest population was in Calgary-Shaw (82,516 people, 230% more than the average) and the lowest was Dunvegan (24,657 people, almost 69% of the average). In fact, Dunvegan had a lower population than the Lesser Slave Lake special division (25,919). The Athabasca-Wabasca special division had a population of 20,752 (about 58% of the average).

During the hearings and the course of its deliberations, the Commission heard and considered a variety of alternative distributions of electoral divisions. These included: strictly applying the provincial average population per division with no variation; using the allowable +/-25% variation to the full; using all four allowable special electoral divisions; and arbitrarily assigning a number of electoral divisions to Edmonton and Calgary and the remainder to the rest of the province.

Considering the submissions it heard emphasizing community of interest, the Commission considered treating the effectoral divisions within the corporate boundaries of the cities of Calgary and Edmonton and the electoral divisions immediately adjacent to these boundaries as groups, since there is a real community of interest among people residing in these electoral divisions. The Commission is aware that in the mid-1950s there was a move to include all the adjoining communities in the two major cities. That essentially happened in the Calgary area, but in me Edmonton area the metropolitan area was not included in that city's boundaries. Therefore, recognizing that such a grouping likely would be unpopular with the municipal authorities in the Edmonton area in particular, the Commission rejected this alternative.

the Commission eventually decided to use the four categories of electoral divisions described earlier: major ceties, urbanized, rural and special.

The distribution of electoral divisions proposed by the Commission in the Interim Report was:

CATEGORY	EXISTING	PROPOSED	CATEGORY	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Calgary	21	23	Urbanized	21	21
Edmonton	19	18	Rural	20	19

Special

2

2

#### TABLE 5 - DISTRIBUTION OF INTERIM ELECTORAL DIVISIONS BY CATEGORY

The population in each proposed new division is shown in Table 6.

40

The variation of the electoral divisions from the provincial quotient is:

CATEGORY	LOW	HIGH
MAJOR CITIES	-1.1%	+11.2%
URBANIZED	-15%	+19.5%
RURAL	-18.4%	+4.1%
SPECIAL	-27.8%	-27.1%

Within the categories the variation of the electoral divisions from the category average is:

41

CATEGORY	LOW	HIGH
MAJOR CITIES	-5.6%	+6.0%
URBANIZED	-14.2%	+20.5%
RURAL	-12.6%	+11.4%
SPECIAL	-0.5%	+0.5%

Major Cities Total

In the Major Cities category, generally the electoral divisions with lower populations are areas where growth has occurred since the 2001 census or is occurring at present and the electoral divisions with higher populations are generally those where little growth has occurred or is likely to occur.

In the Urbanized category, the electoral divisions with lower populations are growth areas or, in the case of Vermilion-Lloydminster (-15% of the average) include rural areas with very low-density population. The electoral divisions with high population are Wood Buffalo (+19.5%), where the submissions indicated that the people wanted their municipality included in one division, and St. Albert (+8.9%), intended to include the majority of the city in one division.

In the Rural category, the electoral divisions with low populations are generally those which might qualify as special electoral divisions with slightly different boundaries. Two of the proposed rural electoral divisions (Drumheller-Stettler [-15.5%], and West Yellowhead [•18.4%]) have populations more than 15% below but less than 25% below the provincial quotient. Although technically these do not need to be designated as special electoral divisions, similar factors justify the relatively large deviations from the average population per division. They satisfy the area requirement, satisfy the distance requirement from the Legislature Building, and have borders coterminous with provincial borders.

The Commission believes that these variations from the provincial quotient are justifiable under the Act and conform to the factors cited by the Supreme Court of Canada.

There are two proposed special electoral divisions:

(a) *Dunvegan* (-27.8%): area exceeds the limits set out in 15(2) of the Act, the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres; there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people; an Indian Reserve is located within the division; and the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the province.

(b) Lesser Slave Lake (-27.1%): area exceeds the limits set out in 15(2) of the Act, the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres, and Indian Reserves and Metis Settlements are included in the division.

This distribution involves the addition of two new electoral divisions within the City of Calgary and a new division in the heavily populated area surrounding Calgary. The addition of these electoral divisions is offset by the reduction of one division in the City of Edmonton, the reduction of one division in central Alberta and the merger of the former Fort McMurray division with a portion of the former Athabasca-Wabasca special division to form one new division called Wood Buffalo.

In the Interim Report, one member of the Commission, Bauni Mackay, did not support this conclusion. Ms. Mackay disagreed with the removal of a division from Edmonton because she believed that doing so failed to acknowledge Edmonton's growth and the major role the city plays in the economic success and social growth of the province. <u>Appendix B</u> of this report provides the full text of Ms. Mackay's Minority Position.

The majority of Commission members noted that the application of the matrix generally indicated that Edmonton electoral divisions (and the adjacent electoral divisions) are the easiest in the province to effectively represent, even with the inclusion of the dependant population proportion as one of the variables. The majority of the Commission was guided not only by the matrix but also by all of the information provided in oral and written representations and by its own judgement and research.

The Commission acknowledged the submissions stressing that urban ridings have their own challenges, such as a large number of linguistic and cultural communities and a disproportionate number of people dependent on social programs. There was no hard data available at the time from the 2001 census to support these representations, other than the dependant population ratio that was been included in the matrix.

The Commission also noted that these types of challenges were not confined to the major cities, or even to urban areas. Many rural electoral divisions had significant numbers of different linguistic and cultural

communities, particularly First Nations and Metis groups. They may also have significant numbers of people dependent on social programs.

In light of all the information provided to it, the majority of Commission members believed that, in the circumstances, the loss of only one division in Edmonton was appropriate. This still left Edmonton electoral divisions, on average, about 1,200 below the Calgary average population per division.

The Commission noted that the effect of the proposal was to change the boundaries of every electoral division in the province except one. Consequently, the names of some electoral divisions were changed to reflect the new alignment.

Among these, the Commission proposed three new names, recognizing former mayors in Calgary and Edmonton:

*Calgary-Hays* - to recognize Harry William Hays, who served as Mayor of Calgary from 1959 to 1963 and later served as Canada's Minister of Agriculture and as a Senator,

*Calgary-Mackay* - to recognize Donald Hugh Mackay who served as Mayor of Calgary from 1950 to 1959 during a time of tremendous growth. He led the Calgary contingent to the 1948 Grey Cup which began the national festival associated with the game. He also popularized the white stetson as one of Calgary's symbols, and

*Edmonton-Decore* - to recognize Laurence G. Decore who served as Mayor of Edmonton 1983 to 1988 and conceived the idea of Edmonton's Heritage Festival. He later served as Alberta's Leader of the Official Opposition.

TABLE 6: POPULATIONS OF INTERIM PROPOSED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

		Pop.	%PA	%CA			Pop.	%PA	%CA
MAJO	RCITIES				URB	ANIZED			
CALG	ARY				44	Airdrie-Chestermere	37,329	3.8%	4.7%
03	Calgary-Bow	39,673	10.4%	5.3%	45	Banff-Cochrane	35,264	-1.9%	-1.1%
04	Calgary-Buffalo	39,357	9.5%	4.4%	47	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	32,729	-9.0%	-8.2%
05	Calgary-Cross	38,835	8.0%	3.1%	49	Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	37,014	3.0%	3.8%
06	Calgary-Currie	39,961	11.2%	6.0%	50	Cypress-Medicine Hat	32,169	-10.5%	-9.8%
07	Calgary-East	39,528	9.9%	4.9%	54	Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,158	0.6%	1.4%
08	Calgary-Egmont	37,518	4.4%	-0.4%	55	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	33,007	-8.2%	-7.4%
09	Calgary-Elbow	38,285	6.5%	1.6%	56	Highwood	31,375	-12.8%	-12.0%
10	Calgary-Fish Creek	36,597	1.8%	-2.9%	60	Leduc	37,378	4.0%	4.9%
11	Calgary-Foothills	38,327	6.6%	1.7%	61	Lethbridge-East	34,684	-3.5%	-2.7%
12	Calgary-Fort	38,491	7.1%	2.1%	62	Lethbridge-West	32,695	-9.1%	-8.3%
13	Calgary-Glenmore	38,124	6.0%	1.2%	65	Medicine Hat	35,889	-0.2%	0.7%
14	Calgary-Hays	36,707	2.1%	-2.6%	68	Red Deer-North	36,115	0.5%	1.3%
15	Calgary-Lougheed	38,273	6.5%	1.6%	69	Red Deer-South	36,424	1.3%	2.2%
16	Calgary-McCall	36,458	1.4%	-3.2%	72	Sherwood Park	37,051	3.1%	3.9%
17	Calgary-Mackay	37,803	5.2%	0.3%	73	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon -St. Albert	37,657	4.7%	5.6%
18	Calgary-Montrose	38,478	7.0%	2.1%	74	St. Albert	39,160	8.9%	9.8%
19	Calgary-Mountain View	39,361	9.5%	4.5%	76	Strathmore-Brooks	38,140	6.1%	7.0%
20	Calgary-North Hill	38,072	5.9%	1.0%	78	Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,573	-15.0%	-14.2%
21	Calgary-North West	37,471	4.2%	-0.6%	81	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	36,157	0.6%	1.4%
22	Calgary-Nose Hill	38,596	7.4%	2.4%	83	Wood Buffalo	42,971	19.5%	20.5%
23	Calgary-Shaw	36,258	0.9%	-3.8%		Urbanized TOTAL (21)	749,939	AVG	35,711
24	Calgary-Varsity	38,456	7.0%	2.1%	L				
25	Calgary-West	38,237	6.4%	1.5%	RUR	AL			
	TOTAL (23)	878,866	AVG	38,212	46	Barrhead-Westlock- Athabasca	36,085	0.4%	7.4%

					40	Caluston-Taber-Warner	31,700	-11.7/0	-0
	EDMONTON				51	Drayton Valley-Calmar	34,038	-5.3%	1
	26 Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	37,797	5.1%	0.3%	52	Drumheller-Stettler	30,387	-15.5%	-9
	27 Edmonton-Calder	35,939	-0.0%	-4.6%	53	Foothills-Rocky View	34,083	-5.2%	1
	28 Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570	4.5%	-0.3%	57	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	36,660	2.0%	9
	29 Edmonton-Centre	37,030	3.0%	-1.7%	58	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	33,790	-6.0%	0
	30 Edmonton-Ellerslie	35,707	-0.7%	-5.2%	59	Lacombe-Ponoka	36,494	1.5%	8
	31 Edmonton-Decore	35,570	-1.1%	-5.6%	63	Little Bow	34,217	-8.5%	-2
	32 Edmonton-Glenora	36,766	2.3%	-2.4%	64	Livingstone-Macleod	33,534	-6.7%	-0
	33 Edmonton-Gold Bar	37,280	3.7%	-1.1%	66	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	34,885	-3.0%	3
	34 Edmonton-Highlands	37,470	4.2%	-0.6%	67	Peace River	31,434	-12.6%	-6
	35 Edmonton-Manning	37,410	4.1%	-0.7%	70	Redwater	33,332	-7.3%	-0
U	36 Edmonton-McClung	38,266	6.4%	1.5%	71	Rocky Mountain House	33,121	-7.9%	-1
rsic	37 Edmonton-Jasper Place-Meadowlark	36,483	1.5%	-3.2%	75	Stony Plain	37,410	4.1%	11
Ve	38 Edmonton-Mill Creek	36,545	1.7%	-3.0%	77	Vegreville-Viking	34,004	-5.4%	1.
inal	39 Edmonton-Mill Woods	38,339	6.6%	1.7%	79	Wainwright	31,348	-12.8%	-6
orig	40 Edmonton-Riverview	37,312	3.8%	-1.0%	80	West Yellowhead	29,349	-18.4%	-12
je o	41 Edmonton-Rutherford	36,420	1.3%	-3.3%	82	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	32,251	-10.3%	-4
or th	42 Edmonton-Strathcona	36,798	2.4%	-2.3%		Rural TOTAL (19)	636,857	AVG	33
er fo	43 Edmonton-Whitemud	37,402	4.0%	-0.7%					
she	TOTAL (18)	666,104	AVG	37,006	SPE	CIAL			
ildu	Major Cities TOTAL (41)	1,544,970	AVG	37,682	01	Dunvegan	25,958	-27.8%	-0
nd e					02	Lesser Slave Lake	26,196	-27.1%	0
the						Special TOTAL (2)	52,154	AVG	26
rpotation Please contaction of the secontaction of the secontacti	<b>The Matr</b> reports the results of applying the rix, see <u>Appendix E</u> .	%PA %CA ix Applie matrix to	Pop. = J = % over = % ove ed - Int the in	population -/under the r/under the terim Pr terim pro-	of the Provine Cates Opose	division ncial Average gory Average ed Electoral Divisions d electoral divisions. For	r a full des	cription	of
The rang	ge of matrix scores for the existing	and prope	osed e	lectoral o	livisio	ns by category was:			
ā									

48	Cardston-Taber-Warner	31,755	-11.7%	-5.5%
51	Drayton Valley-Calmar	34,038	-5.3%	1.3%
52	Drumheller-Stettler	30,387	-15.5%	-9.5%
53	Foothills-Rocky View	34,083	-5.2%	1.5%
57	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	36,660	2.0%	9.1%
58	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	33,790	-6.0%	0.6%
59	Lacombe-Ponoka	36,494	1.5%	8.7%
63	Little Bow	34,217	-8.5%	-2.1%
64	Livingstone-Macleod	33,534	-6.7%	-0.2%
66	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	34,885	-3.0%	3.9%
67	Peace River	31,434	-12.6%	-6.4%
70	Redwater	33,332	-7.3%	-0.8%
71	Rocky Mountain House	33,121	-7.9%	-1.4%
75	Stony Plain	37,410	4.1%	11.4%
77	Vegreville-Viking	34,004	-5.4%	1.2%
79	Wainwright	31,348	-12.8%	-6.7%
80	West Yellowhead	29,349	-18.4%	-12.6%
82	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	32,251	-10.3%	-4.0%
	Rural TOTAL (19)	636,857	AVG	33,519
SPE	CIAL			
01	Dunvegan	25,958	-27.8%	-0.5%
02	Lesser Slave Lake	26,196	-27.1%	0.5%
	Special TOTAL (2)	52,154	AVG	26,077

range of matrix scores	or the existing and	proposed electoral	divisions by	category was:

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
MAJOR CITIES		
Calgary	-12 to -3	-12 to -3
Edmonton	-18 to -9	-17 to -9
URBANIZED	-15 to 12	-15 to 15
RURAL	+3 to +16	+3 to +17
SPECIAL	+16	+15 to +16

#### TABLE 7: MATRIX APPLIED TO INTERIM PROPOSED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

ι

		Total	
MAJOR	MAJOR CITIES		
CALGARY			
03	Calgary-Bow	-9	
04	Calgary-Buffalo	-12	
05	Calgary-Cross	-9	
06	Calgary-Currie	-11	
07	Calgary-East	-10	

		Total		
JRB/	IRBANIZED			
44	Airdrie-Chestermere	0		
45	Banff-Cochrane	8		
47	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	12		
49	Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	-4		
50	Cypress-Medicine Hat	11		
54	Grande Prairie-Smoky	12		

08	Calgary-Egmont	-8
09	Calgary-Elbow	-8
10	Calgary-Fish Creek	-9
11	Calgary-Foothills	-7
12	Calgary-Fort	-6
13	Calgary-Glenmore	-9
14	Calgary-Hays	-9
15	Calgary-Lougheed	-6
16	Calgary-McCall	-3
17	Calgary-Mackay	-6
18	Calgary-Montrose	-9
19	Calgary-Mountain View	-10
20	Calgary-North Hill	-9
21	Calgary-North West	-9
22	Calgary-Nose Hill	-9
23	Calgary-Shaw	-3
24	Calgary-Varsity	-9
25	Calgary-West	-6

#### EDMONTON

26	Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	-14
27	Edmonton-Calder	-9
28	Edmonton-Castle Downs	-14
29	Edmonton-Centre	-17
30	Edmonton-Ellerslie	-9
31	Edmonton-Decore	-15
32	Edmonton-Glenora	-15
33	Edmonton-Gold Bar	-15
34	Edmonton-Highlands	-15
35	Edmonton-Manning	-9
36	Edmonton-McClung	-10
37	Edmonton-Jasper Place-Meadowlark	-15
38	Edmonton-Mill Creek	-11
39	Edmonton-Mill Woods	-15
40	Edmonton-Riverview	-15
41	Edmonton-Rutherford	-16
42	Edmonton-Strathcona	-17
43	Edmonton-Whitemud	-9

55	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	10
56	Highwood	0
60	Leduc	-1
61	Lethbridge-East	-5
62	Lethbridge-West	-3
65	Medicine Hat	-2
68	Red Deer-North	-8
69	Red Deer-South	-14
72	Sherwood Park	-11
73	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	-5
74	St. Albert	-15
76	Strathmore-Brooks	15
78	Vermilion-Lloydminster	9
81	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	-2
83	Wood Buffalo	8

RUR	<u>AL</u>	
46	Barrhead-Westlock-Athabasca	10
48	Cardston-Taber-Warner	17
51	Foothills-Rocky View	8
52	Drayton Valley-Calmar	8
53	Drumheller-Stettler	15
57	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	4
58	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	12
59	Lacombe-Ponoka	4
63	Little Bow	16
64	Livingstone-Macleod	11
66	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	9
67	Peace River	16
70	Redwater	3
71	Rocky Mountain House	13
75	Stony Plain	3
77	Vegreville-Viking	6
79	Wainwright	13
80	West Yellowhead	11
82	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	9

	SPECIAL	
01	Dunvegan	15
02	Lesser Slave Lake	16

#### PART V - SECOND ROUND HEARINGS Submission Highlights...

In the second round hearings the issue of population concentration in the Calgary/Edmonton corridor as compared to the remainder of the province was again a major topic of discussion. The Commission was urged to use the full four special divisions or the full range of +/-25% population variation allowed by the Act both to address the geographical size of divisions outside the corridor and to permit realignment of some of the divisions within the corridor proposed in the Interim Report. Suggestions were also made that the Matrix either focused too much on rural/remote factors or did not sufficiently recognize issues related to sparsity of population.

Many submissions made useful suggestions regarding revisions to the boundaries of the proposed divisions to better match communities, trading areas, municipal boundaries and other factors. Several submissions emphasized that division boundaries should not bisect municipalities (outside the cities).

Submissions at the Athabasca hearing expressed concern over the proposal to include Wood Buffalo in one division and combine the remainder of the existing Athabasca-Wabasca with the existing Barrhead-Westlock. Many Edmonton submissions mentioned the reduction of one division proposed in the Interim Report. Other submissions focused on northwestern Alberta.

Submissions at the Red Deer hearing focused on the realignment of divisions proposed north of the city, particularly mentioning that the existing Lacombe-Stettler division appears to satisfy all of the requirements of the Act. Submissions at the Calgary hearing suggested changes to individual division boundaries.

#### Municipal Boundaries...

The Commission is sympathetic to the view that wherever possible a municipality should be contained within a single electoral division. Of course, that is not possible where the population of the municipality is considerably above the average. There is also the challenge of respecting community of interest, for example in the Drumheller area.

#### Athabasca

The Commission heard the representations that connection with the existing Barrhead?Westlock division was not appropriate and that the existing Athabasca-Wabasca division should be retained, perhaps with an expansion to include some additional population.

In reviewing its proposal to include the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo in one division, the Commission noted that more than 90% of the population of the proposed division is concentrated in the relatively small area of the former City of Fort McMurray. The Commission concluded that this division covering the major natural resource area, is appropriate in the current circumstances.

The Commission noted the comments of Councillor John Rigney, the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo, at the Fort McMurray first round hearing:

I think Fort McMurray's riding has more electors than the average and Athabasca has much less than the average, and to add more to McMurray seems to be eating away at the level of representation. However, there are unusual circumstances here. I think the voting population north of here is less than a thousand people. I think that in Fort Chip 540 people voted in the municipal election ... Fort MacKay probably has 250 voters, and there might be 20 others living in the countryside. The area is 25,000 square miles north of here if you exclude the national park.

Fort Chipewyan's links are almost exclusively with Fort McMurray. Our employment, our supply centre, our families are primarily in Fort McMurray. The municipal government is in McMurray. Our road and air links are to McMurray. We know McMurray: its people, its businesses, its economy, and its politicians. We have very little in common with the Athabasca area: no agriculture, no forestry, no contacts, no employment, no friends or relatives. Athabasca is closer to Calgary than to Fort Chip and much more expensive to reach from Fort Chip and much more time consuming to get there ... Fort MacKay is linked almost like an umbilical cord

to Fort McMurray. Everything that happens there is related to what happens here. Again most of us from Fort MacKay and Fort Chip see Athabasca once in a lifetime. We're in Fort McMurray constantly.

Recognizing the north/south travel and trade patterns from Athabasca, the Commission is recommending that the Athabasca area be merged with the eastern part of the existing Redwater division to form an Athabasca-Redwater division. Consequently it is also recommending that Barrhead-Westlock be joined with the western portion of the existing Redwater division to form a Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock division.

#### Edmonton

In considering the Edmonton submissions, the Commission learned that in 1954, a Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Development of Calgary and Edmonton (popularly known as the McNally Commission) recommended that Bowness, Forest Lawn, Montgomery, and portions of land on all sides of Calgary except to the north be added to the City of Calgary. McNally also recommended that Jasper Place, Beverly, most of the industrial area of Strathcona Municipal District, the townsite of Campbelltown and the intervening land, together with a portion of land all around the city limits at the time be added to the City of Edmonton.

To deal with these recommendations, the government of the day appointed a Metropolitan Interim Development Board composed of civil servants. This Board recommended approval of McNally's Calgary recommendation but recommended deletion of most of the Strathcona industrial area, the townsite of Campbelltown (now Sherwood Park) and the intervening area from the Edmonton recommendation.

In 1980, after a lengthy hearing, the Local Authorities Board (LAB) issued Order No. 14000. The Board ordered that the City of St. Albert, a large portion of Strathcona County and portions of the then Municipal District of Sturgeon, County of Parkland and County of Leduc be annexed to the City of Edmonton. Legislation at the time provided that no Annexation Order of the Board had any effect unless it was approved by the government. The government of the day did not approve the Order but varied it by deleting St. Albert and Sherwood Park and compacting the "rural" areas to be annexed.

Had the Board Order been approved, Edmonton's population in the 2001 Canada Census would have been:

	POPULATION
Edmonton	666,104
St. Albert	53,081
Sherwood Park	47,645
Acreage*	10,000
TOTAL	776,830

\*This is a conservative estimate of the population in the rural area that would have been annexed under the Board Order.

as compared to Calgary's 2001 population of 878,866.

Using the average provincial division population of 35,951, Edmonton would have been entitled to 22 divisions (Calgary 24). Using the major cities average of 37,682, Edmonton would have been entitled to 21 divisions (Calgary 23).

In this Report the area encompassed in the LAB Order has the equivalent of 21 divisions (Edmonton (18), St. Albert, Sherwood Park and portions of Strathcona and Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert). Calgary has 23.

#### Northwestern Alberta

In a thorough paper, Gary Friedel, MLA pointed out that the Peace River division proposed in the Interim Report had an area 10 times as large as some of the other rural divisions, with communities over 400 kilometres apart. The paper pointed out areas that would be easier to access from other divisions and provided two alternative alignments. The Commission agreed that the alignment of divisions in northwestern Alberta needed to be revisited.

#### **Electoral Division Names**

The Commission established a principle that as a general rule, where two or more place names are used, division names should be in alphabetical order. The Commission also decided that where the name of an existing division is appropriate for a recommended division, the existing name should be used.

#### Summary of Decisions

In considering these submissions, the Commission decided to:

(a) maintain the distribution of divisions proposed in its Interim Report

(b) respond as possible to the submissions suggesting relatively minor changes

(c) amend its proposal regarding the Athabasca area, responding to the submissions suggesting that inclusion with Barrhead and Westlock was not appropriate, by including it with an area to the south (in the existing Redwater division) and consequently amending its proposed extension of the existing Barrhead-Westlock division to include the western portion of the existing Redwater division, and

(d) adjust boundaries in northwestern, northeastern, and central Alberta, and east of Edmonton to reflect the essence of submissions.

#### **PART VI - RECOMMENDED DIVISIONS**

As a result of the Commission's decisions the distribution of divisions has changed slightly from the Interim Report:

	INTERIM REPORT		FINAL REPORT	
	PROPOSED INTERIM	% PA	RECOMMENDED	% PA
MAJOR CITIES	41	4.8	41	4.8
URBANIZED	21	-0.7	22	-0.9
RURAL	19	-6.8	19	-7.6
SPECIAL	2	-27.5	1	-32.7

% PA = the variation of the average population per division in the category from the provincial average population per division (35,951)

The adjustments to the interim proposed divisions in northwestern Alberta resulted in Lesser Slave Lake no longer being classified as a special division. The adjustments east of Edmonton resulted in one additional urbanized division (Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville).

<u>Table 8</u> shows the populations of the recommended electoral divisions and compares them to the provincial average and the average for divisions in the category. The variations are:

	FINAL REPORT				
	% PA	% CA			
MAJOR CITIES	-2.4 to +10.4	-6.9 to +5.3			
URBANIZED	-14.7 to + 19.5	-13.9 to +20.6			
RURAL	-22.9 to +4.1	-16.5 to +12.6			
SPECIAL	-32.7 N/A				

The recommended divisions which are represented by the greatest variations from average all have special circumstances:

Urbanized - Vermilion-Lloydminster (-14.7% of the provincial average) would be difficult to increase given the configuration of other divisions along the eastern boundary of the province: Wood Buffalo (+19.5% of the provincial average) encompasses the whole Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo as requested in submissions to the Commission.

Rural - Lesser Slave Lake (-22.9% of the provincial average) was formerly a special division. The realignment of boundaries in northwestern Alberta results in Lesser Slave Lake having slightly more than the population requirement to be included in the special division category.

The recommended Calgary divisions range from +0.0% to +10.4% of the provincial average. Those in Edmonton range from -2.4% to +6.9%. With the exception of Lesser Slave Lake (-22.9%), West Yellowhead (-18.4%), Wood Buffalo (+19.5%) and the special division of Dunvegan (-32.7%), the remainder (95%) of the recommended divisions are within the +/-15% of average range targeted by the Commission.

#### TABLE 8: POPULATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

		Pop.	% PA	% CA			Pop.	% PA	% CA
MAJO	RCITIES				URBA	NIZED			
CALGARY					43	Airdrie-Chestermere	37,651	4.7%	5.7%
02	Calgary-Bow	39,604	10.2%	5.1%	45	Banff-Cochrane	35,593	-1.0%	-0.1%
03	Calgary-Buffalo	39,357	9.5%	4.4%	48	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	31,289	-13.0%	-12.2%
04	Calgary-Cross	39,524	9.9%	4.9%	51	Cypress-Medicine Hat	31,513	-12.3%	-11.5%
05	Calgary-Currie	39,340	9.4%	4.4%	54	Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville	36,172	0.6%	1.5%
06	Calgary-East	38,655	7.5%	2.6%	55	Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,178	0.6%	1.6%
07	Calgary-Egmont	37,423	4.1%	-0.7%	56	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	32,987	-8.2%	-7.4%
08	Calgary-Elbow	38,906	8.2%	3.2%	57	Highwood	31,410	-12.6%	-11.8%
09	Calgary-Fish Creek	36,457	1.4%	-3.3%	61	Leduc-Beaumont-Devon	37,378	4.0%	4.9%
10	Calgary-Foothills	36,415	1.3%	-3.4%	63	Lethbridge-East	34,684	-3.5%	-2.6%
11	Calgary-Fort	39,155	8.9%	3.9%	64	Lethbridge-West	32,695	-9.1%	-8.2%
12	Calgary-Glenmore	37,770	5.1%	0.2%	67	Medicine Hat	35,889	-0.2%	0.7%
13	Calgary-Hays	36,258	0.9%	-3.8%	70	Red Deer-North	36,115	0.5%	1.4%
14	Calgary-Lougheed	36,702	2.1%	-2.6%	71	Red Deer-South	36,424	1.3%	2.3%
15	Calgary-MacKay	37,803	5.2%	0.3%	73	Sherwood Park	35,360	-1.6%	-0.7%
16	Calgary-McCall	36,458	1.4%	-3.2%	74	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	37,216	3.5%	4.5%
17	Calgary-Montrose	39,276	9.2%	4.2%	75	St. Albert	39,160	8.9%	9.9%
18	Calgary-Mountain View	39,586	10.1%	5.1%	77	Strathcona	36,435	1.3%	2.3%
19	Calgary-North Hill	38,465	7.0%	2.1%	78	Strathmore-Brooks	38,140	6.1%	7.1%
20	Calgary-North West	39,246	9.2%	4.2%	79	Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,675	-14.7%	-13.9%
21	Calgary-Nose Hill	38,622	7.4%	2.5%	81	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	37,750	5.0%	6.0%
22	Calgary-Shaw	35,966	0.0%	-4.6%	83	Wood Buffalo	42,971	19.5%	20.6%
23	Calgary-Varsity	39,691	10.4%	5.3%		TOTAL (22)	783,685	-0.9%	35,622
24	Calgary-West	38,187	6.2%	1.3%					_
	TOTAL (23)	878,866	6.3%	1.4%		RURAL			
					44	Athabasca-Redwater	34,772	-3.3%	4.7%
EDMO	NTON				46	Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock	35,086	-2.4%	5.6%
25	Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	37,797	5.1%	0.3%	47	Battle River-Wainwright	31,042	-13.7%	-6.5%
26	Edmonton-Calder	37,190	3.4%	-1.3%	49	Calmar-Drayton Valley-Millet	34,279	-4.7%	3.2%
27	Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570	4.5%	-0.3%	50	Cardston-Taber-Warner	31,755	-11.7%	-4.4%
28	Edmonton-Centre	35,096	-2.4%	-6.9%	52	Drumheller-Stettler	33,483	-6.9%	0.8%
29	Edmonton-Decore	35,570	-1.1%	-5.6%	53	Foothills-Rocky View	33,397	-7.1%	0.6%
30	Edmonton-Ellerslie	35,707	-0.7%	-5.2%	58	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	36,076	0.3%	8.6%

31	Edmonton-Glenora	36,766	2.3%	-2.4%	5	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	35,230	-2.0%	6.1%
32	Edmonton-Gold Bar	37,052	3.1%	-1.7%	6	Lacombe-Ponoka	35,065	-2.5%	5.6%
33	Edmonton-Highlands- Norwood	38,418	6.9%	2.0%	6	Lesser Slave Lake	27,731	-22.9%	-16.5%
34	Edmonton-Jasper Place	36,483	1.5%	-3.2%	6	5 Little Bow	32,897	-8.5%	-1.0%
35	Edmonton-Manning	37,410	4.1%	-0.7%	6	<ul> <li>Livingstone-Macleod</li> </ul>	33,534	-6.7%	1.0%
36	Edmonton-McClung	38,266	6.4%	1.5%	6	8 Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	32,738	-8.9%	-1.4%
37	Edmonton-Mill Creek	36,545	1.7%	-3.0%	6'	Peace River	31,655	-11.9%	-4.7%
38	Edmonton-Mill Woods	38,339	6.6%	1.7%	7:	Rocky Mountain House	33,313	-7.3%	0.3%
39	Edmonton-Riverview	37,059	3.1%	-1.7%	7	o Stony Plain	37,410	4.1%	12.6%
40	Edmonton-Rutherford	36,420	1.3%	-3.3%	8	West Yellowhead	29,349	-18.4%	-11.6%
41	Edmonton-Strathcona	37,014	3.0%	-1.8%	8	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	32,251	-10.3%	-2.9%
42	Edmonton-Whitemud	37,402	4.0%	-0.7%		TOTAL (19)	631,063	-7.6%	33,214
	TOTAL (18)	666,104	2.9%	-1.8%					
	MAJOR CITIES TOTAL	1,544,970	4.8%			SPECIAL			
					0	Dunvegan	24,202	-32.7%	

**Pop.** = population of the division

%PA = the variation of the division population from the provincial average population per division (35,951) %CA = the variation of the division population from the average population per division in the category

#### Applying The Matrix...

<u>Table 9</u> reports the results of applying the matrix to the recommended electoral divisions. For a full description of the matrix, see <u>Appendix E</u>. It should be noted that since the Interim Report was released the number of Regional Health Authorities has been reduced to nine, thereby affecting the number of elected/ appointed bodies overlapping some of the electoral divisions.

The range of matrix scores for the recommended electoral divisions by category is:

	RECOMMENDED
MAJOR CITIES Calgary Edmonton	-3 to -12 -9 to -18
URBANIZED	-15 to +15
RURAL	+3 to +17
SPECIAL	+16

<u>Appendix F</u> provides the descriptions of the boundaries of the recommended electoral divisions.

Appendix G provides maps showing the recommended electoral divisions.

#### TABLE 9: MATRIX APPLIED TO THE RECOMMENDED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

SCORE
1
8
10
10
3
12
11
1
-2
-4

11	Calgary-Fort	-5
12	Calgary-Glenmore	-9
13	Calgary-Hays	-3
14	Calgary-Lougheed	-7
15	Calgary-MacKay	-6
16	Calgary-McCall	-3
17	Calgary-Montrose	-9
18	Calgary-Mountain View	-10
19	Calgary-North Hill	-9
20	Calgary-North West	-9
21	Calgary-Nose Hill	-9
22	Calgary-Shaw	-9
23	Calgary-Varsity	-9
24	Calgary-West	-8

#### EDMONTON

25	Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	-14
26	Edmonton-Calder	-9
27	Edmonton-Castle Downs	-13
28	Edmonton-Centre	-18
29	Edmonton-Decore	-15
30	Edmonton-Ellerslie	-9
31	Edmonton-Glenora	-15
32	Edmonton-Gold Bar	-15
33	Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood	-15
34	Edmonton-Jasper Place	-15
35	Edmonton-Manning	-9
36	Edmonton-McClung	-10
37	Edmonton-Mill Creek	-11
38	Edmonton-Mill Woods	-15
39	Edmonton-Riverview	-15
40	Edmonton-Rutherford	-15
41	Edmonton-Strathcona	-17
42	Edmonton-Whitemud	-9

64	Lethbridge-West	-3
67	Medicine Hat	-2
70	Red Deer-North	-8
71	Red Deer-South	-14
73	Sherwood Park	-10
74	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert	-6
75	St. Albert	-15
75 77	St. Albert Strathcona	-15 -3
75 77 78	St. Albert Strathcona Strathmore-Brooks	-15 -3 15
75 77 78 79	St. Albert Strathcona Strathmore-Brooks Vermilion-Lloydminster	-15 -3 15 9
75 77 78 79 81	St. Albert Strathcona Strathmore-Brooks Vermilion-Lloydminster Wetaskiwin-Camrose	-15 -3 15 9 -1

URAL		
44	Athabasca-Redwater	7
46	Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock	10
47	Battle River-Wainwright	13
49	Calmar-Drayton Valley-Millet	8
50	Cardston-Taber-Warner	17
52	Drumheller-Stettler	15
53	Foothills-Rocky View	8
58	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	3
59	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	14
60	Lacombe-Ponoka	4
62	Lesser Slave Lake	16
65	Little Bow	17
66	Livingstone-Macleod	11
68	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	8
69	Peace River	16
72	Rocky Mountain House	12
76	Stony Plain	3
80	West Yellowhead	9
82	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	9

PECIA	<u>L</u>	
01	Dunvegan	16

#### **Privacy Policy and Disclaimer**

In reviewing the variables used in the 1995/1996 matrix, the 2002/2003 Commission considered that, given the submissions it had received, it would be useful to add variables related to the number of languages other than English spoken in the division and some social variable such as the number of persons receiving assistance under the various programs offered by the Province. In addition, the Commission considered that some indication of the number of non-profit organizations which an MLA would be required to maintain contact with would also be an indicator of representation challenges.

In the end, none of these variables were added. Statistics Canada will not release mother tongue information (the indicator for the number of languages variable) from the 2001 census until December 2002. The Commission was informed that less than 50,000 of the nearly 3 million Albertans are recipients under social assistance programs. There also appeared to be no accurate records of the number of non-profit organizations active in each electoral division.

The absence of reliable information for these variables called into question the relevance of the matrix for urban electoral divisions. This led the Commission to decide that the matrix is most useful when it is applied to the four categories of electoral divisions - major cities, urbanized, rural and special.

The Commission also considered driving time in relation to the distance from the Legislature. For example, a southern Alberta MLA who has to drive through Calgary to get to Edmonton might face traffic delays which would make the trip longer or more difficult than for an MLA whose travel was mostly outside the major traffic congestion areas. Again, there appeared to be no accurate method of measuring this variable. During the hearings, some submissions suggested that air travel could offset the distance factor. Others suggested that, depending where an MLA lives, it could take as long to fly as to drive and the availability of scheduled airline service to most of Alberta would pose scheduling difficulties for the MLA.

In reviewing the 1995/1996 Commission's variables, the 2002/2003 Commission decided that since population was a standard requirement, it did not need to be included in the matrix. The Commission also determined that the number of Albertans living in urban population centres of 1,000 or more affected the degree of difficulty in representing the electoral division. Therefore it decided to replace the population variable with a "rural/urban ratio" variable.

In the end, the Commission decided to include the following variables in the matrix:

- Area of the division in square kilometres
- Density of population (people per square kilometre)
- Rural/Urban Ratio the number of people living in the rural areas of the division for every 100 people living in an urban centre of 1,000 or more
- "Dependant" Population Proportion the number of children (0-14 years old) and seniors (65+) compared to the total population with a higher ratio indicating a larger number of persons eligible to be dependent on various provincial programs
- Elected/Appointed Bodies, Indian Reserves and Metis Settlements the number of local authorities in the division
- Distance to the Legislature measured as the distance from the Legislature to the geographic centre of the division

The way the matrix is structured, a higher score indicates greater difficulty in providing effective representation. A lower score indicates less difficulty.

The mean value for each variable has been determined and points have been allocated on the basis of deviation from the mean. A score of zero for any variable indicates that the division is within +/-10% of the mean value. A score of +/-1 indicates a deviation of +/-10% up to 19% from the mean; a score of +/-2 indicates a deviation of +/-20% up to 29% from the mean; a score of +/-3 indicates a deviation of +/-30% or greater from the mean. Since there are six variables, each eligible for a maximum score of +/-3, the maximum score would be +/-18.

A detailed description of the 2002/2003 matrix is provided in Appendix E.

The Commission believes that this matrix is statistically defensible and is understandable. While it is not a panacea and does not cover everything, it does provide a measure of difficulty of representation, particularly within the categories of electoral divisions which the Commission adopted.

Table 4 shows the results of applying this matrix to the existing electoral divisions.



# Existing Electoral Division Maps

To view *Existing* Electoral Division Maps, please select one of the following:

- Province of Alberta
- Edmonton and Electoral Divisions within
- <u>Calgary and Electoral Divisions within</u>
- Other Electoral Divisions
- <u>Major Cities</u>

Note: The following maps are those printed in the **final** report of the 2002/2003 Electoral Boundaries Commission. Revisions made post publication of the report are not reflected on these maps. For updated maps, you may contact Elections Alberta at (780) 427-7191.

To view 2002/2003 Recommended Electoral Division Maps, please select one of the following:

- <u>Grande Prairie</u> (45 KB)
- Lethbridge (63 KB)
- Medicine Hat (59 KB)
- <u>Red Deer</u> (65 KB)
- <u>Sherwood Park</u> (55 KB)
- <u>St. Albert</u> (57 KB)
- Calgary (593 KB)
- Edmonton (396 KB)
- Province of Alberta (1.08 MB)
- Northern Alberta (481 KB)
- <u>Central Alberta</u> (472 KB)
- Southern Alberta (318 KB)

**CARK** to Final Report's Table of Contents

Note: The following maps are those printed in the **interim** report of the 2002/2003 Electoral Boundaries Commission. Revisions made post publication of the report are not reflected on these maps. For updated maps, you may contact Elections Alberta at (780) 427-7191.

To view 2002/2003 Proposed Electoral Division Maps, please select one of the following:

- Grande Prairie (71.7 KB)
- Lethbridge (26.3 KB)
- Medicine Hat (26.2 KB)
- <u>Red Deer</u> (26.4 KB)
- <u>Sherwood Park</u> (24.5 KB)
- <u>St. Albert</u> (26.0 KB)
- Calgary (209 KB)
- Edmonton (229 KB)
- Province of Alberta (1.15 MB)
- Northern Alberta (523 KB)
- Central Alberta (544 KB); Wetaskiwin-Camrose (Revised) (163 KB)
- Southern Alberta (356 KB)

**BACK** to Interim Report's Table of Contents

Privacy Policy and Disclaimer

## **Proposed Electoral Division Maps**

The following maps are in **PDF** format. Click <u>here</u> to a download a free Acrobat Reader to view the pdf files

## **Recommended Electoral Division Maps**

The following maps are in **PDF** format. Click <u>here</u> to a download a free Acrobat Reader to view the pdf files



## Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission 2002/2003 [Maps] [FAQs]

[Welcome | Contact | Membership | Mandate | Legislation | Schedule | Preparing a Submission or Presentation | Public Hearing Locations ] [ Reports | Hansard Transcripts ]



### Appendix A

The following maps are in **PDF** format.

Click <u>here</u> to a download a free Acrobat Reader to view the pdf files

Click <u>here</u> to view the lists of presenters and submitters for first- and second- round public hearings in pdf format.

#### Appendix B ALBERTA ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION MINORITY POSITION by Bauni Mackay

Increasing the number of Calgary electoral divisions to 23 to partially accommodate that city's 15.8% growth and retaining 42 in the rest of the province leaves Edmonton with 18 electoral divisions, one fewer than it currently has.

I disagree with the recommendation to remove a division from Edmonton for several reasons.

**POPULATION GROWTH**: Although Edmonton did not have the growth of Calgary prior to the 2001 Census, it did have a growth rate of 8.7%, enough to retain 19 electoral divisions. Based on the 2001 Census figures, the average population of the current Edmonton electoral divisions is 35,058, just 2.4% below the provincial average of 35,951.

Edmonton has grown dramatically since the 2001 Census was completed. According to Economic Development Edmonton, in 2001 the population of Edmonton grew by 4.5%, exceeding the Conference Board of Canada's forecast that it would be the fastest growing city in Canada with a growth rate of 4.1%. The Conference Board of Canada forecasts Edmonton's growth at 2.4% for 2002 and 4.5% for 2003.

According to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in the first six months of 2002, single family housing starts in Edmonton increased by 50% compared to the same period last year. In May of 2002 there was a 95% jump in single and multiple housing starts compared to May, 2001, and in June the increase over last year's figures was 91%.

In other words, Edmonton's rapid growth has been occurring since the 2001 Census and is forecast to continue. However, the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act stipulates that the next Commission is to be appointed no sooner than 8 years after the appointment of this Commission. Therefore, in the next eight years, Edmonton's population will be disproportionately larger than the figures in the Commission's report indicate, thus further diluting Edmontonians' votes in the next two elections and further diminishing Edmonton's voice in the Legislative Assembly.

**REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION**: The concept of representation by population (one person, one vote) is fundamental to a democratic society. Voter parity should be the first consideration in determining electoral boundaries. However, the proposal that Calgary gain two seats, Edmonton lose one seat and the rest of the province lose only one seat means that the residents of Edmonton will have their right to democratic representation compromised.

The challenge is to find ways to get as close as possible to voter parity without violating anyone's right to effective representation. Inevitably, this requires additional human and financial resources to provide the physical means to ensure effective representation for all Albertans, including more rural constituency offices and staff, increased air travel, more assistance with ground travel, and high quality communications technology. The capacity to do this rests in the will of the Legislative Assembly, not in taking a division from Edmonton.

**EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION**: The definition of effective representation is vague. It would seem that the ease with which the MLA and constituents are able to have access to each other is the measurement of effective representation. However, ensuring adequate access and addressing access issues is the responsibility of Member Services, not of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

At one time access required face to face contact. Distance, area, and population density were critical factors in determining the effectiveness of representation. However, in the 21st century, access means communicating efficiently and expediently. The excellent communications technology available across Alberta, including the Supernet, makes distance, area, and population density insignificant barriers to accessibility. Where one lives or works in this province no longer determines one's ability to communicate anywhere in the world. Effectiveness of representation is no longer a function of location.

Distance from the legislature is a differentiating factor, but Alberta is blessed with a network of roads and air strips that is second to none. If there is a weak link in this network, it is the lack of adequate roadways in Edmonton and Calgary.

Although linear distance, geographic area, and low population density are viewed as potential barriers to effective representation and are therefore measured and compared, cultural distance as defined by linguistic, ethnic, religious, cultural and racial diversity is not. Neither is the social distance that is created by the fact that large cities are magnets for the physically, mentally, emotionally, or spiritually unwell. Similarly, vertical distance and high population density can be daunting because any kind of access to residents of apartment blocks and high rises is often impossible. The anonymity and social isolation of city dwellers provides another invisible distance.

These distances, unlike linear distance, cannot be bridged by technology because there must be social learning, which can come only from interpersonal contact. Although these distances make effective representation in some Edmonton constituencies extremely difficult, they were not taken into consideration in the distribution of electoral divisions.

**INCREASING URBANIZATION**: Like the rest of the world, Alberta has become increasingly urbanized. This phenomenon places great stress on those rural areas that are coping with the economic and social losses accompanying their de-population just as it does on the large urban centres as they struggle to develop the infrastructure to support their burgeoning populations.

During the hearings in rural Alberta, the Commission heard a lot about the loss of rural power in most economic, social and political arenas in the province. The remedy proposed by most presenters at these hearings is to maintain or even increase the number of rural electoral divisions. Some presenters suggested giving urban electoral divisions a +25% variance from the provincial average and rural electoral divisions a -25% variance to compensate for the imbalance in population.

While there is no question that the changing face of the province presents a major concern that must be dealt with, the urban/rural distinction serves no useful purpose in grappling with the economic, political and social challenges facing Albertans. The solution lies in public policy and not in removing a division from Edmonton. Diluting Edmonton's voice in the Legislative Assembly is not the solution to maintaining a strong rural population. In fact there is a growing body of evidence to show how regressive and counter productive such a move is.

For example, in A State of Minds: Toward a Human Capital Future for Canadians, Tom Courchene states that cities are where the policies of the federal and provincial governments most visibly come into play - policies related to health care, education, immigration, and trade and investment. He says that more than ever, these governments must look through an urban lens to see how well their policies are working.

Anne Golden, the president and Chief Executive Officer of the Conference Board of Canada told the Toronto City Summit on June 26, 2002 that "globalization and the knowledge and information revolution have greatly enhanced the position and importance of cities...."In the July 24, 2002 edition of The Edmonton Journal, Golden also says," We need to take a closer look at the plight of Canadian cities. Canadian cities are charged not only with the basic business of city-building - roads, transit and other infrastructure required by modern economies - but also must shoulder a large portion of the responsibility for various social programs... A consensus about the need for change is developing, and it is characterized by a deepening understanding of the pivotal role of cities in the dynamics of innovation."

In his presentation to the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Dr. Roger Gibbins, President and CEO of Canada West Foundation reiterated this point of view. He talked about the need to recognize the role of cities in the global economy, pointing out that:

- cities drive the new, knowledge-based economy which is central to the well-being of this province,
- cities attract immigration, which is vitally important to provide the human capital necessary to compete in the global economy,
- cities are where national and international corporations choose to locate based on the quality of life offered in those cities.

Dr. Gibbins stated that "all Albertans stand to gain from an urban strategy that enhances the competitive position of the province's major cities in the new global economy." He went on to say, "I would argue, therefore, that the Electoral Boundaries Commission should recognize both the urban growth to date and the urban growth to come ... It should recommend that urban voters bring their demographic weight to bear in the Legislative Assembly, thereby ensuring that the Assembly reflects and responds to the province's new urban agenda... I would recommend that the Electoral Boundaries Commission should embrace rather than resist Alberta's new urban reality, and thereby play a role in enhancing the province's competitive position... The Electoral Boundaries Commission should embrace the new urban realities, enhance urban representation in the Legislative Assembly, and then, but only then, empower representatives from low-density constituencies through reducing the numerical size of their constituencies."

Dr. Gibbins was not talking only about Calgary. To ignore the role of Edmonton in the changing economy by removing an electoral division and diminishing that city's voice in the Legislative Assembly is to lack the vision and flexibility demanded by the realities of the 21st Century.

WHAT THE NUMBERS DO NOT SAY: The recommendations of the Electoral Boundaries Commission are based on a precise interpretation of the legislation and pertinent court decisions, with little visionary latitude. Exchanging three electoral divisions north of Red Deer for three electoral divisions in and around Calgary recognizes neither the geographic size nor the economic explosion of the top two-thirds of the province. Similarly, focusing on the numbers disregards the fact that Edmonton is the economic and social hub of the northern two-thirds of the province, extending from Red Deer to the Northwest Territories border and beyond.

Edmonton is the capital city, the seat of government, the gateway to the North, and the magnet site for health care, education, employment, recreation, and commerce for the major part of the province. Residents from Red Deer north to the Territories and beyond depend on Edmonton for all of these services, some within a 100 km. radius on a daily basis, others intermittently as the need arises. Government decisions affecting the central and northern part of Alberta have an impact on Edmonton, and Edmonton's voice in the Legislature must be strong enough to influence these decisions.

Edmonton, with the most diversified business base in the province, including knowledge- based industries, has one of the fastest growing economies in the country. This benefits the whole province. Growth in the metropolitan area surrounding Edmonton is largely the result of Edmonton's rapid economic development. Similarly, the foundation of much of the economic activity and consequent population growth in the northern part of the province is generated, supported and facilitated in Edmonton. Removing an electoral division from Edmonton fails to acknowledge the major role Edmonton plays in the economic success and social growth of this province.

Not one presenter at the Commission hearings in Edmonton suggested that Edmonton should lose a division. Even in the rest of the province, there were very few presenters who singled out Edmonton to lose a division. However, what we did hear many times in rural Alberta is that the electoral boundaries process should be about people and not about numbers.

The people of Edmonton should not be penalized because their city did not grow as fast as Calgary prior to the 2001 Census. They should not be the victims of timing, circumstance, or rigid adherence to a numerical doctrine.

What the numbers do not say expresses the truth far more accurately and fairly than what they do say. Therefore, notwithstanding the arguments put forth in the interim report of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission, Edmonton should retain 19 electoral divisions.

Dated at Edmonton, Alberta, this 9th day of September, 2002.

Bauni Mackay, Member

## Appendix C ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ACT Chapter E-3

HER MAJESTY, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, enacts as follows:

#### Definition

1 In this Act, "Commission" means an Electoral Boundaries Commission appointed pursuant to section 2.

1990 cE-4.01 s1

#### Part 1

#### **Electoral Boundaries Commissions**

#### Electoral Boundaries Commission

**2(1)** From time to time as required by this Act, an Electoral Boundaries Commission is to be appointed consisting of

(a) a chair appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council,

- (i) who must be one of the following:
- (ii) the Ethics Commissioner;

(iii) the Auditor General;

(iv) the president of a post-secondary educational

(v) institution in Alberta;

(vi) a judge or retired judge of any court in Alberta;

(vii) a person whose stature and qualifications are, in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, similar to those of the persons referred to in subclauses (i) to (iv),

(b) 2 persons, who are not members of the Legislative Assembly, appointed by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly on the nomination of the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition in consultation with the leaders of the other opposition parties represented in the Legislative Assembly, and

(c) 2 persons, who are not members of the Legislative Assembly, appointed by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly on the nomination of the President of the Executive Council.

(2) The Chief Electoral Officer is to provide advice, information and assistance to the Commission.

(3) With respect to the persons appointed under subsection (1)(b), one must be resident in a city and the other resident outside a city at the time of their appointment.

(4) With respect to the persons appointed under subsection (1)(c), one must be resident in a city and the other resident outside a city at the time of their appointment.

(5) Persons appointed under subsection (1) must be Canadian citizens, residents of Alberta and at least 18 years of age.

1990 cE-4.01 s2;1995 c10 s2

#### Function

3 The function of a Commission is to review the existing electoral boundaries established under the Electoral divisions Act and to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly as to the area, boundaries and names of the electoral divisions of Alberta in accordance with the rules set out in Part 2.

1990 cE-4.01 s3;1995 c10 s3

#### Remuneration

**4(1)** The members of a Commission may be paid the remuneration prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for their services on the Commission.
(2) The members of a Commission may be paid their reasonable travelling and living expenses while away from their ordinary place of residence in the course of their duties as members at the rates the Lieutenant Governor in Council prescribes.

1990 cE-4.01 s4

### Time of appointment

5(1) A Commission is to be appointed on or before June 30, 2002.

(2) Subsequent Commissions are to be appointed during the first session of the Legislature following every 2nd general election after the appointment of the last Commission.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), if less than 8 years has elapsed since the appointment of the last Commission, the Commission is to be appointed

(a) no sooner than 8 years, and

(b) no later than 10 years

after the appointment of the last Commission.

RSA 2000 cE-3 s5;2001 c23 s3

### **Report to Speaker**

**6(1)** The Commission shall, after considering any representations to it and within 7 months of the date on which the Commission is appointed, submit to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly a report that shall set out the area, boundaries and names of the proposed electoral divisions and reasons for the proposed boundaries of the proposed electoral divisions.

(2) On receipt of the report, the Speaker shall make the report public and publish the Commission's proposals in The Alberta Gazette as soon as possible.

(3) If the office of Speaker is vacant, the report shall be submitted to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, who shall comply with subsection (2).

1990 cE-4.01 s6;1995 c10 s5

### Public hearings

- 7(1) The Commission must hold public hearings both
  - (a) before its report is submitted to the Speaker, and
  - (b) after its report has been made public,

at the places and times it considers appropriate to enable representations to be made by any person as to the area and boundaries of any proposed electoral division.

(2) The Commission shall give reasonable public notice of the time, place and purpose of any public hearings held by it.

1990 cE-4.01 s7;1993 c2 s8

### Amendment of report

8(1) The Commission may, after considering any further representations made to it and within 5 months of the date it submitted its report, submit to the Speaker a final report.

(2) On receipt of the report, the Speaker shall make it public and publish it in The Alberta Gazette.

(3) If the office of Speaker is vacant, the report shall be submitted to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, who shall comply with subsection (2).

1990 cE-4.01 s8;1995 c10 s6

### **Commission report**

**9** If there is more than one report submitted under section 6 or 8, the report of a majority of the members of the Commission is the report of the Commission, but if there is no majority, the report of the chair is the report of the Commission.

1995 c10 s7

### **Report to Assembly**

10 After the Commission has complied with sections 6 to 8, the final report of the Commission shall,

(a) if the Legislative Assembly is sitting when the report is submitted, be laid before the Assembly immediately, or

(b) if the Legislative Assembly is not then sitting, be laid before the Assembly within 7 days after the beginning of the next sitting.

1990 cE-4.01 s9;1995 c10 s8

### New electoral divisions

**11(1)** If the Assembly, by resolution, approves or approves with alterations the proposals of the Commission, the Government shall, at the same session, introduce a Bill to establish new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution.

(2) The Bill shall be stated to come into force on Proclamation and, if enacted, shall be proclaimed in force before the holding of the next general election.

1990 cE-4.01 s10

### Part 2

### **Redistribution Rules**

### Population

**12(1)** In this Part, "population" means, subject to subsection (2), the population of Alberta as provided in the most recent decennial census of population referred to in section 19(3) of the Statistics Act (Canada), from which the population of all proposed electoral divisions is available, plus the population on Indian reserves that were not included in the census, as provided by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (Canada).

(2) If, in the opinion of the Commission, there is some other province-wide census that is more recent than the decennial census of population referred to in section 19(3) of the Statistics Act (Canada), from which the population of all proposed electoral divisions is available, the population of Alberta for the purposes of this Part is to be determined

(a) by that province-wide census of population, and

(b) with respect to the population on Indian reserves that are not included in the census, by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (Canada).

1990 cE-4.01 s12;1993 c2 s10;1995 c10 s9

### **Electoral divisions**

13 The Commission is to divide Alberta into 83 proposed electoral divisions.

1990 cE-4.01 s13;1995 c10 s10

### Relevant considerations

14 In determining the area to be included in and in fixing the boundaries of the proposed electoral divisions, the Commission, subject to section 15, may take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but shall take into consideration

(a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,

(b) scarcity and density of population,

(c) common community interests and community organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Metis settlements,

(d) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary,

- (e) wherever possible, the existing municipal boundaries,
- (f) the number of municipalities and other local authorities,
- (g) geographical features, including existing road systems, and
- (h) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

1990 cE-4.01 s16;1993 c2 s12;1995 c10 s12

### **Population of Electoral Divisions**

**15(1)** The population of a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25% above nor more than 25% below the average population of all the proposed electoral divisions.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), in the case of no more than 4 of the proposed electoral divisions, if the Commission is of the opinion that at least 3 of the following criteria exist in a proposed electoral division, the proposed electoral division may have a population that is as much as 50% below the average population of all the proposed electoral divisions:

(a) the area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 20,000 square kilometres or the

total surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15,000 square kilometres;

(b) the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres;

(c) there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people;

(d) the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Metis settlement;

(e) the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the Province of Alberta.

(3) For the purpose of subsection (2)(c), The Municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town. 1990 cE-4.01 s17;1993 c2 s13

### Appendix D EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE 2002 YUKON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Reprinted with permission of Elections Yukon

### part ii: CONSIDERATIONS

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Section 3 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (the "Charter") states:

> Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.

### Legal Precedent

The Commission reviewed the relevant cases. The first Canadian court case to consider the

constitutionality of electoral boundaries was *Dixon* v. *Attorney General of British Columbia*, decided by the Supreme Court of British Columbia in 1989. *Dixon* concluded that the "right to vote" in section 3 of the *Charter* gives rise to constitutional limits on the unequal distribution of population between electoral districts. While the Court decided that section 3 of the *Charter* did

not require absolute equality of voting power it did find that "relative equality of voting power is

fundamental to the right to vote."

The *Dixon* case also concluded that deviations from "absolute parity" should be permitted, but only those "which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populous as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the populous and geographic factors

within the territory governed."

While *Dixon* approved of setting limits on the extent to which the province of British Columbia could deviate from equality of voting power, it stated, "In determining the amount of deviation

permissible, deference must be accorded to the legislature." The maximum deviation of plus or minus 25 percent recommended by the 1987 British Columbia Electoral Boundaries Commission (which had not yet been acted upon) was noted by the Court to be tolerable "given the vast and

sparsely populated regions to be found in British Columbia." However, as the subsequent British Columbia Electoral Boundaries Commission remarked in its Report of December 3, 1998 "...nothing in the *Dixon* decision precludes an argument that, in appropriate circumstances, a deviation greater

than plus or minus 25 percent may be justified." As that Report noted, the only general proposition laid down in *Dixon* is that deviations from voter parity must be justified.

A percentage deviation occurs when the number of electors in an electoral district is compared with [viii] the electoral quotient. The electoral quotient is the average number of electors per electoral district, commonly obtained by dividing the number of electors by the total number of electoral [ix]

districts.

In 1991, the Supreme Court of Canada dealt with the issue of electoral boundaries in Reference Re:

*Prov. Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)* (the "*Saskatchewan Reference*"). This case remains the leading Canadian authority on the constitutionality of electoral boundaries. It established that "... the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the *Charter* is not equality of voting power *per se*, but the right

to "effective representation"..." The majority decision stated:

Each citizen is entitled to be *represented* in Government. Representation comprehends the idea of having a voice in the deliberations of government as well as the idea of the right to bring one's grievances and concerns to the attention of one's government representative; as noted in *Dixon* ... elected representatives function in two roles - legislative and what has been termed the "ombudsman role."

What are the conditions of effective representation? The first is relative parity of voting power. ...

But parity of voting power, though of prime importance, is not the only factor to be taken into account in ensuring effective representation. ...

Notwithstanding the fact that the value of a citizen's vote should not be unduly diluted, it is a practical fact that effective representation cannot often be achieved without taking into account countervailing factors.

First, absolute parity is impossible...

Secondly, such relative parity as may be possible of achievement may

prove undesirable because it has the effect of detracting from the primary goal of effective representation. Factors like geography, community history, community interests and minority representation may need to be taken into account ...

It emerges therefore that deviations from absolute voter parity may be justified on the grounds of practical impossibility or the provision of more effective representation. Beyond this, dilution of one citizen's vote as compared with another's should not be countenanced. I adhere to the proposition in Dixon ... that "only those deviations should be admitted which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populace as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the populace and geographic factors within the territory governed."

The pre-eminence given by the Supreme Court of Canada to effective representation over voter parity is also evident from the following passages. First, where the majority said that the goal of enshrining the right to vote in our written constitution:

> ... was to recognize the right affirmed in this country since the time of our first Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, to effective representation in a system which gives due weight to voter parity

> > [xiii]

but admits other considerations where necessary.

And later, where the majority stated:

In the final analysis, the value and principles animating a free and democratic society are arguably best served by a definition that

[xiv] places effective representation at the heart of the right to vote.

In the Saskatchewan Reference the electoral boundaries were created by the Representation Act,

[xv] 1989 (Saskatchewan). That Act was based upon the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act [XVI]

(Saskatchewan) , which specified certain permissible maximum deviations from the average number of voters in each constituency. The permitted deviations were up to 25 percent for the 64 southern Saskatchewan ridings and as high as 50 percent for the two northern ridings. The Supreme Court of Canada considered both of these maximum deviations constitutionally acceptable. In particular, no issue was taken either before the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court of Canada with the special treatment for the northern ridings, given the sparse population and the [xvii]

difficulty of communication in the area.

The majority of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Saskatchewan Reference also spoke of the need for courts to give deference to the legislature in setting permissible deviations:

> It is important at the outset to remind ourselves of the proper role of courts in determining whether a legislative solution to a complex problem runs afoul of the Charter. This court has repeatedly affirmed that the courts must be cautious in interfering unduly in decisions that involve the balancing of conflicting policy considerations. ... These considerations led me to suggest in Dixon, ... that "the courts ought not to interfere with the legislature's electoral map under s.3 of the Charter unless it appears that reasonable persons applying the appropriate principles ... could not have

[xviii]

set the electoral boundaries as they exist"

Since the Saskatchewan Reference, the Alberta Court of Appeal has rendered two decisions on electoral boundaries. The first was in 1991, entitled Reference re: Electoral Boundaries Commission Act (the "1991 Alberta Reference"). The second was in 1994, entitled Reference re: Electoral divisions Statutes Amendment Act, 1993 (the "1994 Alberta Reference").

The 1991 Alberta Reference examined a 50 percent deviation limit for up to five percent of the electoral districts in the province which satisfied specific statutory criteria (the details of which were attached as an appendix to the case) focusing on their relative remoteness and sparse population. The Alberta Court of Appeal unanimously accepted that as reasonable and stated:

> We think we can take notice that Alberta contains sparsely populated areas that are also a long distance both from other populated areas and <u>[xxi]</u>

the legislature itself.

The 25 percent deviation permitted in the remaining ridings was found to be acceptable, where [xxii]

The Court also addressed the matter of deference to the legislature in setting necessary. electoral boundaries and said:

> We must therefore ask ourselves whether a boundary rule or decision is clearly wrong. In other words, we should not interfere unless a rule or decision is demonstrably unjustified, palpably wrong, or manifestly

[xxiii] unreasonable.

In the 1994 Alberta Reference, another panel of the Alberta Court of Appeal examined specific statutory boundaries. The unanimous Court made the following statement emphasizing the need to justify deviations:

> It is one thing to say that effective representation of a specific community requires an electoral division of a below-average population. That approach invites specific reasons, and specific facts. The Constitution of Canada is sufficiently flexible to permit disparity to serve geographical and demographic reality.

> It is guite another to say that any electoral division, for no specific reason, may be smaller than average. In the 1991 Reference, we affirmed the first, not the second. We affirm again that there is no permissible variation if there is no justification. And the onus to establish justification

> > [xxiv]

lies with those who suggest the variation.

The case of *MacKinnon* v. *Prince Edward Island* was decided by the Prince Edward Island Supreme Court in 1993, in the interval between the two Alberta reference cases. The Court found the Election Act (P.E.I.) contravened section 3 of the Charter as it legislated unacceptable disparities between the numbers of voters in a district and the provincial average, ranging between 115 percent over the average and 63 percent under the average. Twelve districts were in excess of 40 percent above or below the provincial average. The Court referred to the Saskatchewan *Reference* and commented that the case:

> ...does not resolve the question of how far electoral districts can be moved away from strict equality before Charter problems are encountered...[the majority] did not comment specifically on the outer limits of variation that

[xxvi]

However, the P.E.I. Supreme Court ruled that the deviations in issue before it were "far out of [xxvii]

proportion to any legitimate regional concerns" and therefore contrary to the Charter.

In 1998, the case of *Charlottetown* (*City*) v. *Prince Edward Island* came before the Prince Edward [xxviii]

Island Court of Appeal. At issue was new legislation creating 27 electoral districts which provided for an electoral population variance of plus or minus 25 percent. The Court of Appeal held that there was "considerable acceptance in Canada" for this level of deviation and that it did not violate section 2 of the *Charter*. The Court once again emphasized that in determining the

violate section 3 of the *Charter*. The Court once again emphasized that in determining the amount of variance permissible, "... the legislative process must be allowed to operate without undue judicial interference." An application for leave to appeal *Charlottetown* to the Supreme

Court of Canada was dismissed without reasons on December 2, 1999.

The most recent case on the constitutionality of electoral districts arose from the creation of the new northern territory of Nunavut on April 1, 1999. The Northwest Territories, which previously had 24 electoral districts, was to be divided into two parts: Nunavut in the east (previously with 10 seats) and the remaining Northwest Territories in the west (previously with 14 seats). An electoral boundaries commission for the remaining Northwest Territories was formed in 1998 in anticipation of this event. It recommended two additional seats for the voters in Yellowknife, for a total of 16 seats in the remaining Northwest Territories. The Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly rejected that recommendation and enacted amendments to the *Legislative Assembly and Executive* 

*Council Act* (N.W.T), providing for only 14 seats. That legislation was challenged in the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories by individual voters claiming a violation of their right to vote under section 3 of the *Charter*.

The Court gave its judgment on March 5, 1999 in the case of *Friends of Democracy* v. *Northwest* 

*Territories* (Attorney General) ("*Friends of Democracy*"). The Court held that the amendments violated section 3 of the *Charter*. It specifically addressed the over-representation of the non-urban electoral districts and stated:

... the right to vote guaranteed by section 3 of the *Charter* is more than merely the right to be registered as a voter and to cast a ballot on election day. In times past, there were residents of the Northwest Territories who were denied all right to vote in elections to the House of Commons and in elections to the legislature of the Northwest Territories. These denials of right have long since been corrected by legislation. Canadians, through Parliament and their provincial and territorial legislatures, have chosen to tolerate a measure of over-representation from thinly populated and relatively remote regions in preference to any such complete denial of

[xxxiv] legislative representation from those regions.

However, the over-representation of the more remote regions of the Northwest Territories was not the issue in that case. Rather the question before the Northwest Territories Supreme Court was "whether the under-representation of voters at Yellowknife, in elections to the Legislative

Assembly, is in violation of section 3 of the *Charter*." This distinction was further elaborated by the Court as follows:

Considering the factors of geography, community history and interests, language differences, difficulties in communication with remote communities and minority representation, not to mention the normal

### Final Report - Appendices

difficulties and expenses of travel between the seat of government at Yellowknife and the various communities outside Yellowknife, I am satisfied that there probably is justification within the ambit of section 3 of the *Charter* for the present over-representation of the electoral districts whose percentage variations in population are below the average. On the other hand, I am unable to find similar justification for the gross under-representation of those other districts where the variations are markedly (25% or more) above the average. This gross under-representation must constitute a clear violation of section 3 of [xxxvi]

the *Charter* in the absence of due justification.

The challenged legislation in *Friends of Democracy* did not specify a maximum permissible deviation. The Court failed to explain why it accepted 25 percent as the threshold, other than to comment on the lack of justification in those instances where 25 percent was exceeded in the urban [xxxvii]

electoral districts.

The case also commented on effective representation within the City of Yellowknife:

Much was made by counsel for the Respondent and Interveners of the apparently dominant position of Yellowknife within the Northwest Territories, being as it is the seat of government for these Territories and the pre-eminent territorial centre of private commercial and public government business ...

There is no real room for doubt as to the much greater access to their elected representatives in the Legislative Assembly by voters at Yellowknife than elsewhere in the Northwest Territories. Nor is there any question but that access to officials in the government at many levels is generally less of a problem at Yellowknife than elsewhere in these Territories. The "ombudsman role" of elected representatives for districts at Yellowknife is consequently likely to be more effective and less onerous [xxxviii]

than for representatives of outlying districts across the Territories.

The Supreme Court of Canada, in August 1998, had occasion to quote the Saskatchewan Reference

in its unanimous decision in *Reference re: Secession of Quebec* as follows: "[T]he Canadian tradition", the majority of this Court held in [the *Saskatchewan Reference*] ... is "one of evolutionary democracy moving in uneven steps toward the goal of universal suffrage and more effective representation".

In November 1999, the Newfoundland Supreme Court commented on the Saskatchewan Reference,

in the case of *Baker v. Burin School Board* as follows:

... the case focuses on the purpose of [section 3 of the *Charter*] as being designed to ensure "effective representation" while at the same time recognizing that equality of voting may not always be achieved where factors such as geography, community history, community interests, and minority representation require consideration to ensure that legislative assemblies effectively represent their constituents.

This Commission is bound to follow the principles in the Supreme Court of Canada *Saskatchewan Reference* decision. While the Commission is not bound to follow the decisions it reviewed from

other courts, we have been guided where those authorities appeared persuasive. The Commission paid particular attention to the circumstances influencing those decisions which involved northern and sparsely populated electoral districts.

### **Demographic Information**

Section 419(a) of the *Elections Act* mandates that the Commission take into account "the density and rate of growth of the population of any area". Section 419(d) requires the Commission to consider "available census data and other demographic information". The Commission was informed that the results of the federal census taken this spring would not be available prior to the deadline for completing our final report. The most recent census information available is the Statistics Canada Census of 1996, which the Commission reviewed for background purposes. We concluded that this information is outdated.

Section 419(e) of the *Elections Act* requires the Commission to take into account "the number of electors in the electoral districts appearing on the most recent official lists of electors". Previous Yukon electoral district boundaries commissions relied upon the number of eligible electors rather than population figures. The Commission decided to use the most accurate and up-to-date information: the numbers of electors from the 2000 Yukon general election.

### **Deviation Guideline**

The *Elections Act* does not refer to a particular percentage deviation.

The Yukon Electoral District Boundaries Commission Report, 1991 (the "1991 Yukon Report") noted:

... I have decided that the range of plus or minus 25 percent should serve as a guide in framing my recommendations for the Yukon's electoral boundaries. However, where necessary, I was prepared to consider a

greater deviation in order to achieve effective representation.

Subsequent to the Dixon decision, a deviation of plus or minus 25 percent has been generally

accepted in Canada, and has been referred to as "the Canadian standard." However, we agree with the 1998 British Columbia Electoral Boundaries District Commission that nothing in *Dixon* precludes an argument that a deviation greater than plus or minus 25 percent may be justified in appropriate circumstances. After its review of the relevant cases, that Commission noted:

... Canadian court decisions have established that there are limits to the degree to which a departure from representation by population is acceptable under the Constitution. At the same time, the courts have endorsed such deviations from the electoral quota as are necessary in

order to ensure that voters are effectively represented.

The Saskatchewan Reference did not fix 25 percent as a constitutional threshold. Rather, the legislation considered by the Court specified 25 percent as the maximum deviation for the southern part of the province. In that case, both the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada concluded that deviations greater than 25 percent for the two northern ridings were constitutionally acceptable for achieving effective representation, given the regional factors such as the scarcity of population and the difficulty of communication. The majority of the Supreme Court of Canada adhered to the proposition asserted in *Dixon* that "... only those deviations should be admitted which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populace as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the populace and geographic

factors within the territory governed."

This Commission has decided to apply the plus or minus 25 percent deviation as a guideline.

### **Special Circumstances**

Section 419(f) of the *Elections Act* requires the Commission to take into account "any special circumstances relating to the existing electoral districts." "Special circumstances" are not defined in the *Elections Act*. The *Saskatchewan Reference* spoke about some of the factors which may justify departure from absolute voter parity in the pursuit of more effective representation. That decision made it clear that the list of factors that may need to be taken into account is not closed, however those identified were:

- § geography
- **§** community history
- **§** community interests
- **§** minority representation.

### [xlv]

The Friends of Democracy case added to this list:

- **§** language differences
- s difficulties in communication with remote communities
- s travel expenses.

The 1991 Yukon Report under "Special circumstances of the Yukon" states:

The entire region outside Whitehorse is sparsely populated and ... no other Canadian city dominates its province or territory to the extent that Whitehorse dominates the Yukon. The disproportionate representation of rural areas in the existing legislature was explicitly intended to offset this feature of population distribution. Given relatively less developed municipal organization of much of rural Yukon, MLAs from those areas contend with a broader range of responsibilities toward their constituents than is common elsewhere in Canada. Also, Yukoners are used to intensive representation and expect to be able to meet with their representatives,

face-to-face, on a regular basis.

This Commission acknowledges that similar circumstances exist today.

### Number of Electoral Districts

Section 409 of the *Elections Act* explicitly mandates the Commission to review and make proposals

as to the number of electoral districts. Section 9(2) of the Yukon Act provides for a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 20 members of the Legislative Assembly.

The Commission considered the potential consequences of having an odd or even number of seats in the Legislative Assembly. Odd and even numbers of electoral districts are found in other jurisdictions in Canada. The Yukon has experienced both circumstances at different periods in its history. We concluded that there are offsetting advantages and disadvantages to both, which result in the issue having no influence on our proposals.

### Timing of the Next Review

The Commission has kept in mind throughout its deliberations that section 411 of the *Elections Act* provides for another electoral boundaries review within six to eight years.

### **Principles and Other Factors**

In addition to following the mandatory considerations set out in section 419 of the *Elections Act*, the Commission was guided by the principles of effective representation and voter parity. The Commission also considered geographic boundaries, the role of the Legislative Assembly, and the electoral quotient.

This copy is for archival purposes only. Please contact the publisher for the original version

### Effective Representation

In the *Saskatchewan Reference*, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the purpose of the right to vote enshrined in section 3 of the *Charter* is the right to effective representation and not equality of voting power *per se*. Representation includes having a voice in the deliberations of government as well as the right to raise issues with elected representatives. Effective representation is "the

[xlviii] primary goal" in exercising the right to vote. Even relative voter parity may be undesirable, if it detracts from effective representation. Factors such as regional issues, geography and those previously mentioned under "Special Circumstances", may be taken into account to achieve this fundamental goal.

### Voter Parity

The *Dixon* decision examined the historical development of voting rights in Canada and recognized that absolute equality of voting power has never been required in Canada - that some degree of deviation is permissible. The case concluded that it is relative equality of voting power which underlies our system of representational democracy and is fundamental to the right to vote enshrined in section 3 of the *Charter*. The Supreme Court of Canada in the *Saskatchewan Reference* subsequently stated that the pursuit of relative parity of voting power, while important in our representative democracy, must meet the primary goal of effective representation. The Commission has sought relative voter parity.

### Geographic Boundaries

The Commission has attempted to simplify and rationalize electoral boundaries, wherever possible, on the basis of physical geography. Section 419(b) of the *Elections Act* requires us to take into account the "physical characteristics" of the electoral districts. Our intention is that the boundaries will be logical delineations of electoral districts.

### Role of the Legislative Assembly

The relative difficulty faced by some MLAs in serving their constituents, particularly in electoral districts which are vast and sparsely populated, received our full consideration. The Commission balanced the weight given this factor with the knowledge that the Legislative Assembly is able to assist members in meeting these responsibilities.

### **Electoral Quotient**

An electoral quotient is the average number of electors per electoral district. The plus or minus 25 percent guideline is measured against the quotient. A common approach in Canada is to calculate the electoral quotient by dividing the total number of electors by the total number of electoral

[xlix] districts. This approach is not exclusive. The Saskatchewan *Constituency Boundaries Act*, 1993 employs a different method in calculating the electoral quotient. It removes the two northern ridings and their populations from its calculations. The electoral quotient for the remainder of the province is determined by using only the 56 remaining ridings and the population of those ridings. This approach is in keeping with the recognition in the Saskatchewan Reference that the two northern ridings are justified, as they are vast with a relatively small and dispersed population.

[[<sup>I]</sup> (1989), 59 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 247 (B.C.S.C.) (McLachlin C.J.)

ibid. at 266

ibid. at 265

```
ibid. at 267
```

[<u>V</u>] *ibid. at* 266

[vi]

<sup>•</sup> *ibid.* at 283

```
[vii]
```

<sup>1</sup> British Columbia Electoral Boundaries Commission Report, December 3, 1998, at page 17

### [viii]

Deviation can also be determined by comparing the population of an electoral district with the average population per electoral district, sometimes referred to as "the equal population norm".

### [ix]

The Commission used a slightly different approach to calculate the electoral quotient, which is detailed in Part IV, "Establishing the Electoral Quotient".

```
[X]
   [1991] 2 S.C.R. 158 (McLachlin J.)
[xi]
   ibid. at 183
[Xii]
    ibid. at 183-185
[xiii]
    ibid. at 186
[xiv]
    ibid. at 188
[XV]
    S.S. 1989-90, R-20.2
[xvi]
    S.S. 1986-87-88, c. E.6-1
[XVII]
     Saskatchewan Reference, supra, at 190 and 197
[xviii]
      ibid. at 189
[xix]
    (1991), 86 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 447 (Alta. C.A.) ("1991 Alberta Reference")
[XX]
    (1994), 119 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 1, (Alta. C.A.) ("1994 Alberta Reference")
[xxi]
     1991 Alberta Reference, supra. at 453
[xxii]
     ibid. at 454
[xxiii]
      ibid. at 452
[xxiv]
      1994 Alberta Reference, supra, at 12
[XXV]
     (1993), 101 D.L.R. (4th) 362 (P.E.I. S.C.)
[xxvi]
      ibid. at 369-370
[xxvii]
      ibid. at 386
```

[xxviii] (1998), 168 D.L.R. (4 <sup>th</sup> ) 79 (P.E.I. C.A.)
ibid. at 98
ibid. at 98
[xxxi] S.C.C. Bulletin, 1999, p. 1913
[xxxii] R.S.N.W.T. 1988, c. L-5
[xxxiii] (1999), 171 D.L.R. (4 <sup>th</sup> ) 551 (N.W.T. S.C.)
[xxxiv] <i>ibid.</i> at 557
[xxxv] <i>ibid.</i> at 558
ibid. at 560
[xxxvii] <i>ibid.</i> at 568
[xxxviii] <i>ibid.</i> at 564-565
[xxxix] [1998] 2 S.C.R. 217 at 254
[xl] (1999), 184 Nfld. & P.E.I. R. 145 (NFTD)
[xli] Yukon Electoral Boundaries Commission Report, 1991, at page 55
[xlii] The Nunavut Electoral Boundaries Commission Report, 1997, p. 17
[xliii] British Columbia Electoral Boundaries Commission Report, <i>supra</i> . at p. 21
[xliv] Saskatchewan Reference, supra. at 185
Friends of Democracy, supra. at 560
[xlvi] 1991 Yukon Report, <i>supra.</i> at 42
[xlvii] R.S.C. 1985 c. Y-2
Saskatchewan Reference, supra. at 184
[xlix] <i>The Constituency Boundaries Act, 1993</i> , S.S. 1993, c. 27-1, as amended by S.S. 1997, c. 31

### Appendix E TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MATRIX

### MATRIX SCORING

To derive the scores used in the matrix, an average (mean) value was calculated for each variable. From the average score, increments of +/-10%, +/-20% and +/-30% were found for each variable. For the majority<sup>\*</sup> of the variables, the following scores relate to the calculated means and increments:

Score	Means/Increments
+3	≥30%
+2	≥20%
+1	≥10%
0	>-10% to <10%
-1	≤-10%
-2	≤-20%
-3	≤-30%

\*The Population Density variable used a reverse scoring methodology where -3  $^3$  30%...3  $\pm$  -30% (see "Matrix Variables" for details).

Using this scoring system, a higher score (+1, +2, +3) indicates a greater degree of difficulty in representation. A lower score (-1, -2, -3) indicates a lesser degree of difficulty in representation. An average score is deemed to be between -10% and 10% of the average and is given the value of 0.

On the matrices, the "Total" score reflects the overall difficulty in effective representation for each electoral division based on the six matrix variables. The lowest possible score is -18 (least difficult to represent), and the highest possible score is 18 (most difficult to represent). The following chart breaks down the score ranges into 5 categories of difficulty for effective representation based on equal increments from the average score category:

Degree of Difficulty	Total Score Range
Most difficult	13 to 18
More difficult	7 to 12
Average	-6 to 6
Less difficult	-7 to -12
Least difficult	-13 to -18

### **MATRIX VARIABLES**

As mentioned in the report, six variables were used as measures for the matrix. The following describes each of the variables with reference to methodology, data source and technical merit.

### 1. <u>Area</u>

The geographic area of each electoral division was reported in square kilometres as determined by Alberta Finance, Statistics using MapInfo® geographic referencing software, based on the standard geography files for Alberta provided by Statistics Canada, Geography Division.

The larger the area, the greater the difficulty in representing constituents, resulting in a higher score.

### 2. Population Density

Population density is the number of people per square kilometre. Calculations are based on the geographic area figures for each electoral division, as well as population numbers from the 2001

Census of Canada. Population figures have been adjusted to include Aboriginal population counts from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada for those Indian Reserves missed in the 2001 Census.

When the population displays a higher level of concentration for a given land area, it will result in a lower score. A higher population density indicates a lesser degree of difficulty in representation.

### 3. Rural/Urban Ratio

This ratio compares the population in each electoral division living in rural areas versus those in urban areas, represented as a ratio per 100 urban population. An urban centre is defined as an incorporated municipality having 1,000 people or more. Population data were derived from the 2001 Census of Canada for the calculations.

The more "ruralized" an electoral division, the greater the difficulty in representation (example: Athabasca-Wabasca has 759 rural constituents for every 100 urban constituents. The resulting rural/urban (r/u) ratio value is 759 which is more than 30% *above* the mean and results in a score of +3). Inversely, the more "urbanized" an electoral division, the less difficult it is to represent, thus is assigned a lower score (example: Calgary-Bow has 0 rural constituents for every 100 urban constituents. The resulting r/u ratio value is 0 which is more than 30% *below* the mean and results in a score of -3).

### 4. "Dependant" Population Proportion

This variable measures the proportion of the population who are "dependant", or not in the labour force age group compared to the total population. "Dependants" include children (14 years of age and under) and seniors (65 years and older). The age data used for this variable came from the 2001 Census of Canada.

The higher the number of "dependants" compared to the overall population, the higher the "Dependant Proportion", which in turn is given a higher score and considered more difficult to represent.

### 5. Elected/Appointed Bodies

The number of elected or appointed bodies includes: municipalities, health regions, school divisions (public and separate), Indian Reserves, and Metis Settlements. Data were obtained from Alberta Finance, Statistics' Geographic Information System.

The higher the number of elected/appointed bodies present, the greater the difficulty in effective representation, resulting in a higher score.

### 6. Distance to Legislature

The geographic centre of each electoral division was found with the aid of MapInfo<sup>®</sup> geographic referencing software. From this point a measurement of the direct distance to the Legislature was found in kilometres.

The higher the distance in kilometres from the Legislature, the more difficult it is to effectively represent constituents, resulting in a higher score.

### MATRIX SCORING SYSTEM

Below is a chart which outlines the scoring system for each Matrix. Matrix 1 refers to existing electoral divisions, while Matrix 2 refers to the recommended electoral divisions.

	Existing Electoral Divisions - Matrix 1								
		Area	Density (*Reverse)	R/U Ratio	"Dependant" Proportion	Elected Bodies	Distance		
•	%							Score	
	-30	5,568	633	37	22.03	7	139	-3	
	-20	6,363	723	43	25.18	8	158	-2	
	-10	7,159	813	48	28.32	9	178	-1	
	0	7,954	904	53	31.47	10	198	0	
	10	8,750	994	59	34.62	111	218	1	
	20	9,545	1,085	64	37.76	12	238	2	
	30	10,340	1,175	69	40.91	13	257	3	
	Mean	7,954	904	53	31.47	10	198		

\*Reverse = scores are reversed (i.e. +3 to -3 instead of -3 to +3)

<b>Recommended Electoral Divisions - Matrix 2</b>							
	Area	Density (*Reverse)	R/U Ratio	"Dependant" Proportion	Elected Bodies	Distance	
%							Score
-30	5,568	610	33	21.92	7	139	-3
-20	6,363	698	38	25.06	8	159	-2
-10	7,159	784	43	28.19	9	179	-1
0	7,954	872	48	31.32	10	199	0
10	8,750	959	52	34.45	11	219	1
20	9,545	1,046	57	37.58	12	239	2
30	10,340	1,130	62	40.72	13	259	3
Mean	7,954	872	48	31.32	10	199	

\*Reverse = scores are reversed (i.e. +3 to -3 instead of -3 to +3)

Detailed Matrices are available by clicking one of the following:

- Detailed Matrix 1 Existing Electoral Divisions
- Detailed Matrix 2 Recommended Existing Electoral Divisions

Privacy Policy and Disclaimer



## **GRANDE PRAIRIE**

PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002/2003)







**RED DEER** PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002/2003)



PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002/2003)



**ST. ALBERT** PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002/2003)



# CALGARY

PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002 / 2003)



# EDMONTON

PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS (RECOMMENDED 2002 / 2003)



BASE MAP DATA PROVIDED BY SPATIAL DATA WAREHOUSE LTD.







This copy is for archival purposes only. Please contact the publisher for the original version



### List of Presenters - First Round Public Hearings

### Calgary - May 27, 2002

**Cindy Ady** MLA, Calgary-Shaw

Rebecca Aizenman

**Dr. Loleen Berdahl** Canada West Foundation

Jay Bortnik

**Paul Breeze & Stephen Hope** Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association

**David Bronconnier** Mayor, City of Calgary

**Doug Caswell** Calgary-East PC Constituency Association

Harvey Cenaiko MLA, Calgary-Buffalo

Harry Chase

**Oscar Fech** 

**David Fryett** 

Larry Goodhope & Jack Hayden Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties

**Doug Hayes** Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association **Neil Hughes** Calgary-Buffalo PC Constituency Association

James Istvanffy

Allan Kiernan Calgary-Glenmore PC Constituency Association

**Ron Liepert** Calgary-West PC Constituency Association

### Bill Longstaff

Maureen McConaghy Calgary-West PC Constituency Association

### Shirley Milnes

Madeleine Oldershaw Fair Vote Canada

**Jo-Anne Teed** Calgary-Cross PC Constituency Association

### J.R. (Rolly) Thomas

Lorraine Weller

Sandra Wilson Calgary-Fort PC Constituency Association

### Olds - May 28, 2002

**Chris Bojda** Town of Olds

**Richard Marz** MLA, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills

**Truper McBride** Councillor, Town of Cochrane **Dorothy Moore** Mayor, Town of Didsbury

Judy Stewart Mayor, Town of Cochrane

### <u>Red Deer – May 28, 2002</u>

**Dale Barr** Mayor, Town of Rimbey

Elsie Brewin

**Melvin Butler** 

Harlan C. Hulleman

William McQuesten Mayor, Town of Lacombe

Helen Posti Rocky Mountain House PC Constituency Association

### Edmonton - May 29, 2002

Judith Axelson Edmonton-Mill Woods Liberal Constituency Association

Chris Belke Councillor, Town of Devon

### Bruno Binassi

Laurie Blakeman MLA, Edmonton-Centre

**Norma Calicott** Sherwood Park Liberal Constituency Association

Ian Crawford Riverbend Community League

**Lee Danchuck** St. Albert PC Constituency Association

### John Day

**Robert Dunseith** Edmonton-Riverview PC Constituency Association

Dave Hancock MLA, Edmonton-Whitemud

### Dr. J. Paul Johnson

**Doug King** Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan PC Constituency Association

Heather Klimchuk Edmonton-Glenora PC Constituency Association

John Kolkman New Democrats

**Don Kuchelyma** Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues

**Dean Lien** Farmers Advocate

Thomas Lo

**Brian Mason** MLA, Edmonton-Highlands

**Carolyn Machell** 

**Liliane Maisonneuve** French Canadian Association of Alberta

Julian Martin Edmonton-Strathcona PC Constituency Association

Mary O'Neill MLA, St. Albert

**Tony Ollenberger** Alberta First Party

### Albert Opstad

David J. Parker Alberta Green Party

Jerry Patsula Leduc PC Constituency Association

Dave Purewal Edmonton-Mill Creek PC Constituency Association

### Marg Stephen

**Dr. Kevin Taft** MLA, Edmonton-Riverview

Pat Vincent General Manager, Town of Beaumont

John Ward

Joe Yurkovich

### <u>St. Paul – June 3, 2002</u>

**Ray Danyluk** MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul

**Denis Ducharme** MLA, Bonnyville-Cold Lake

**Gordon Elliot** Councillor, Town of Lac La Biche

**Ray Ewaskiw** Lac La Biche & District Chamber of Commerce

Mary Anne Finley St. Paul & District Chamber of Commerce **Myron Goyan** Manager, Town of Elk Point

Phil Lane Deputy Reeve, Lakeland County

Hansa Thaleshvar Mayor, City of Cold Lake

Kathryn Wiebe Mayor, Town of Bonnyville

### Wainwright - June 3, 2002

Bob Barss Reeve, MD of Wainwright

Fritz Crone Reeve, MD of Provost

**Doug Griffiths** MLA, Wainwright

Wayne Richardson Reeve, County of Paintearth Herb Rock Mayor, Town of Coronation

Clark Steele

**Don Whittaker** Deputy Reeve, County of Vermilion River

### Drumheller – June 4, 2002

Kyle Christianson, Barry Davis & Gerald Kornelson Special Areas Board

Jack Horner

Brent Pederson Councillor, Town of Drumheller

Ross Rawlusyk Administrator, Starland County

**Terry Kuhl** Drumheller Regional Chamber of Development & Tourism

Shirley McClellan MLA, Drumheller-Chinook **Stan Schumacher** Drumheller-Chinook

PC Constituency Association

### Medicine Hat - June 4, 2002

**Ted Fisher** Cypress-Medicine Hat PC Constituency Association

### **Rob Gardner**

Lawrence Gordon Medicine Hat PC Constituency Association

**Alan Hyland** Mayor, Town of Bow Island

Mara Nesbitt

Lutz Perschon Manager, Cypress County

**Rob Renner** MLA, Medicine Hat

**Terry Riley** Medicine Hat PC Constituency Association

**Garth Vallely** Mayor, City of Medicine Hat

### Lethbridge - June 5, 2002

**Blair Barkley** Highwood PC Constituency Association

**Mike Cormican** Lethbridge-West Liberal Constituency Association

**Brian Hammond** Reeve, MD of Pincher Creek

**Ron Hierath** 

Emma Hulit Reeve, County of Warner

**Don Johnson** Councillor, MD of Taber

**Bill Laird** 

Marg Loewen Foothills-Little Bow Municipal Association

**Barry McFarland** MLA, Little Bow

**David Oseen** Reeve, County of Lethbridge

**Dr. Mark Sandilands** Lethbridge New Democrats

Floyd Smith Councillor, Cardston County

Leslie Vaala

**David White** Lethbridge-East & West PC Constituency Associations

### Wetaskiwin – June 6, 2002

Brian Austrom Administrator, County of Camrose

**Garry Dearing** Reeve, County of Wetaskiwin

**Garry Gibeault** Manager, City of Camrose

**Jim Hillaby** Reeve, County of Camrose

**LeRoy Johnson** MLA, Wetaskiwin-Camrose Larry Majeski County Manager, County of Leduc

**Norman Mayer** Mayor, City of Camrose

**Bettyanne Skagen** Battle River Rural Electrification Association

**Rob Snider** 

**Curtis Vesely** Wetaskiwin-Camrose PC Constituency Association

### <u>Westlock – June 25, 2002</u>

### **Davie Barnes**

Russell Hakes Stony Plain PC Constituency Association

Laurie Hodge Pembina Hills Regional School Division

**Doug Horner** MLA, Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert

Ken Kowalski MLA, Barrhead-Westlock

Bill Lee Deputy Reeve, County of Barrhead

Lawrence Miller Reeve, County of Barrhead

**Shirley Morie** Mayor, Town of Westlock

Ann Nagel

Ken Nagel Pembina Hills Regional School Division

George Rogers & John McGowan Alberta Urban Municipalities Association

Brian Schulz Mayor, Town of Barrhead

**Dallas Stevens** Councillor, Town of Swan Hills

**Don Tomlinson** Reeve, County of Westlock

Brad Watson Manager, Town of Swan Hills

**Garry Wetsch** Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert PC Constituency Association

### Edson – June 25, 2002

### Floyd Becker & Jim Gomuwka

West Yellowhead PC Constituency Association **Dale Johnson** Whitecourt-St. Anne PC Constituency Association

**Moe Hamdon** Mayor, Town of Drayton Valley

### <u>Slave Lake – June 26, 2002</u>

**Bernie Charette** Tallcree First Nation

Hudson Foley

**Sheila Foley** Reeve, MD of Lesser Slave Lake

**Lorraine Gislason & Edgar Koeher** Reeve & Councillor, County of Athabasca

**Dawn Konelsky & Vivien McCoy** High Prairie School Division No. 48 Mike Poulter Councillor, Town of High Prairie

**Ray Stern & Shirley Torresan-Chylerda** Mayor & Councillor, Town of Slave Lake

Ken Vanderwell Lesser Slave Lake PC Constituency Association

Allan Willier Lesser Slave Lake Indian Regional Council

### Fort McMurray - June 26, 2002

Bill Almdal

**John Rigney** Councillor Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo

### Grande Prairie – June 27, 2002

**Roy Borstad** Reeve, County of Grande Prairie

Jean Charchuk Mayor, Town of Fairview

**Dr. Darwin Eckstrom** Peace Wapiti School Division

**Gordon Graydon** MLA, Grande Prairie-Wapiti

**Richard Harpe** 

**Bryn Kulmatiki** Superintendent, Grande Prairie & District Catholic Schools

Gerald McDonald

Walter Paszkowski

**Barry Robinson** Grande Prairie-Wapiti & Smoky Liberal Constituency Associations

Tony Yelenik Reeve, MD of Greenview

### Peace River - June 27, 2002

**Tom Baldwin** Northern Alberta Development Council

**Craig Bissell** Councillor, MD of Big Lakes

Walter Doll Reeve, MD of Fairview

Daniel Dunwoody Dunvegan PC Constituency Association

Joyce Dvornek Councillor, MD of Big Lakes

**Gary Friedel** MLA, Peace River

Hector Goudreau MLA, Dunvegan

**Brian Grant** Reeve, MD of Peace

**Peter Hawryliuk** Northwestern Regional Health Authority **Carolyn Kolebaba** Reeve, MD of East Peace

**Bruce Moltzan** Peace River School Division

Helen Mussio Councillor, MD of Northern Lights

**Bruce Rutley** Dunvegan Liberal Constituency Association

Walter Sarapuk Councillor, MD of Mackenzie

Elaine Sky Chair, Peace River School Division

**Barb Spurgeon** Silver Birch Child & Family Services Authority

**Gwen Tegart** Dunvegan PC Constituency Association
## List of Submitters - First Round Written Submissions

#### Wendy Adams

Norm Adolphson

**Paul Ainscough** Mayor, Town of Drumheller

Herbert Albrecht

Marilyn Assheton-Smith Edmonton-Strathcona NDP Constituency Association

Wayne Ayling Mayor, City of Grande Prairie

A.M. Balfour

Ken Balko Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview PC Constituency Association

R.T. Ballantyne

**Carlos Barth** 

Robert, Jaqueline & Rob Beagle

**Evan Berger** Reeve, MD of Willow Creek

E.G. Bowden

Robert B. Breakell

A.J. Brinker

**Dave Broda** MLA, Redwater

**Duncan Brooks** Edmonton-Gold Bar Liberal Constituency Association

Eric F. Bryant

## Herb Buchanan

**Richard Buchanan** Chairman, Lac Cardinal Regional Economic Development Board

**Robert Bouchard** Reeve, County of St. Paul No. 19

**Beverley Bushell** 

Pat Burns

Daniel P. Carroll Edmonton-Riverview Liberal Constituency Association

Andrew R. Cameron

Lawrence Cherneski

David Chamberlain

**R.N.** Christie

Jeanette Chernow Calgary-Egmont PC Constituency Association

James D. Clark

**Ed Chubocha** Reeve, County of Leduc

Gale Conarroe

**Pat Cochrane** Chair, Calgary Board of Education

James Coswan Mayor, Village of Waskatenau

Sheila Cooper

E.N. Crowther

Paulo Da Costa

Kathy Czar

Martin M. Driessen, Q.C.

**R. Wayne Davey** Reeve, Vulcan County

Helmut Eisert

Milton Elliot Reeve, Clearwater County

## Mark Fecho

Jacqueline Fetherston Calgary-Bow PC Constituency Association

## Peter Fitzgerald-Moore

**Anne Flynn** Municipal Administrator Village of New Norway

Tom Flynn Redwater PC Constituency Association

Heather Forsyth MLA, Calgary Fish-Creek

Mike Franchuk Reeve, Smoky Lake County

Cecil Gammon

Robert N. Gibbard

**Dr. Roger Gibbins** President & CEO Canada West Foundation

**Robert Giles** 

Jean Graham

Zoria E. Grieve

Doug Grisack

John Gullett

**Bart Guyon** Reeve, MD of Brazeau No. 77

Mark Hambridge

William Hamilton

Kristy A. Harcourt

**Randy Harris** 

Terry Helgeson

Sid A. Hinton Reeve, County of Minburn

# John Hohm

Kenneth Hoppins Reeve, Kneehill County

**Bernie Hornby** Mayor, Town of Fox Creek

**Joanne Horton** Village of Marwayne

## **Robert Howard**

**Dr. John T. Huang** Calgary-Varsity PC Constituency Association

Asgeir Ingibergsson

John Isbister

Colin Jackson

Harold James

Doreen T. Jeary-Fischer

Felix Jesualexander

## David Johnson

**Penny Kary** Municipal Administrator Town of Manning

**Dan Kelly** Vice President, Prairie Region Canadian Federation of Independent Business

Mark Kelly

Peter & Evangeline Keough

Bill & Mary-Lou King

Mel Knight MLA, Grande Prairie-Smoky

**Ross Koelmans** 

Scott Koratch Economic Tourism Development Officer, City of Lloydminster

Jeff Kovitz, Q.C.

Kathryn Kozak Wiebe Mayor, Town of Bonnyville

Jason Krips Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert PC Constituency Association

**Betty Kruse** Chair, Peace Regional Health Authority

David Kucherawy Mayor, Town of Vegreville

Manny Langman

**Donna E. LaPretre** Executive Director Poverty In Action Society

Douglas Lee

**Lori Leibel** Village of Innisfree

Alvin J. Levitt

**Gerald Lovejoy** 

**Robert MacDonald** Director, Leduc PC Constituency Association

Anne Mair Edmonton-Glengarry PC Constituency Association

## Gary Malthouse

Alan Martens County Administrator County of Newell No. 4

## Bernhard Martens

David Marynowich County Manager, County of Minburn

Marlene Maxwell Reeve, MD of Clearhills No. 21

Patrick McCall

Don McCallum

Rod E. McConnell

Ray McFetridge

Bruce McGregor

Margaret Mackay

Lois McLeod Little Bow PC Constituency Association

**Diana McQueen** Chair, Brazeau Seniors Foundation **Greg Melchin** MLA, Calgary-North West

## John Middleton-Hope

Dean Milner

Michael Minchin Director of Corporate Services Town of Drumheller

Andre Morin

D.W. Morley

**Brad Musat** President, Lac La Biche Chamber of Commerce

Nina Neville

Jeff Newland Councillor, Town of Wainwright

Allan C. Oliver

K.J. Olsen

Ralph & Noreen Olson

Elsie Osbak

**Ed Parent** 

**Robert Pelletier** Mayor, Town of Legal

Harry Pelton

David R. Pfau, B.A. LL.B.

**Corinne Pohlmann** Director, Provincial Affairs Alberta/NWT Canadian Federation of Independent Business

**Carol Potter** 

John Reid Chair, Provincial Advocacy Calgary Professional Arts Alliance

June Roe

George Rogers Mayor, City of Leduc

W.H. Rogerson

Anne Rothwell

Bernice Sambor Lamont-Two Hills Business Development Corporation

**Bonnie Sansregret** President, Consort & District Chamber of Commerce

**Al Seatter** Calgary-North West PC Constituency Association

Brent Shewchuck

Doug Schierman, P.Eng.

Peter Sidey

**Bill Smith** Mayor, City of Edmonton

**Dr. T.J. (Tom) Snell** Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills PC Constituency Association

**D.L. (Lou) Soppit** Mayor, Town of Rocky Mountain House

John Stevens Mayor, Town of Picture Butte

**Michael Stiles** 

David & Gail Stolee

**Evelyn Straty** Secretary-Treasurer Village of Myrnam

Margaret Tardif Mayor, Town of Falher

Frank C. Totino

Hans & Lena Visser

Ed Waelpoel

Phillip H. Walker

Sid Wallace

George & Mabel Ward

Dr. D.C. Warwick

**Robert H. Watt** Town of Vermilion

Erik Weigeldt

**David Wiens** 

**Connie Wilkinson** Village of Paradise Valley

**Sharon Williams** Village of Kitscoty

Art Williamson

R.E. Wolf

Valerie J. Wray

**Shannon Wyatt** Sherwood Park PC Constituency Association

Joseph Yanchula

Hal Zoeller

Henry Zolkewski Reeve, County of Thorhild No. 7

#### List of Presenters - Second Round Public Hearings

#### Athabasca – December 16, 2002

Kirk Andries Director, External Affairs Alberta Pacific Forest Industries

**Charlie Ashbey** Councillor, County of Athabasca

**Robert Bouchard** Reeve, County of St. Paul

Mike Cardinal MLA, Athabasca-Wabasca

Jack Dowhaluk President, Grassland Agricultural Society

**Ray Ewaskiw** Lac La Biche & District Chamber of Commerce

**Douglas L. Faulkner** Mayor, Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo

Mary Anne Finley St. Paul & District Chamber of Commerce

#### Hudson Foley

Sheila Foley Reeve, MD of Lesser Slave River

**Jim Giancola** Councillor, Village of Boyle

Ken Hodgins Mayor, City of Fort Saskatchewan

Bruce Jackson

**Don Kravontka** President, Grassland & Areas Economic Development Association

**Trevor Martin** Athabasca & District Chamber of Commerce

**Don McGladdery** Athabasca-Wabasca PC Constituency Association

#### Maria Minto

Ron Nemetchek

Frank Ponto Athabasca County Tourism

**Robert Richard** Reeve, County of Lakeland

**Paul Sinclair** Reeve, MD of Opportunity

Dr. Mike Smith

## Robert A. Splane

Marian Wolitski Chair, Keeweetinok Lakes Regional Health Authority

Al Wurfel Mayor, Town of Athabasca

**David Zabot** Deputy Reeve, MD of Opportunity

#### Edmonton – December 17, 2002

**Ken Allred** St. Albert PC Constituency Association

**Ken Balko** Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview PC Constituency Association

Chris Belke Councillor, Town of Devon

Laurie Blakeman MLA, Edmonton-Centre

**Duncan Brooks** Edmonton-Gold Bar Liberal Constituency Association

**Dan Carroll** Edmonton-Riverview Liberal Constituency Association

Paul Chalifoux Director, St. Albert PC Constituency Association

John Patrick Day Edmonton-Norwood Liberal Constituency Association

**David Despuis** 

John Engelmann

**Gary Friedel** MLA, Peace River

Vernon Hafso Councillor, Beaver County

Jack Hayden President, Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties **Douglas E. King** Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan PC Constituency Association

Ken Kobly Mayor, Town of Beaumont

Carolyn Kolebaba Reeve, Northern Sunrise County

John Kolkman New Democrats

Jason Krips Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert PC Constituency Association

**Rod Krips** Chief Administrator Officer Town of Viking

**Don Kuchelyma** President, Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues

David Kucherawy Mayor, Town of Vegreville

Ken Lesniak Deputy Mayor, County of Strathcona

**Rob Lougheed** MLA, Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan

Hugh MacDonald MLA, Edmonton-Gold Bar

**Liliane Maisonneuve** French Canadian Association of Alberta

**Brian Mason** MLA, Edmonton-Highlands

Gary Masyk MLA, Edmonton-Norwood Chuck McBurney Reeve, Beaver County

John Ogle Edmonton-Glenora Liberal Constituency Association

**Tony Ollenberger** Alberta First Party

**Bill Smith** Mayor, City of Edmonton John Szumlas Edmonton-Gold Bar PC Constituency Association

**Reg Woelfle** Sherwood Park Liberal Constituency Association

**Stan Woloshyn** MLA, Stony Plain

## Red Deer – December 18, 2002

**Dale Barr** Mayor, Town of Rimbey

Elsie Brewin

Shirley Cripps

Judy Gordon MLA, Lacombe-Stettler

May Johnson President, Lacombe & District Chamber of Commerce

**Douglas A. Jones** Mayor, Town of Oyen

**Doug Lehman** Deputy Mayor, Town of Oyen

**Ty Lund** MLA, Rocky-Mountain House

William McQuesten Mayor, Town of Lacombe Wayne Richardson Reeve, County of Paintearth

**Stan Schumacher** Drumheller-Chinook PC Constituency Association

## Rev. Dr. Doreen Sturla Scott

**Clifford Soper** Lacombe-Stettler PC Constituency Association

**Ted Szumlas** Ponoka-Rimbey PC Constituency Association

Wayne Tutty Mayor, Town of Blackfalds

**Dorothy Ungstad** Ponoka-Rimbey PC Constituency Association

Loren Wiberg

#### Calgary - December 18, 2002

#### Rebecca Aizenman

Moe Amery MLA, Calgary-East

Paul C. Breeze Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association

Al Brissette Calgary-Egmont PC Constituency Association

Valerie A. Chatten Calgary-Fish Creek PC Constituency Association

Marlene Graham, Q.C. MLA, Calgary-Lougheed

**Doug Hayes** Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association

**Stephen Hope** Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association

**J. B. Isaacs** Calgary-Fish Creek PC Constituency Association

**Ron Laycraft** MD of Foothills Allan LePoudre Airdrie-Rocky View PC Constituency Association

**Kim Linkletter** Calgary-Currie PC Constituency Association

Marg Loewen President, Foothills-Little Bow Municipal Association

John Murray Airdrie-Rocky View PC Constituency Association

Mark Ross President, Whitehorn Community Association

Ian Seright Southview Community Association

Darril Stephenson Calgary-Lougheed PC Constituency Association

**Jo-Anne Teed** Calgary-Cross PC Constituency Association

Sandy Wilson Calgary-Fort

## List of Submitters - Second Round Written Submissions

527 letters were received from the Sundance Ridge Community in Calgary.

105 letters were received from the Whitehorn Coummunity in Calgary.

395 signatures were received on a letter from the Baldwin Community in Edmonton.

163 letters were received from individuals resident in Sherwood Park.

Jan Anderson

Victoria Arcand Chief, Alexander First Nation

**Tom Baldwin** Executive Director Northern Alberta Development Council

**Blair W. Barkley** Highwood PC Constituency Association

**Dennis Beck** Calgary-Bow PC Constituency Association

Dave Bell

**Cody Berggren** Mayor, Town of Bowden

**R. Lloyd Bertschi** Mayor, Town of Morinville

#### **Brad Blair**

Bill Bonner MLA, Edmonton-Glengarry

**Doug Borg** Reeve, Woodlands County

André Boudreau President, Centre Culturel Marie-Anne-Gaboury Sheila Bowker President, Parkdale-Cromdale Community League

#### A.J. Brinker

Malcolm Brown Calgary-Lougheed PC Constituency Association

**Richard Buchanan** Chairman, Lac Cardinal Regional Economic Board

**Pat Burns** Mayor, Town of Hanna

Wayne Cao MLA, Calgary-Fort

Harvey Cenaiko MLA, Calgary-Buffalo

Frank (Manny) Chalifoux Chair, Northern Lakes College Board of Governors

Larry Chorney

Nolan & Shelley Chrapko

Harvey Christensen

James D. Clark, BSF, RPF

## Directors of the Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Association

Lucien N.Cloutier Development Officer, Lakeland County

William E. Code, Q.C.

**Dianne Cooper-Ponte** Calgary-Glenmore PC Constituency Association

Mrs. K. Cox

**Shirley Cripps** President, Federation of Alberta Bingo Associations

Wayne Daniels Reeve, County of Newell

**Ray Danyluk** MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul

Garry Dearing Reeve, County of Wetaskiwin

## L.H. & M. Leone Dennis

Horst Doberstein

**Denis Ducharme** MLA, Bonnyville-Cold Lake

John Wm. Duke

**Diane Ellens** 

Jacqueline Elton

Rob & Deb Elzinga

**J. Denise Exton** Manager, Legislative & Legal Services, Strathcona County **J. Falkenberg** County Administrator County of Paintearth

**Don Fleming** Board Chairman Edmonton Public Schools

## W.J. Fleming

Sheila Foley Athabasca-Wabasca PC Constituency Association

Wallace Fox Chief, Onion Lake First Nation

Lyle Frisby Mayor, Town of Elk Point

**Yvonne Fritz** MLA, Calgary-Cross

**Dave Fryett** Chairman, South Fish Creek Transportation Action Committee

Vincent Gaudet Secretary/Treasurer Golden Hills School Division

**Bob Gerlock** Chair, South East Community Leagues Association

**Lorraine Gislason** Reeve, County of Athabasca

Alex E. Gomes

**Pat Gordeyko** Reeve, County of Two Hills

**Grant Gordon** 

**Peter Green** Reeve, County of Vermilion River

Ken Greenwell Mayor, Town of Ponoka

Zoria Grieve

Doug Grisack

Dale Gust Mayor, Town of Bashaw

Dorothy J. Hagemaan

James Halicki

Mark Hambridge

**Gary Hanson** General Manager & COO West Edmonton Mall

## Olga, Dwayne & Joe Harnaha

Scott Hennig

Jim Hillaby Reeve, County of Camrose

Tracy & Maurice Houle

Joanne Hrycun

Harlan C. Hulleman, M.A.

Alan Hyland Mayor, Town of Bow Island

Layne Johnson County Manager, County of Lethbridge

**Doug Jones** Drumheller-Chinook PC Constituency Association

Halvar C. Jonson MLA, Ponoka-Rimbey

**Peter Karbashewski** Mayor, Village of Willingdon

## Bill Kent

**Gloria S. Kereliuk** Balwin-Delwood Community Association

**Bartek Kienc** Edmonton-Rutherford PC Constituency Association

Gillian Kier

**Bill King** Mayor, Town of Manning

**Edna Kneller** President Parkridge Community Association

**Paul Kowalenko** Director, Civic Affairs Canyon Meadows Community Association

## Carolyn Kreke

Helene Larocque President Martindale Community Assocation

## Charlotte Lima

**Duncan Lloyd** Mayor, Town of Coaldale

**Le-Ann Lundgren** President Southview Community Association

Sandra MacArthur Assistant Manager, MD of Opportunity

Darryl Machan

Rolly Magee Mayor, Town of Black Diamond

**Lorne G. Mann** Mayor, Town of Peace River

## Werner H. Mannert

**Gary Mar** MLA, Calgary-Nose Creek

**Norm Mayer** Mayor, City of Camrose

**Don McCallum** Edmonton-Meadowlark PC Constituency Assocation

Ian McClelland MLA, Edmonton-Rutherford

James McCracken Reeve, MD of Nothern Lights

Roy McLean Reeve, MD of Foothills

#### Gordon McRobbie

**Greg Melchin** MLA, Calgary-North West

Violet Melo

**Mike Mihaly** Mayor, Town of High Level

## Dean & Susan Milner

**Leonard Mitzel** Chair, Mayors & Reeves of South Eastern Alberta

**Don Montgomery** Mayor, Wetaskiwin

**Denise Morie** Edmonton-Mill Creek Liberal Constituency Association

**Terry Murray** President, Cedarbrae Community League Association **Ewen Nelson** Vice President Boyle Street Community League

#### **Deryk Norton**

**Dan Oneil** Mayor, City of Airdrie

Doug Orlecki President, Two Hills Lions

#### Patrick A. O'Sullivan

**Dr. Raj Pannu** MLA, Edmonton-Strathcona

**Leif Pedersen** Chief Administrative Officer Town of Mundare

**Paul Pelchat** President, French Canadian Association of Alberta, Edmonton Region

**Richard H.M. Plain** Mayor, City of St. Albert

**Richard Poole** 

Peter Popowich Mayor, Town of Two Hills

**Ray Prins** Reeve, Lacombe County

**Richard Reise** 

Dean & Sandra Rendle

Susan Rigby Calgary-East PC Constituency Association

**Jim Rivait** Edmonton-Mill Woods PC Constituency Association

55

## Mary-Lou Robertson

Doug & Jean Rose

Ronald T. Rosychuk

Marjorie L. Roy Programs & Services Director Pineridge Community Association

Gerry Schenk Edmonton-Manning PC Constituency Association

#### Barb & George Scherrens

Shiraz Shariff MLA, Calgary-McCall

Elaine Sky Chair, Peace River School Division

Jay J. Slemp Chairman, Special Areas Board

Murray Smith MLA, Calgary-Varsity

Jane Steckley

Ken & Sandra Stevens

**R.E.** Stevenson

Gordon Svenningsen Reeve, Ponoka County

Peggy & John Szumlas

Len Thesen Drayton Valley-Calmar PC Constituency Association

## K. Ed Thomlinson

**Donald B. Thompson** Reeve, Starland County Edward & Joyce Tona

**Kelly Tuck** Mayor & Councillors Town of Turner Valley

**Theresa Turner** President, Ponoka & District Chamber of Commerce

**Carolynn Vodden** President Monterey Park Community Association

Michael Walters Community Organizer Community Action Project

## Lynn Warkentin

#### Dwayne C. & Collette Weatherall

**Debbie Wiebe** Community Relations Temple Community Association

**Beth Wiwchar** Calgary-Varsity New Democrats Constituency Association

Garry Wolosinka Mayor, Town of Viking

Larry Yasman President Rundle Community Association

**Douglas Yeo** Superintendent of Schools St. Paul Education Regional Division

**Joseph W. Yurkovich** Edmonton-Whitemud PC Constituency Association

Henry Zolkewski Reeve, County of Thorhild

# Detailed Matrix 1 - Existing Electoral Divisions

Rank							R/U		"Dependant"		Elected		Distance		
	Electoral Division	Population	Area	Score	Density	Score	Ratio	Score	Proportion	Score	Bodies	Score	from Leg.	Score	Total
1	Athabasca-Wabasca	20,752	124,730	3	0	3	759	3	35	1	38	3	410	3	16
2	Dunvegan	24,657	39,038	3	1	3	182	3	36	1	29	3	480	3	16
3	Drumheller-Chinook	25,062	27,036	3	1	3	113	3	35	1	27	3	270	3	16
4	Lesser Slave Lake	25,920	87,741	3	0	3	141	3	38	1	33	3	440	3	16
5	Peace River	28,072	74,536	3	0	3	138	3	35	1	20	3	580	3	16
6	Little Bow	30,130	10,770	3	3	3	150	3	38	1	21	3	380	3	16
7	Cardston-Taber-Warner	30,588	9,998	2	3	3	78	3	40	2	18	3	470	3	16
8	Wainwright	28,908	15,643	3	2	3	135	3	36	1	30	3	190	0	13
9	Strathmore-Brooks	39,099	10,190	2	4	3	68	2	33	0	18	3	310	3	13
10	Bonnyville-Cold Lake	29,002	11,979	3	2	3	68	2	34	0	16	3	218	1	12
11	Rocky Mountain House	31,157	22,305	3	1	3	195	3	34	0	22	3	190	0	12
12	Lac La Biche-St. Paul	32,284	12,721	3	3	3	155	3	38	2	24	3	144	-2	12
13	Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,158	19,382	3	2	3	51	0	31	0	15	3	290	3	12
14	Highwood	46,549	8,410	0	6	3	74	3	33	0	17	3	340	3	12
15	Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,436	8,862	1	3	3	78	3	35	1	24	3	180	0	11
16	Livingstone-Macleod	30,250	10,928	3	3	3	36	-3	38	1	18	3	430	3	10
17	Grande Prairie-Wapiti	33,007	14,270	3	2	3	47	-1	30	0	12	2	400	3	10
18	Banff-Cochrane	48,517	11,368	3	4	3	43	-1	27	-1	17	3	290	3	10
19	Vegreville-Viking	27,931	8,986	1	3	3	117	3	39	2	23	3	85	-3	9
20	West Yellowhead	29,349	37,689	3	1	3	41	-2	29	0	12	2	300	3	9
21	Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	31,412	11,786	3	3	3	217	3	33	0	26	3	129	-3	9
22	Cypress-Medicine Hat	31,513	20,885	3	2	3	47	-1	33	0	11	1	470	3	9
23	Barrhead-Westlock	24,976	11,525	3	2	3	130	3	37	1	11	1	117	-3	8
24	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	31,781	6,255	-2	5	3	90	3	37	1	17	3	210	0	8
25	Drayton Valley-Calmar	28,149	8,901	1	3	3	265	3	34	0	24	3	100	-3	7
26	Lacombe-Stettler	32,530	6,271	-2	5	3	84	3	36	1	18	3	150	-2	6
27	Ponoka-Rimbey	30,868	5,460	-3	6	3	125	3	39	2	25	3	92	-3	5
28	Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	37,378	4,152	-3	9	3	116	3	33	0	14	3	160	-1	5
29	Airdrie-Rocky View	47,335	3,369	-3	14	3	74	3	30	0	9	-1	250	2	4
30	Redwater	33,342	4,599	-3	7	3	123	3	34	0	16	3	85	-3	3
31	Stony Plain	37,480	2,663	-3	14	3	220	3	32	0	18	3	57	-3	3
32	Medicine Hat	35,889	77	-3	466	3	0	-3	36	1	4	-3	430	3	-2
33	Leduc	37,363	1,899	-3	20	3	38	-2	32	0	15	3	42	-3	-2
34	Lethbridge-East	31,675	45	-3	707	2	0	-3	35	1	4	-3	430	3	-3
35	Wetaskiwin-Camrose	34,611	1,774	-3	20	3	23	-3	37	1	12	2	68	-3	-3
36	Lethbridge-West	35,704	81	-3	441	3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	431	3	-3
37	Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albe	36,628	1,013	-3	36	3	31	-3	30	0	13	3	32	-3	-3

#### http://www.altaebc.ab.ca/fexistingmatrix.htm

<sup>38</sup> Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan	38,294	1,240	-3	31	3	175	3	30	0	6	-3	30	-3	-3
<sup>39</sup> Calgary-McCall	48,756	89	-3	551	3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	269	3	-3
40Calgary-Fort	36,883	63	-3	588	3	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	283	3	-4
41 Calgary-Shaw	82,516	124	-3	664	2	0	-3	30	0	7	-3	295	3	-4
42 Fort McMurray	38,667	65	-3	595	3	0	-3	24	-2	4	-3	380	3	-5
43Calgary-Lougheed	34,443	40	-3	855	0	0	-3	26	-1	4	-3	295	3	-7
44Calgary-Nose Creek	55,393	48	-3	1,150	-2	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	268	3	-8
45Calgary-North West	62,849	55	-3	1,153	-2	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	271	3	-8
46Calgary-Varsity	32,339	18	-3	1,753	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	276	3	-9
47 Calgary-East	31,856	14	-3	2,275	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	278	3	-9
48 Edmonton-Ellerslie	32,280	64	-3	505	3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	14	-3	-9
49 Calgary-Glenmore	33,756	20	-3	1,671	-3	0	-3	32	0	4	-3	288	3	-9
<sup>50</sup> Edmonton-Calder	34,075	72	-3	476	3	0	-3	35	0	4	-3	8	-3	-9
51 Calgary-Elbow	34,499	19	-3	1,842	-3	0	-3	33	0	4	-3	282	3	-9
52Calgary-Bow	35,147	26	-3	1,359	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	277	3	-9
53Calgary-Egmont	36,603	23	-3	1,588	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	287	3	-9
54 Calgary-Montrose	37,086	13	-3	2,876	-3	0	-3	28	0	4	-3	277	3	-9
55Edmonton-Manning	41,129	125	-3	329	3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	16	-3	-9
56Edmonton-Whitemud	46,520	91	-3	512	3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	11	-3	-9
57 Calgary-West	50,524	43	-3	1,178	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	280	3	-9
<sup>58</sup> Calgary-Foothills	55,315	41	-3	1,344	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	270	3	-9
59 Calgary-Fish Creek	33,038	18	-3	1,841	-3	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	292	3	-10
60Calgary-North Hill	33,379	16	-3	2,096	-3	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	275	3	-10
61 Calgary-Cross	39,454	13	-3	3,068	-3	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	275	3	-10
62Sherwood Park	46,818	68	-3	688	2	6	-3	30	0	4	-3	14	-3	-10
63Calgary-Mountain View	32,529	16	-3	2,006	-3	0	-3	23	-2	4	-3	277	3	-11
64Calgary-Currie	34,694	15	-3	2,351	-3	0	-3	25	-2	4	-3	284	3	-11
65 Edmonton-McClung	38,266	52	-3	738	1	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	11	-3	-11
66Red Deer-North	31,283	33	-3	956	0	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	140	-2	-12
67 Calgary-Buffalo	37,807	7	-3	5,734	-3	0	-3	16	-3	4	-3	277	3	-12
68 Edmonton-Mill Creek	42,217	50	-3	838	0	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	7	-3	-12
69 Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	34,817	34	-3	1,026	-1	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	12	-3	-13
70 Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570	36	-3	1,055	-1	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	10	-3	-13
71 Edmonton-Gold Bar	31,344	21	-3	1,501	-3	0	-3	37	1	4	-3	5	-3	-14
72 Red Deer-South	36,424	28	-3	1,310	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	142	-2	-14
73Edmonton-Mill Woods	30,699	17	-3	1,825	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	8	-3	-15
74 Edmonton-Norwood	31,036	12	-3	2,647	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	5	-3	-15
<sup>75</sup> Edmonton-Glenora	31,777	13	-3	2,493	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	4	-3	-15
76Edmonton-Highlands	32,039	16	-3	2,011	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	6	-3	-15
77 Edmonton-Riverview	32,267	21	-3	1,535	-3	0	-3	33	0	4	-3	4	-3	-15
78 Edmonton-Rutherford	34,470	12	-3	2,913	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	7	-3	-15

http://www.altaebc.ab.ca/fexistingmatrix.htm (2 of 3) [7/14/2008 1:56:17 PM]

#### http://www.altaebc.ab.ca/fexistingmatrix.htm

<sup>79</sup> Edmonton-Glengarry	34,584	18	-3	1,966	-3	0	-3	35	0	4	-3	8	-3	-15
80 Edmonton-Meadowlark	34,646	24	-3	1,430	-3	0	-3	32	0	4	-3	9	-3	-15
81 St. Albert	41,001	29	-3	1,409	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	13	-3	-15
82Edmonton-Strathcona	32,945	12	-3	2,802	-3	0	-3	22	-3	4	-3	2	-3	-18
<sup>83</sup> Edmonton-Centre	33,423	9	-3	3,683	-3	0	-3	21	-3	4	-3	1	-3	-18

# **Detailed Matrix 2 - Recommended Electoral Divisions**

Rank								"Dependant"		Elected		Distance		
Electoral Division	Population	Area	Score	Density	Score	R/U Ratio	Score	Proportion	Score	Bodies	Score	from Leg.	Score	Total
<sup>1</sup> Cardston-Taber-Warner	31,755	10,480	3	3	3	84	3	40	2	20	3	453	3	17
<sup>2</sup> Little Bow	32,897	11,555	3	3	3	122	3	38	2	24	3	370	3	17
<sup>3</sup> Dunvegan	24,202	38,965	3	1	3	181	3	36	1	27	3	469	3	16
<sup>4</sup> Lesser Slave Lake	27,731	70,790	3	0	3	193	3	37	1	36	3	284	3	16
<sup>5</sup> Peace River	31,655	99,108	3	0	3	140	3	37	1	26	3	537	3	16
<sup>6</sup> Drumheller-Stettler	33,483	29,211	3	1	3	97	3	36	1	32	3	249	2	15
<sup>7</sup> Strathmore-Brooks	38,140	10,869	3	4	3	86	3	32	0	16	3	341	3	15
<sup>8</sup> Lac La Biche-St. Paul	35,230	27,114	3	1	3	156	3	38	2	25	3	191	0	14
<sup>9</sup> Battle River-Wainwright	31,042	16,796	3	2	3	152	3	36	1	34	3	189	0	13
10 Rocky Mountain House	33,313	23,188	3	1	3	216	3	34	0	25	3	193	0	12
<sup>11</sup> Grande Prairie-Smoky	36,178	19,420	3	2	3	51	0	31	0	17	3	294	3	12
12 Grande Prairie-Wapiti	32,987	14,273	3	2	3	47	0	30	0	12	2	393	3	11
<sup>13</sup> Livingstone-Macleod	33,534	12,971	3	3	3	36	-2	37	1	18	3	419	3	11
14Bonnyville-Cold Lake	31,289	8,870	1	4	3	82	3	34	0	23	S	207	0	10
<sup>15</sup> Cypress-Medicine Hat	31,513	20,880	3	2	3	47	0	33	0	11	1	432	3	10
<sup>16</sup> Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock	35,086	11,936	3	3	3	90	3	36	1	19	3	105	-3	10
17West Yellowhead	29,349	37,689	3	1	3	41	-1	30	0	11	1	300	3	9
18 Vermilion-Lloydminster	30,675	8,189	0	4	3	69	3	35	1	20	3	173	-1	9
19 Whitecourt-Ste. Anne	32,251	11,855	3	3	3	226	3	34	0	29	3	125	-3	9
20Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills	32,738	6,351	-2	5	3	96	3	37	1	15	3	210	0	8
21 Foothills - Rockyview	33,397	3,312	-3	10	3	326	3	30	0	12	2	280	3	8
22Calmar-Drayton Valley-Millet	34,279	10,030	2	3	3	252	3	34	0	31	3	100	-3	8
23Banff-Cochrane	35,593	12,900	3	3	3	12	-3	26	-1	15	3	310	3	8
24Wood Buffalo	42,971	104,330	3	0	3	11	-3	25	-1	13	3	462	3	8
<sup>25</sup> Athabasca - Redwater	34,772	9,241	1	4	3	255	3	34	0	30	3	96	-3	7
26Lacombe-Ponoka	35,065	4,560	-3	8	3	88	3	37	1	21	3	106	-3	4
27 Innisfail-Sylvan Lake	36,076	4,063	-3	9	3	108	3	33	0	12	2	158	-2	3
28 Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville	36,172	6,500	-1	6	3	52	0	36	1	20	3	65	-3	3
29 Stony Plain	37,410	2,633	-3	14	3	220	3	32	0	16	3	58	-3	3
<sup>30</sup> Highwood	31,410	2,786	-3	11	3	50	0	33	0	8	-2	328	3	1
<sup>31</sup> Airdrie-Chestermere	37,651	2,138	-3	18	3	52	0	30	0	8	-2	266	3	1
32Wetaskiwin-Camrose	37,750	1,497	-3	25	3	19	-3	39	2	16	3	69	-3	-1
<sup>33</sup> Medicine Hat	35,889	77	-3	466	3	0	-3	36	1	4	-3	432	3	-2
34 Leduc-Beaumont-Devon	37,378	1,909	-3	20	3	38	-2	32	0	13	3	45	-3	-2
35 Lethbridge-West	32,695	78	-3	419	3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	430	3	-3
36 Calgary-Hays	36,258	94	-3	386	3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	294	3	-3
37Strathcona	36,435	1,092	-3	33	3	228	3	30	0	4	-3	29	-3	-3
38 Calgary-McCall	36,458	86	-3	424	3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	270	3	-3

#### http://www.altaebc.ab.ca/frecommendedmatrix.htm

<sup>39</sup> Lethbridge-East	34,684	47	-3	738	1	0	-3	35	1	4	-3	429	3	-4
40Calgary-Fort	39,155	51	-3	768	1	0	-3	28	0	4	-3	282	3	-5
41 Calgary-Foothills	36,415	41	-3	888	0	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	269	3	-6
42 Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albe	37,216	798	-3	47	3	24	-3	29	0	10	0	33	-3	-6
43Calgary-MacKay	37,803	43	-3	879	0	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	267	3	-6
44Calgary-Lougheed	36,702	44	-3	834	0	0	-3	28	-1	4	-3	294	3	-7
<sup>45</sup> Calgary-Egmont	37,423	36	-3	1,040	-1	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	285	3	-7
<sup>46</sup> Red Deer-North	36,115	178	-3	203	3	5	-3	28	0	8	-2	134	-3	-8
47 Calgary-West	38,187	36	-3	1,061	-2	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	281	3	-8
48 Calgary-Elbow	38,906	22	-3	1,769	-3	0	-3	35	1	4	-3	284	3	-8
49 Edmonton-Ellerslie	35,707	69	-3	518	3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	13	-3	-9
<sup>50</sup> Calgary-Shaw	35,966	27	-3	1,332	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	295	3	-9
<sup>51</sup> Edmonton-Calder	37,190	73	-3	510	3	0	-3	34	0	4	-3	8	-3	-9
52 Edmonton-Whitemud	37,402	81	-3	462	3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	10	-3	-9
<sup>53</sup> Edmonton-Manning	37,410	120	-3	312	3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	17	-3	-9
<sup>54</sup> Calgary-Glenmore	37,770	20	-3	1,889	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	287	3	-9
<sup>55</sup> Calgary-North Hill	38,465	21	-3	1,832	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	275	3	-9
56Calgary-Nose Hill	38,622	24	-3	1,609	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	272	3	-9
57Calgary-East	38,655	18	-3	2,148	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	276	3	-9
<sup>58</sup> Calgary-North West	39,246	26	-3	1,510	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	272	3	-9
<sup>59</sup> Calgary-Montrose	39,276	14	-3	2,805	-3	0	-3	28	0	4	-3	277	3	-9
60 Calgary-Cross	39,524	10	-3	3,952	-3	0	-3	28	0	4	-3	274	3	-9
61Calgary-Bow	39,604	29	-3	1,366	-3	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	277	3	-9
62 Calgary-Varsity	39,691	21	-3	1,890	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	275	3	-9
63Sherwood Park	35,360	51	-3	693	2	5	-3	30	0	4	-3	12	-3	-10
64Calgary-Fish Creek	36,457	18	-3	2,025	-3	0	-3	27	-1	4	-3	293	3	-10
65 Edmonton-McClung	38,266	55	-3	696	2	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	12	-3	-10
66Calgary-Mountain View	39,586	18	-3	2,199	-3	0	-3	25	-1	4	-3	278	3	-10
67 Edmonton-Mill Creek	36,545	49	-3	746	1	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	8	-3	-11
68Calgary-Currie	39,340	12	-3	3,278	-3	0	-3	21	-3	4	-3	282	3	-12
69Calgary-Buffalo	39,357	11	-3	3,578	-3	0	-3	20	-3	4	-3	280	3	-12
/0Edmonton-Castle Downs	37,570	36	-3	1,044	-1	0	-3	29	0	4	-3	11	-3	-13
/1 Red Deer-South	36,424	30	-3	1,214	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	144	-2	-14
/2Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview	37,797	35	-3	1,080	-2	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	11	-3	-14
/3Edmonton-Decore	35,570	19	-3	1,872	-3	0	-3	33	0	4	-3	10	-3	-15
/4Edmonton-Rutherford	36,420	14	-3	2,601	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	8	-3	-15
/bEdmonton-Jasper Place	36,483	25	-3	1,459	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	10	-3	-15
/6Edmonton-Glenora	36,766	18	-3	2,043	-3	0	-3	32	0	4	-3	5	-3	-15
//Edmonton-Gold Bar	37,052	20	-3	1,853	-3	0	-3	34	0	4	-3	4	-3	-15
/8Edmonton-Riverview	37,059	25	-3	1,482	-3	0	-3	34	0	4	-3	4	-3	-15
<sup>79</sup> Edmonton-Mill Woods	38,339	18	-3	2,130	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	9	-3	-15

http://www.altaebc.ab.ca/frecommendedmatrix.htm

80 Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood	38,418	18	-3	2,134	-3	0	-3	31	0	4	-3	6	-3	-15
81 St. Albert	39,160	28	-3	1,399	-3	0	-3	30	0	4	-3	14	-3	-15
82 Edmonton-Strathcona	37,014	12	-3	3,085	-3	0	-3	23	-2	4	-3	3	-3	-17
83 Edmonton-Centre	35,096	10	-3	3,510	-3	0	-3	21	-3	4	-3	2	-3	-18