

9:10 a.m.

Monday, May 27, 2002

[Mr. Clark in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Your Worship, thank you very much for taking the time from a hectic and very busy schedule to be with us this morning. Just a few opening comments and then we'll look forward to hearing your views, Your Worship.

This committee is a committee under the electoral boundaries act. As Ethics Commissioner I was selected to head up the committee. I did that after being asked. I discussed the proposition with the Leader of the Opposition, and he was prepared to support my appointment. Quite frankly, I did that because this is going to be a difficult enough job.

Two of my colleagues were appointed by the cabinet, and two of my colleagues were appointed by the Leader of the Opposition in consultation. I'm extremely fortunate in having four very able and experienced people who sit on the panel with me. To my far left is Doug Graham, a well-respected member of the legal fraternity here in Calgary. To my immediate left is Bauni Mackay, the former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association, from Edmonton. To my immediate right is Glen Clegg, who formerly was the Member for Dunvegan, the Spirit River-Fairview area in the Peace River country and formerly a municipal councillor, a municipal reeve. Then furthest to my right is Ernie Patterson, the 33-year mayor of the great centre of Claresholm. Ernie is also, as you know, the vice-president of the AUMA. So it's a broadly based group, and none of us is under any delusions, sir. At the end of the day we may only have four friends, and they may be the four that are with us here.

Just three or four quick comments. The legislation says that there will be 83 seats, so we have no choice in that. The legislation also says that we have to use the most recent census, so that's the census of 2001, which gives Alberta really a population of 2.98 million. I used to be a schoolteacher in one of my former lives, and if you divide that 2.98 million by the 83 seats, you get 35,900. So virtually 36,000 is the target across the province. The legislation does permit a variance of up to 25 percent plus or minus that, but the last commission had no greater variance than 15 percent in every constituency with one exception. Of course, that exception didn't happen to be Calgary-Shaw, I might add, and we all here know what has happened to Calgary-Shaw with over 80,000 people in it today.

Two other quick comments. One is that there is provision for four seats to have up to 50 percent variance. There are specific criteria for those four seats. They have to touch on a border of either another province or the United States, have to be a very, very large area, and have no centre over 4,000 people. That's the general guideline there.

The last point I want to make is that this is the first day of nearly three weeks of hearings. By the end of June we will have been across the province. From here we go to central Alberta and then Edmonton on Wednesday, and then next week we start in St. Paul and go down eastern Alberta, right down to Medicine Hat and over to Lethbridge and up to Wetaskiwin. In the last week in June we go from Westlock to Edson, Slave Lake, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Peace River. The week after that, we have to get together and come to some conclusions and work on our first report. The draft report will be out in the early part of September. Then there'll be an opportunity for people to look at that and respond to that. We're mandated under the legislation to have a second set of hearings, and that second set of hearings will be likely in December or January. Following that, then we make recommendations to the Speaker, and he'll pass it on to the Legislature. With the last commission, under the very able leadership of Mr. Justice Ed Wachowich, the Legislature in fact accepted all the

recommendations. It's certainly this chairman's target, and I'm sure it's the goal of my colleagues that we will have a report that the Legislature will accept in whole.

Your Worship, I guess there's much more I could say, but we're delighted to have you here, and we look forward to your comments. It's a very laid-back atmosphere, and I am sure my colleagues will have some questions for you and, knowing my colleagues, maybe even some comments. Your Worship, we're delighted to have you here.

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, for today's consideration to address the panel, and most importantly thank you very much for having me first up, as we have a council meeting at 9:30 this morning.

Mr. Chairman, the work of the commission that you will be undertaking over the next few weeks is very valuable for Alberta. I believe that fundamental questions of great political significance which go to the heart of democratic representation in Alberta are at stake. The challenge of the commission is indeed a difficult one: how to ensure that voters across our province have an equally powerful and a representative vote. I believe the commission must look to the future as it draws its electoral divisions. The Alberta of 2010, which is just a few short years away, will largely be an urbanized province, and its representative institutions, such as the Legislature of Alberta, should reflect this change. This point has been emphasized in Calgary's recent submissions to the Alberta Future Summit, the Financial Management Commission, and the minister's council on roles, responsibilities, and resources.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of the electoral boundaries in Alberta has had an eventful history since 1989. The city of Calgary has been an active participant since 1989: in the 1989 review, the 1992 review, the 1993 review, and of course 1995. Previous to this and other commissions, we have expressed several key concerns: the need for equitable distribution of seats based upon population, that each citizen needs to have an equal voice in being represented in the Legislature, that the population of each seat should be reflected as close as possible to the provincial average, and that urbanization trends need to be taken into account with your decision. The focus today will be building upon those themes, and my presentation will emphasize just two points.

Fair and equitable representation should be based primarily on population. It needs to balance competing needs and demands in allocating a fixed number of electoral divisions in the province with great variations in population density. In addition, existing community boundaries and geographic and transportation barriers and links must also be taken into account. Voter population must, though, be the primary consideration although clearly not the only consideration in allocating electoral boundaries. I do understand that your recommendations are not based upon just the math. The current allowable variance in population per electoral division is a plus or minus 25 percent variance and for good reason. In the Calgary region we have populations that are well in excess of the provincial average. There are six divisions in Calgary where the population is much greater than recommended, and Calgary-Shaw as an example, as referenced by the chairman, is almost double the recommended population.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, is that the Calgary region will continue to be a dynamic and growing urban region. Alberta has become a highly urbanized province. More than 90 percent of the increase in its population over the past 30 years has occurred within urban areas. Over half the population of the province resides in the two major centres, and two-thirds of our province's population live in the two metropolitan regions, those being of course Calgary and Edmonton. In the 2001 census the Alberta population grew by just

over 10 percent in the last five years, between 1996 and 2001. Of this growth, 94 percent occurred in urban centres. The city of Calgary itself accounted for 40 percent of the total provincial growth. Expressing this in another way and using the provincial math, this would be equivalent to three average electoral districts in the city of Calgary alone, and that, Mr. Chairman, if my math is correct, is 35,951. By all economic measures Calgary and its surrounding regions have been among the fastest growing regions in Alberta for the last six years. All indications from our forecasters are that this pattern will continue well into the future.

In 1995 the Electoral Boundaries Commission found that on the basis of population alone Calgary would warrant 23 seats but concluded that the allocation of 21 seats was justifiable. It noted in the commission report: “We have declined to add a second electoral division at this time. We leave this determination to the Commission that shall follow us in the new millennium.”

9:20

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Mr. Chairman, that was your predecessor that left you in that enviable position, not myself. I’m really restating it as a fact.

**The Chair:** Just thanks for reminding me.

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Mr. Chairman, you and your committee members have a very important job. You are in fact that commission of the new millennium. I believe that this commission should give meaningful and careful consideration to more than just rural versus urban districts, but the ratios, the ratios of elected officials to the population, should be considered. Urban regions are and will remain a focal point for current and continued high-growth rates in our population. Our urban regions are engaged in developing globally competitive economic development strategies, hosting international events, and supporting research and development to both enhance economic prosperity and diversification of our province.

Mr. Chairman, the work of your commission is very valuable and very challenging. I hope that my comments here today will assist the committee and its membership in setting the course of future direction for our province, one that will look outside of the mandate that you have been presented but one that will focus on the change of electoral reform in this province overall. I thank you for this opportunity, and of course I’m available to answer any questions that you or your committee may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Your Worship.  
Who would like to start? Ernie?

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes. Your Worship, I’ve got two questions. One, is there any process of annexation taking place that will occur this year for the city of Calgary; that is, looking at changing the boundaries of the city of Calgary in the year 2002?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Through the chair. Mr. Patterson, yes, we are reviewing annexation with the municipal district of Rocky View as well as with the municipal district of Foothills. Whether we’re in a position to actually conclude the annexation this year is highly unlikely. A more realistic time frame would be the fall of 2003 or the spring of 2004. However, as I referenced in my earlier text, recognizing the forecast growth of the city of Calgary as we look forward tied into annexation – as you know, Calgary is continuing to grow in the neighbourhood of 20,000 people per year. We expect

this trend to continue. Thus we are down to approximately a 12-year land supply for growth in the city. We are looking at a reasonably aggressive annexation plan that will take us well into the future, in the neighbourhood of a 40-year supply.

**Mr. Patterson:** Chair, if I might just follow that up with a supplemental question. Jeez, that sounds like I’m in the Legislature; doesn’t it?

**The Chair:** You’d get two.

**Mr. Patterson:** Anyway, the question kind of fits in with my previous question. What would be your thoughts if, let’s say, your annexation does not get through this year? That’s always a difficult process, and one can’t always predict what’s going to happen with it. So just a thought here. What would you think if we included I guess you could call it a ‘rurban,’ a rural/urban, constituency that might look at the factor of taking in that future annexation area? Any thoughts on that at all? Thank you, Your Worship.

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Mr. Chairman, there is some precedent for this. The federal government boundaries cross rural and urban ridings. In my previous life representing the west side of the city of Calgary in ward 6, there was a portion of it that was in the Macleod riding, although it was part of the city because the overlap did not describe the city boundary as the city limits. Mind you, it was on a section line, so of course the section line included part of that district to be within the ‘rurban,’ rural and urban, riding. My thought on that is that it may very well be a consideration for the board and one that may address some of the challenges this committee will face in terms of dealing with the 35,951 population number.

**Mr. Clegg:** Your Worship, I know that you and I totally agree that Calgary and Edmonton will grow. I mean, that’s a trend, and I’m sure it’ll continue. However, this commission can’t look too much into the future, because if we look for growth areas, we’ve got to look at the minus areas too. So we are looking at the actual census. I do know that we can in the back of our mind consider that to some degree, but we’re still committed to that census for 2001. What’s your comment on that?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Well, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Clegg, I understand the mandate that the commission has been given. I think I tried to reference in my formal comments that it would be my hope that there might be an opportunity for a little editorial liberty, shall we say, by the committee, the commission, to look beyond the fairly narrow focus of the mandate and to really view how we’re going to position this province in the future.

I look at the makeup. For example, the city of Calgary is going to continue to grow. We very much discussed this several years ago in terms of the right numbers, the right mix for members of Calgary city council. There was a move at one point to add two members of council, to have 15 members, move up by adding two aldermen, to have 17, and we declined that because more doesn’t always mean better. I believe that if I could encourage the commission in any way to look beyond its mandate, to really and truly evaluate the future of our province, the reality in the numbers eight short years from now: 90 percent of our population will be living in urban centres. Calgary will continue to grow. Those are the numbers. I appreciate the mandate that you have been tasked with, but I’m hopeful that there will be an opportunity for the commission to at least editorialize what I think many Albertans feel, and that’s looking at the ratios in terms of elected officials to the population base.

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you.

**Ms Mackay:** You didn't address the particular challenges that urban MLAs have. I mean, one of the things of course that the commission is going to have to grapple with is the workload of a rural MLA because of the distances that are involved, both distance from the Legislature and distance within the constituency. When we come to argue the position of increasing seats in the cities, of course that means at the cost of rural seats, and that is the big challenge in the province. What points would you make in particular related to the particular challenges of urban MLAs?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Well, maybe I can give you another scenario, through the chair, Ms Mackay, if I may, and that's that I have never been a member of the Legislature, so I have difficulty in addressing the challenges that rural MLAs may face. It is not too dissimilar, to use an analogy, with the federal government, but I'll take an analogy that's closer to home. I'll use the province of Ontario. Several years back the province of Ontario redid a commission very similar to this one. They reduced their MLAs by approximately 30 percent. They matched up their electoral boundaries with the federal government's electoral boundaries. There are disparities in and amongst that province, geography being one of them, with travel times, travel distances. I believe that those challenges can be overcome or compensated for in terms of geographical distance with rural MLAs by staffing them up more appropriately within their constituencies.

If we look at Calgary overall, we have seven Members of Parliament. They're on planes every week going back and forth to Ottawa. I wouldn't say that it's an easy task, nor is it easy traveling from Lac La Biche to Edmonton. But if you provide sufficient support, recognizing that there are different challenges with different ridings - rural MLAs, of course, have the disparity of population, the size in terms of the footprint of their riding, but urban MLAs also face different challenges: challenges around homelessness, challenges around growth within communities. You referenced earlier Calgary-Shaw. I don't wish to misquote the MLA for the area, but she has probably the only constituency in this province with 80,000 people without a high school. I know of no other base of population in this province that doesn't have a high school, and until a year ago they didn't have a recreational facility and a whole host of other issues.

9:30

So I think that urban MLAs face different challenges than their rural counterparts. I think that for the Legislature to recognize that there are differences, just as there are differences with city council among wards - some face growth; some face urban decay and redevelopment - and for this committee to recommend different options for the Legislature to consider would be appropriate. I think that staffing resources to assist the MLAs to recognize those areas because of size is an appropriate way. I'm hopeful that the commission would consider, although it may be editorially, the population ratio as it relates to elected officials versus population. I believe that in the future of our province that is a way in which this commission could have a major impact on the new millennium.

**Ms Mackay:** Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** Your Worship, I think you've articulated very well for us the general principles we have to take into consideration in discharging our roles, but the devil lies in the details, and I wonder if you've addressed the issue of what you think an appropriate number of MLAs for the city would be. I don't wish to put you on the spot, but if you have, do you wish to share that with us?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** I haven't considered what would be the appropriate number for the city, but I don't mind sharing with you my views. I believe that if we look at the province overall, I think there is some opportunity for this commission to reference - and I'll go back to my earlier comment, Mr. Graham - the population ratio to number of elected officials. The average ward in the city of Calgary has 65,000 people. There are ways to deal with disparity in one's population base. We consider the number of factors between the size, travel, and distance. You can compensate by assisting the MLAs with the resources they need to run their office efficiently, and efficiency doesn't mean having more seats in the Legislature. I don't have an ideal number that I could present to the commission today, nor do I have an ideal number for the city of Calgary. I can say that I do believe that as a fundamental principle we should have population-based seats in the Legislature. We should allow for those special seats that you have identified earlier, Mr. Chairman - those with First Nations people, Metis settlements, and others - and I believe there are four seats within the province. There are good reasons for those.

But let's not, please, continue to exacerbate the challenge that we face with a growing urban centre. It is going to continue to happen. You are going to continue to have more population growth in the two metropolitan regions, that are going to account for better than two-thirds of this province. The ideal number is one that's always politically challenging for this commission and your predecessors, but I believe that if this commission can do any good work for the Legislature to set it on a footing on a go-forward basis, we could draw from examples in Ontario and others to recognize that if we look at the population ratio to number of elected officials, I think that's a telling tale in itself.

**Mr. Graham:** Just to follow up, then, what I'm hearing is that where there are special challenges - and those would be challenges in both rural and urban areas - your view is that we could assist the process by editorializing and that those offices should be staffed up and resources should be provided to those MLAs to meet those challenges. Is that what I'm hearing from you?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Not if the only solution is that we just provide more staff resources to MLAs because they're in a growing area. What I tried to reference, Mr. Chairman, is to recognize the large rural areas that may occur with boundary redistribution and that we may need to assist those MLAs to, for example, have a staff resource person on the ground or within that constituency, very similar to what they have now, to deal with those challenges. But if you have a very large riding that may take in two centres, you may need the requirement for two people, one in either centre, to deal with the constituents' concerns. That doesn't mean that you need two MLAs.

**The Chair:** Your Worship, I could say that I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but I rather am. I took from your comment that you indicated that the last report said that really in essence Calgary was two MLAs short, but they thought that they'd leave that to us, and we thank them. If you add that and the population figures that you passed on to us, it seemed to me that, in doing my rapid math, that equated to about four new seats for Calgary. I know you've told us that you haven't done the math, but am I a long way off base there, Your Worship?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** No. I believe, Mr. Chairman, expressed another way, the equivalent of three average electoral districts. So three more seats for Calgary.

**The Chair:** One other question: what kind of assistance do you give to your aldermen now? Do they have ward offices? What kind

of support do they get to serve 65,000 people? You can get back to us at a later time.

**Mr. Bronconnier:** No. I'd be happy to answer the question, Mr. Chairman. I served as alderman for ward 6 for nine years. The assistance that is provided to aldermen versus that of my urban MLAs is far different. It's far greater for an MLA than it is for a member of Calgary city council. Members of Calgary city council are provided with one executive assistant, and they handle all the mail, the phone calls, deal with all of the ward issues as well as all of the agendas and all of the material that's related to being a member of city council.

I, too, believe that they need some additional resources, but recognizing that we're also in a political world, to date Calgary city council has not chosen that course of action. I believe that they do need more resources. If we maintain the complement that we have today of 14 members of city council elected by ward and the mayor elected citywide, in the long term there will not be enough resources to adequately govern the city appropriately. They, too, will need additional support. We can draw those conclusions from a number of cities. Although I hate to add two examples, Mr. Chairman, from Ontario in one sitting, I shall: the city of Ontario in the province of Toronto. Let me get this straight: the city of Toronto in the province of Ontario.

**The Chair:** It's hard to get out; isn't it?

**Mr. Bronconnier:** It is very hard to get out. Mel Lastman will never forgive me.

They are provided, depending upon the ward, with up to five staff. Now, having said that, they also have significantly larger ridings than members of Calgary city council do, but they have five members of staff to assist them. I'm not sure that that's the right number, because that's the number that I have in my office, and some days I would say that that's short and other days, depending upon the issues, I would say that that's not enough. But overall that's where we're at. If we look at governance in this country overall, whether it be at the city level, the provincial level, or the federal level, I think we're well served. I really would, Mr. Chairman, strongly encourage you – you've put me on the spot, and I'm trying to give you a strong recommendation that, whether it's editorially or considerations within your report for the Legislature to consider, is truly population to elected officials.

**The Chair:** Any further questions from my colleagues?

Well, Your Worship, thank you very much. I know you have a city council meeting that was supposed to start a few minutes ago. We're very grateful for your coming, because really the heart of the dilemma we face starts here with Calgary. In essence, what we do in Calgary and the area surrounding Calgary has impact all across the province. I don't think I'm passing on any military secret from my colleagues that likely three-quarters, at least well over half of the presentations that we've received in written form to date deal with this issue of we should be reducing the number of MLAs. I'm sure that the chairman is going to get used to saying: I appreciate your advice, but we can't do that.

I appreciate the candour with which you told us frankly to not sacrifice what's happening in the urbanization of Alberta and not give people some additional resources to deal with those matters in those rural areas.

Thank you very, very much. We're very grateful.

9:40

**Mr. Bronconnier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the

commission. I very much appreciate this opportunity, and I really do thank you for putting me first on the speakers' list this morning. Thank you.

**The Chair:** The next presenter is not until 10:30, so the commission will stand adjourned until 10:30.

[The commission adjourned from 9:41 a.m. to 10:17 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Well, ladies and gentlemen, we're delighted that Mrs. Madelene Oldershaw is with us. You are the second presenter, Madelene. His Worship the Mayor was here just before you, so you're sitting in the same chair. We have one or two more presenters this morning after you, and then this afternoon and this evening it's quite full. Tomorrow we move on to central Alberta, and on Wednesday we're in Edmonton. Next week we're in St. Paul, down to Medicine Hat, over to Lethbridge, and up to Wetaskiwin. Then the last week in June we're in Westlock, Edson, Slave Lake, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Peace River. That'll get us to the end of June.

Then we're going to take time very early in July and start to work on our report. We hope to have our interim report in the Speaker's hands early in September. That'll then be available, and you will get a copy of that as soon as it's released. We're asking people to look at that, and then we'll have a second round of hearings in December or perhaps early January. We have to have our final report in the Speaker's hands by early March of next year. It's our hope that when we make our final recommendations to the Legislature, the Legislature will then adopt it as the new boundaries. That's what happened with the last commission eight years ago.

Under the law in Alberta after every two elections there's a mandatory redrawing of the electoral boundaries, and in that law it says that the chairman of the commission will be either a judge or a head of an academic institution, the Auditor General, or the Ethics Commissioner. I'm the Ethics Commissioner, and I guess it was the Ethics Commissioner's turn on this occasion. In addition to that, the Leader of the Opposition in consultation selects two members who are on the panel, and the Premier and the government select two members. That's the five of us.

The legislation also says that we must use as the basic foundation the last federal census, and that's the 2001 numbers, which give us 2.983 million people. The legislation also says that there has to be 83 seats. So in our very simple way of doing things, we've divided 2.98 million by 83, and we got 35,951, virtually 36,000. So that's where we started from. We're under no illusion, Madelene. This is not an easy task. It may be the most difficult task that I've ever been involved in, and at the end we may be in a situation where each of us hopes we have four other friends. That would be the members of the panel here. So in a nutshell that's what we're doing.

I'll introduce you to my colleagues. To my right is Ernie Patterson. Ernie is the mayor of the town of Claresholm. He's been mayor for 33 years. He's also the vice-president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. To my immediate right is Glen Clegg. Glen is a former municipal councillor, reeve, and former member of the Legislature for the Dunvegan area, Fairview and Spirit River, in the northwest part of the province. To my immediate left is Bauni Mackay. Bauni is a former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association. She's from Edmonton. To my far left is Doug Graham. Doug is a prominent lawyer here in the city of Calgary. I should introduce to you – oh, you've already met – Brian Fjeldheim, Alberta's Chief Electoral Officer. I believe you met Brian when you came in.

What we'd like is for you to tell us what you think we need to know, and then we'd like to ask you some questions. We're not

strong on formality. We would really like you to feel comfortable, and we'd like to hear your advice to us.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Thank you very much. I realize you're in a tough spot. Really I don't envy you, but I'm sure you'll be glad that I came along because I think I've solved all your problems.

**The Chair:** Great. We'll wait with bated breath.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** I'm actually going to read my little letter here, and then you can ask questions.

It's the duty of the Alberta government to ensure fair representation for all voters in the province. For many reasons this has become a difficult task. The population of Alberta is increasing at a very rapid rate. The population increases are not evenly distributed between electoral divisions. There's a migration of population from rural to urban areas, which will increase critically over time. There's an increasing tendency for rural votes to count for more than urban votes in elections. The conventional approach to solving these problems has been to frequently modify the boundaries of electoral divisions. This is a short-term and unsatisfactory solution. It's expensive to make minor adjustments to boundaries on a continuing basis. It's also expensive to continually increase the number of MLAs. When the Legislature is dominated by one political party, the government becomes excessively large.

There are understandable objections to the creation of oversized rural divisions, which make travel difficult for the representing MLA. There are very strong objections by voters to the blending of rural and urban communities in the same division. The attached chart shows that at the present time, in order to produce fair geographical representation for the Alberta population, we need major modifications to about 15 electoral divisions. The roots of many of these difficulties lie in our exclusive use of simple plurality, or the first-past-the-post electoral system. This system relies entirely on citizen representation by geographic district.

I would like to suggest that the commission give consideration to the benefits of alternate electoral systems such as proportional systems where representation by geographic district is not the only method employed. Some form of the proportional electoral system is used by all the developed countries in the world except Canada, the U.K., and the U.S. For example, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Ireland, Japan, Spain, and New Zealand all use proportional systems. The government is elected according to the popular vote rather than by obtaining a majority of members elected by the first-past-the-post system.

There are many different forms of proportional representation. In the mixed-members system about half of the representatives are elected as division representatives and therefore maintain the geographic link between the voter and the member. The remaining seats are topped up to match the popular vote by the inclusion of representatives selected from a party list. Each voter may have two votes, one for an individual district candidate and one for a political party. Under proportional representation there is much less dependence on representation by geographic district. Electoral boundary problems would be vastly muted by the fact that half of the MLAs would be elected not because they were locally popular but because of their qualifications in a broader spectrum of political issues. These members would be selected from the party list because of their capacity to represent the population according to factors such as age, occupation, gender, ethnic origin, health, et cetera. They would be available to serve all Albertans on an equal basis.

Since only half the members would be elected by geography, the electoral districts would be twice as large. However, the demands placed upon the division representatives would not necessarily be increased because constituents would have the option of directing their concerns towards a general member with expertise in the appropriate area.

Proportional representation offers much greater flexibility of administration than our present first-past-the-post system. Equality of electoral divisions does not have the same significance, and the 25 percent variance rule need not be enforced to the same degree. Proportional representation would do a great deal to reduce the problems caused by uneven population increases. The number of MLAs would increase in proportion to the total population increase rather than in response to electoral division problems. The possibility always exists of assigning general members to specific electoral divisions as necessary. Larger rural divisions would not pose a problem because general members would be available to represent the interests of rural residents. The blending of rural and urban divisions would not be required. Both urban and rural citizens would always have appropriate representation.

I believe that representation by geography is not the only option available. I urge you to recommend consideration of alternative electoral systems and the benefits which these systems might offer regarding electoral boundary problems in Alberta.

I thank you very much for allowing me to address this commission. I could talk all day on the benefits of proportional representation, but I really tried to restrict myself to issues concerned with boundaries.

**The Chair:** And you did that well.

Years ago Alberta used to have a system where it wasn't first past the post. If no one got past the post, then you went and counted the second choices. If my memory is accurate, that was discarded in the 1950s, I believe.

10:27

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Yes, I do understand that quite a few areas in Canada have done this at some point and abandoned it for a variety of reasons, and I just feel that it's time to have another look at it.

**The Chair:** Who had the first question? Bauni? Or did I catch you writing?

**Ms Mackay:** Yes, you did actually. My understanding is that what you're talking about in terms of the district representatives would mean that you'd be cutting the number of electoral districts in half. Are you aware that the commission has no jurisdiction over changing the number of seats? The act says that we must stick to 83 seats. Now, how would you suggest that the commission consider implementing your proposal based on the fact that we cannot change the number of seats? That's not within our mandate.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Okay. I realize that this is slightly beyond the boundaries of your concerns. However, I still think it's worth telling you about, because I really think that people like you could make a recommendation to higher powers to consider this.

Now, the point about the mixed-member system is that half of the members would still be associated with specific districts, specific ridings; the other half would in fact float. So you still could start with the same number of MLAs, but your fundamental districts would be twice as large. As I think I have mentioned in here, this at first looks like: oh, dear, here's twice as big a problem as we had before. In fact, because half the members, as I said, float rather than being tied to a specific electoral division, they're available for work

in any electoral division.

I don't know specifically the laws associated with this, and I realize that this is just a first step to some improvement, but initially there would need to be no increase in the number of MLAs, just a halving of the number associated with specific ridings.

**Ms Mackay:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** First of all, I'd like to compliment you on your presentation. I thought it was very well written and concise, which we always appreciate. You've set out a large number of advantages to this proportionate representation, and I gather what you're suggesting is that we make a recommendation by way of appendix or some such thing, because you quite understand that we don't have the power to implement this.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** That is the best I could hope for.

**Mr. Graham:** You've set out a large number of advantages of this system. Just so that we can consider the matter of any disadvantages of what you propose, are you aware of any problems that could crop up or that have cropped up in these other jurisdictions where this is used?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Yes. The main disadvantage is much quoted. For instance, in the case of Israel, which is I guess one of the worst cases of how this isn't working, there is no barrier regarding proportionality. It is usual to have a limit on how low the votes can be before a member is elected according to proportionality, and it varies from country to country. I think 5 percent is probably the lowest. If it doesn't exist, then you do tend to get dominance by extreme small parties.

**Mr. Graham:** So to temper the system, what you would suggest then would be a cutoff point that you would have to achieve.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** That's what most countries use.

**The Chair:** So that would be like 5 percent. You'd have to get 5 percent of the votes for the party or you don't . . .

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Or you don't qualify for any seats at all. There's a great deal of literature. I didn't attempt to produce a list of references, but certainly if you're interested, I can send some to you. I don't really know of any other real downside. Nothing is easy. There are always problems, but I think we're in a particularly bad situation now.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. Hello, Madelene. This is something that certainly I personally hadn't thought about. When you're on a committee, you try and think of all alternatives, but this is something that I really hadn't dealt with or even thought about. So what you're really saying is that half the MLAs would have electoral divisions, but they'd be twice as big. We'll just in round figures say 45 electoral divisions, and then there would be 38, if my figuring is right, what you call members at large that could travel throughout the province, if there are problems, wherever they're needed. Is that what you're saying?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** They serve in government as independent of any electoral division. I would imagine that frequently ministers would be selected from this group of people. I think it's wide open

how any government could decide to employ these. Some of course will be opposition members, but in Alberta I still expect that a large number would be governing party members.

**Mr. Clegg:** I understand all that, but what I'm trying to get at is if you have these 38 members – and I'm going to call them members at large – then if you had the right amount of votes and everything, you would have this half, 38 or whatever the figure is, doing work right across the province?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Yes. Anywhere.

**Mr. Clegg:** Well, wouldn't that be very costly, for traveling and that? I'm just trying to think of some negative things about it. That's all I'm trying to do. You know, I live just a little bit south of the North Pole, and if I had to come down to Lethbridge if I were one of these 38 – I mean, we all know what it costs to travel from Peace River to, say, Lethbridge. If I were a member at large, wouldn't that be costly, or am I getting lost here somewhere?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Well, I think it's more flexible than that. You would have a choice, when you stood for election, of standing as a district representative or having your name put on the party list. Therefore, if you live in the far north and it would be inconvenient for you to be an at-large person, then you would probably opt for representing your district. There's nothing forcing people to become the at-large representative.

**Mr. Clegg:** So what you're saying is that there would still be districts that these people would represent.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Yes. Half of them would represent specific districts exactly as they do now.

**Mr. Clegg:** There would be, say, four or five districts throughout the province, and you would be a representative of one of those?

**The Chair:** Correct me if I'm wrong, Madelene. What I think you're saying, to use Glen's example, is that there would be 45 district members, and then there would be these 38 people at large who would be picked from the party lists and who would really be assigned responsibilities by the party. Is that right?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** By the government if they formed the government.

**The Chair:** If they were from the government. If they were from the opposition, they would be assigned responsibilities by the opposition given their expertise and their interests.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Yes. Exactly. In particular their expertise.

**Mr. Clegg:** And they would not be elected people?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Okay. I'll back up a bit here if you like. Yes, you have an election, and everybody has two votes instead of one. At least this is the case I'm using as an example. As I say, there are a vast number of variations. The two votes that everybody has are one vote for a party and one vote for a local candidate. After the election is over, you discover that you've elected 25 PCs, 10 Liberals, and five NDPs, and this does not correspond to the popular vote. Therefore, you look at the statistics that you have, you look at the numbers, and then you top up the Legislature to equal the ratio of representatives according to the popular vote. The source of the people that you top up from is a list created by the individual

political parties. So there may be people who never get elected by a district, but because for instance they may be experts on economics or the environment, therefore they're at the top of the party's list. So it's two processes.

10:37

**Mr. Clegg:** Okay. I understand.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** It is more complicated than what we've always done before, but look at the countries that make it work. Look at the individual provinces and individual countries that do make it work. I think it has many advantages for Alberta.

**Mr. Patterson:** I'd like to compliment you on bringing forth an idea that's been around for a long time. As our chair has said, it was even in Alberta in one form until the mid-1950s.

I just want you to comment on this. When we look at the countries that you've listed here, one of the things that happens with this quite often is the lack of stability in government, and Israel is one example of that. Ireland, for example, just for the first time in 20 years has a majority government. So when you get all of these – and you've alluded to it yourself – smaller parties in, then sometimes you have that lack of stability. Of course, I suppose you can come back with a statement saying: well, on the other hand, we experience it in Canada where governments are in for a long period of time.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** You answered your own question.

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes, but I'd like your comments on that because stability seems to be one of the factors that we seem to value highly.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Well, I think we've taken stability in Alberta to very extreme lengths. I think that if you only look at stability, you sacrifice democracy. The main method of increasing stability is this method of eliminating very, very small parties. That's how it's usually done. Yes, there are other problems, but I think that if we look at the fact that people aren't voting in Canada anymore, that's much worse than having a few new problems to tackle.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** You're very welcome.

**The Chair:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Clegg:** I understand what you're saying, that there would be this list and every party would have it and the second ballot. I understand all that. Would they have the absolute same privileges as any member of the government? For example, you use 25-10, so they would have proportionately that percentage. Would they sit in caucus and have exactly the same rights and privileges?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** No. They'd be tied to their political party.

**Mr. Clegg:** I understand that, but they would sit in caucus and make decisions just the same?

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** They'd be just another member except that they wouldn't have to spend all that time sitting in their office back in their district answering phone calls from local people over local issues. They'd be available to handle the bigger stuff.

**Mr. Clegg:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** It's an interesting concept. The question that I have for you is: in these countries where they adopt this system, who chooses the party representatives, and how is that done? It strikes me that there is a potential for abuse with the fact that you'd have an inner circle in a party in fact choosing who these proportionate representatives would be without some sort of primary system or some such thing.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Well, we choose party leaders now. I would imagine that it would be an extension of that process.

**Mr. Graham:** Right.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** I don't know specifically how different countries use it. If you're interested in more information – I mean, New Zealand has just adopted this, so they're recent. They've studied it, I'm sure, very well, and I'm sure that they're experiencing the problems that come along with it. I'm hoping to look into that a bit more in a bit more detail, but that's who I'd look to for the information on that.

**The Chair:** My understanding on that is that the parties have a yearly conference, and people put their names forward at this conference. Then the membership of the party either at the conference or through a mail-in ballot – the numbers get ranked accordingly, and if you get 10 members, then the 10 come off the top.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Right. In fact, it would be up to the party to select their own electoral system, and they could be as complicated or as varied as they like.

Just to add one thing. The point about this method is that you might elect people with expertise in different areas. I'm always disappointed by how few scientists there are. I guess scientists are busy within their own field, and they don't like going through the process of becoming popular at the local level, et cetera, so a lot of times their wisdom is ignored. It would be nice to have a choice to use that.

**The Chair:** Any further questions?

Well, Madelene, on behalf of my colleagues on the commission, thank you very much. You've broadened our scope of understanding as a result of your presentation, and I echo the comments made by Mr. Graham. It's succinct, to the point, and certainly you can rest assured that we'll consider it. We're mindful of your comment when you responded to Mr. Graham, when you implied that it would be your hope that we'd make some reference to this in the report for future deliberation, and I can assure you that we'll earnestly consider that. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Oldershaw:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. David Fryett is the next presenter. We'll break until Mr. Fryett is ready and available.

David, you are waiting for one or two more people; are you?

**Mr. Fryett:** I'm ready and available, yes, but I request that we wait. I copied my request to make this submission to my MLA's office, and they have contacted me and indicated that she would really like to attend the submission. I guess my education of this is that MLAs are really concerned about their riding boundaries, so if it's possible, I'd like it if we could just hold off. She'll hopefully be here in five or 10 minutes, no later than 11.

**The Chair:** We have you filled in for 11 o'clock. That's when we'll start. Is that fair?

**Mr. Fryett:** It's a five-minute presentation. I'll make sure you get out in good time here.

**The Chair:** Oh, we aren't that pressed this morning.

[The commission adjourned from 10:45 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we'll move forward, please. I'm pleased to introduce Mr. David Fryett, who is going to make a presentation to us.

David, just a few words. I think you heard my introduction earlier, so I won't bore you with the same thing again other than to say that to my right is Mr. Ernie Patterson, the mayor of Claresholm; Glen Clegg, the former Member for Dunvegan, the Fairview-Spirit River area; Bauni Mackay, the former president of the Teachers' Association, a resident of Edmonton; and Doug Graham, who is a well-respected Calgary lawyer. My name is Bob Clark, and I'm the Ethics Commissioner for the provincial Legislature.

Four quick points. We're holding these hearings, and an interim report will be available in the first part of September. You'll be getting a copy of that. Along with that it will be made public through the Speaker. Then we'll want people to look at that and react to that and then get back to us. In December or January we'll have a second round of hearings, and then we'll have a final report in the Speaker's hands early in March of next year. It's my hope as the chairman that this commission will be as successful as the last commission, where the report went to the Legislature and the Legislature virtually accepted the report in its entirety.

I think you know that the legislation says that two members are appointed by the opposition in consultation and two are appointed by the Executive Council. Also, we are tied to 83 seats, but that doesn't exclude us from making comments or suggestions on other information that comes to us, as was done in the previous submission where we talked about a different form of electoral organization in the province.

So, David, thank you very much. Please feel free to give us your best thoughts and suggestions, because it's really important that we hear from people like yourself and others. The commission has met I guess on three or four occasions to date. We have not put a pen to boundaries at all. I want to assure you of that. We spent considerable time becoming more familiar with the law. We have the services of the people in Alberta Finance, the statistical people, who have got a program so you can move the boundaries this way or this way or this way or this way and the numbers of people that are affected as a result of that. We've also had a chance to meet with the former chairman of the commission and also with Senior Parliamentary Counsel. So I'll leave it there, Dave, and we look forward to hearing your presentation.

**Mr. Fryett:** Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Clark. My name is Dave Fryett. First off, I'm going to make an apology for the top section of my title slide. This is a constituent's perspective, but it's not to be confused with the constituency association. I have nothing to do with the association. I'm just a resident of Calgary-Shaw. Where you might have heard me and what I do take some credit for or maybe accountability, depending on who you're talking to – I'm chairman of what's called the South Fish Creek Transportation Action Committee. I've been active in volunteer work down here for over a dozen years, so I'm quite familiar with planning issues in South Fish Creek.

Thank you very much for allowing me to make this presentation.

I did e-mail you a written submission on May 15, but I've attached copies at the back of the presentation, in case you've lost it.

**The Chair:** I read your presentation last night, your written one.

**Mr. Fryett:** Okay. Thank you.

Can we have the introduction slide, please? Thank you. Just to give you a road map of what I'm going to go over here, it's going to be as easy as one, two, three. I'm going to go over our area, how it looks provincially, federally, and municipally. Then I'm going to give you my ideas of how perhaps we should split Calgary-Shaw into one, two, three ridings, and then conclusions. I don't think I have to go into detail with Calgary-Shaw with you. It's the biggest riding in Alberta: 82,500 people, 130 percent over the average, one of the fastest growing regions in Calgary if not Alberta. I'll just highlight on it here. I went over it a little bit more in my submission.

This growth has created tremendous infrastructure pressures. We're probably ground zero with the infrastructure deficit here in Alberta. We don't have the schools, we don't have the roads, and we don't have the medical facilities. Most of our work in the community associations is spent trying to get these facilities for the people that live in our area. We are somewhat concerned, you know, because we only have one MLA trying to represent such a large number of people on a large number of issues, whether we get fair representation in the Legislature.

Quite a bit of concern in our area about the 2002 cuts. I mean, we realize the government had to make them, but it sure seemed like a lot of the cuts hit pretty close to home. We lost the south Calgary high school funding. The Deerfoot Trail: they had actually started the work on an interchange and stopped mid-work and closed the construction detour. Those things are all on hold as well as the medical facility, the diagnostic and treatment centre that's supposed to come to south Calgary. These are all election promises. They've all been put on hold, and it has created a fair amount of anxiety in our communities.

Next slide, please. This is Calgary-Shaw, the largest riding. It's so large that when you go onto your web site, it is actually two pictures. It can't be made into one page, so I've kind of cut and pasted in here what you can see. It's basically everything south of Fish Creek to the west of the Bow River and includes Douglasdale and all those areas pretty much south of Anderson Road there along Deerfoot, the largest number of people, and really we think it needs to be split into multiple ridings.

**The Chair:** Just while you're on that map, where would you split it if you were sitting where we are?

**Mr. Fryett:** Well, I'm going to get to that, if you could have a bit of patience. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Oh, okay. Good.

**Mr. Fryett:** The first thing I did was look at: well, how does the federal split it? They have their own Internet site. Their maps actually look better than this. I had to reduce them to get them on one slide, so they look a little blurry on there. Essentially, we have two federal MPs for south Calgary. It's split by Macleod Trail. That's that kind of jagged line you see running down the middle of the two different slides. Basically, everything north of Glenmore. One of the things I look at is that the federal riding sizes aren't that much larger than what Cindy has to look after provincially, 115,000 and 120,000 people.



**The Chair:** You are aware, aren't you, that there's a federal redistribution taking place this summer?

**Mr. Fryett:** Yes.

Then you look at it municipally. South Calgary is represented by three aldermen. To the east there's ward 12, which is Alderman Rick McIver, which is basically everything east of the Bow River. So they use the Bow River as a splitting, dividing line; not a bad way to do it. Sixty-five thousand people. Again, much like federally you see a split caused by Macleod Trail. There is ward 14, which is the centre riding there, Alderman Linda Fox-Mellway: basically everything south of Anderson Road between Macleod Trail and the Bow River. There are about 56,000 people there. Then when you go on the west side of Macleod Trail, you have ward 13, which is Alderman Diane Colley-Urquhart: again, about 61,000 people. So you could make some pretty good provincial ridings just by kind of looking at that. That's when I kind of looked at it and said: well, probably what we need to do is split Calgary-Shaw into three ridings much along the same boundaries. Use the Bow River and Macleod Trail, and you get pretty natural constituencies.

Now, I realize that the justification for any provincial riding, you know, comes back to population, population, population. I've done a fair bit of planning work, and I've done a lot of work with the city and the school boards trying to forecast population growth. Both of those jurisdictions have almost given up because Calgary is fairly unpredictable, the huge growth that we've seen in Calgary in the last few years and especially in south Calgary.

This is the south Fish Creek area west of Macleod Trail. It encompasses the communities of Bridlewood, Evergreen, Millrise, Shawnee, Shawnessy, and Somerset. I'll use the same format for the next three slides. The actual data is shown by the area graphs on the left-hand side of your screen which are shaded in. That's actual data. This is actually good to 2001. This is the 2001 municipal census. If I had about another month, I could give you the 2002 data. It'll come out, and I'll e-mail it to you and update it when it comes out.

Anyway, when you look at just these communities, they're already over the threshold in 2001. They're over the 27,000, you know, the minimum. That's 25 percent less than your average riding population. I've shown the minimum, and the maximum is that shaded yellow bar running horizontally across the top of the page. But what's interesting is – I mean, what we're really setting up here are boundaries for the next provincial election. If you forecast those current growth trends, you can see that probably by the time the election is called in 2005, those areas, because of the tremendous growth we're seeing in south Calgary, will be over the average population riding. When that first term ends – that's the green vertical line on the far right – they'll probably be over your maximum. So I guess if you want to be future looking and see how these areas are going to go and think about the fact that you're setting up boundaries for the next term, this will make a very good constituency all on its own.

11:05

**The Chair:** The challenge is that these boundaries will be in effect for the next two elections. So what you're saying is that they'd be more appropriate.

**Mr. Fryett:** Yes.

Okay; next slide please. What I called riding 2 is what I call south Fish Creek east of Macleod Trail. So it's Macleod Trail to the Bow River with one exception. This includes the communities of Chaparral, Midnapore, and Sundance. I've also included Heritage Pointe and the future community of Silverado. Heritage Pointe is

right now outside of the city boundaries, so I don't have any data on it. It's between the Deerfoot Trail extension and Macleod Trail, about two or three miles south of Chaparral.

Now, from what my understanding is, the city of Calgary is beginning the process to annex those lands, so probably by the time this next election comes into play, they will be part of the city of Calgary. Because it's not in the city of Calgary, I have no population data for it. Of course, the forecasting of future annexation is also somewhat less certain than the previous slide, but it is there. Again, you look at the growth trends there. They don't quite make the Alberta minimum riding yet, but they will make it by 2005. They will be, you know, somewhere around the average population probably by the end of the next term, in 2009.

Silverado is a new community going in just east of Spruce Meadows. One of the things that's happening in this area is that we are starting to get some long-awaited road improvements. The Deerfoot Trail extension is going in. The Fish Creek bridge project got approved a couple of months ago. The city of Calgary had frozen a lot of the area for development because the growth had overwhelmed the road structure. Those caps are now all off, so there are a lot of developers that have been forced to sit on the land for a long time all of a sudden saying: we've got to get in there and recoup our investment. So I expect to see a big pop of development here in the next few years.

Next slide, please. The third riding is what I call south Fish Creek east of Bow. This is from the Bow River east. It includes the communities of Cranston, Douglas Glen, Douglasdale, which according to the papers last week I guess is one community. They are one community association, but they are listed as two communities with the city of Calgary.

McKenzie Lake and McKenzie Towne. Again this is a very rapidly growing area of Calgary. The current population is above the minimum, somewhere around 30,000 people. By 2005 they will be above the Alberta average, and much like west of Macleod they will probably blow through the maximum ceiling long before the next term ends. Again, with the Deerfoot Trail extension I expect to see a development boom in this area of Calgary. You might even see higher growth than what's shown here.

I've tried to be somewhat conservative with my growth forecast, but one could easily draw one that could go higher than that. Conversely, if we have another NEP or something, I guess one could show one that flattens out more too, but this is sort of a conservative best guess forecast.

So, in conclusion, Calgary-Shaw has the current population to meet the minimum requirements for three provincial ridings. By 2005 we'd meet the average riding with these population levels. By the end of the next term these ridings would be exceeding the maximum population. We think that we need no less than three MLAs basically to accommodate this growth, or it dilutes our representation. Because it's a rapidly growing area, I think I would argue that these are probably the communities that really need effective representation in the Legislature. All these infrastructure deficit items are financed by the provincial government, and we need our representatives in there working to get them. We'd like to see it split into three ridings. With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Thank you very much for your time.

**The Chair:** Thanks, David. You've put a lot of work into that.

**Mr. Fryett:** I did.

**The Chair:** Who has the first question? Mr. Patterson.

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes. I'd like to thank you very much for that detailed presentation. I'm somewhat familiar with your area because every time I drive into Calgary, I experience the fun. One time I spent half an hour south of that first signal light trying to get through it. So I see . . .

**Mr. Fryett:** Welcome to our community.

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes. Welcome to your community. That's coming in, but going out is almost as bad. So I do want to compliment you on the thought that you have put into this, because it is a very rapidly growing area and you've given us some precise thoughts and ideas on it.

You mentioned annexation, and I'd asked the same question to the mayor. You probably have been a little bit more precise in talking about where the annexation in that particular area is headed, and I just want your thoughts. Annexation is always a long, painful process. If the annexation was not completed by the time we do our report, what are your thoughts on having a portion outside of the city limits included in one of these ridings? It would be urban/rural but limited rural. I'm thinking of it being limited to the proposed annexation area.

**Mr. Fryett:** I think it really depends on the communities and the issues involved. I know that within our municipal boundaries we have some communities north of Fish Creek and some south of Fish Creek, and there's a lot of friction there because there are really entirely different issues. The ones south of Fish Creek have no infrastructure; they have no schools. The ones in north Fish Creek are more established, mature communities. The demographics have changed. The schools are half full, so there are different issues.

Certainly in some instances I think it makes a lot of sense – like the Heritage Pointe one that I brought up here. I think it really almost is what I'd call kind of an urban development. I think it would be a natural to include that in with the city of Calgary. When you get areas like Springbank or something like that, I'm not sure how they fit. I've heard that they have entirely different philosophies and concerns, so it may or may not work. I have no personal objection myself. Calgary-Shaw right now has a little bit of a rural constituency to it, a very small part, but we will have to do these things to keep it down to 83 MLAs.

**Mr. Patterson:** I would agree with you, Mr. Chair, that when I drive by Heritage Pointe, it is growing rapidly, and I understand that that may be one of the areas that is being looked at for annexation.

**Mr. Fryett:** Yes, that's my understanding as well, although I understand that it's in the early stages and nobody is talking any definitive boundaries.

**Mr. Patterson:** You mentioned one other thing. South of Fish Creek and north of Fish Creek: as I understand your maps here – and correct me if I'm wrong – the constituencies do run north and south of Fish Creek that you're proposing?

**Mr. Fryett:** Calgary-Shaw right now is everything south of Fish Creek. They don't have any communities north of Fish Creek.

**Mrs. Ady:** I don't think there are any more tenant farmers.

**Mr. Patterson:** No. I was getting a little mixed up there because you had mentioned Anderson Road.

**Mr. Fryett:** The civic boundaries do go north of Fish Creek.

**Mr. Patterson:** Okay. Everything south of Fish Creek. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11:15

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Well, no, I haven't got a lot of comment on a very good presentation, I might add. You see, when you bring charts to in fact show what's going to happen in 2010 or 2009 – and I don't question what you're saying, because I think your forward-looking is right. It's just that we are looking at the 2001 census. That is the number we go by, because if we look at Calgary-Shaw or any riding in Alberta, if we look at the projections for that, then we better look at the projections for a lot of other areas that probably – and you never like to say that in rural Alberta – will continue to go down. We have a very difficult job in using one set of census, and then if we try to project either negative or positive – well, it's not my riding, but it used to be, and in Dunvegan the population is decreasing. Now, are we going to say: well, there are 26,000 there; is it going to be 24,000? You know, it makes a very difficult job for us. We've got a difficult enough job. Well, we've got a good chairman; he'll settle everything. But the fact is that we don't want to get into projection too much. You know, when you project things, some things happen; the economy goes bad. So we have a specific task using that 2001 census. Although we can look into the future to some degree, we've got to be extremely careful. Because if we look at Calgary-Shaw, we've got to look at everybody, and then we really run into some difficult decisions.

**Mr. Fryett:** I appreciate that. I'm hoping that maybe by the time of the second round of hearings you'll be able to look at the 2002 data, because I know there's been a tremendous spurt of activity. Very low interest rates do spur people to buy houses and do things. So, yeah, I understand your concerns, and anybody that's ever tried to forecast anything, development or oil prices or economics, you're most likely going to be wrong.

**Mr. Clegg:** Exactly.

**The Chair:** Well, when I look back at the last report, there was no riding that had over a 16 percent variance. Calgary-Shaw wasn't one that had that, yet we've moved from a situation where last time around kind of the average was 30,000. That appeared to be reasonable at that time, albeit two elections ago, and now it's gone from that to where we are now, 82,000. It's just a phenomenally remarkable growth.

**Mr. Fryett:** Okay. Well, part of the blame probably goes to myself, because I did present at that last commission and said that you ought to combine it and make Calgary-Shaw look something like what it is now, and they did follow my advice.

**The Chair:** Seldom do we receive such frankness.

**Mr. Fryett:** And now I'm coming here and saying that, well, maybe you might want to split it out again and do it, but circumstances change.

**The Chair:** On this hand and on the other hand, eh?  
Doug.

**Mr. Graham:** Again I want to compliment you on this. This is one of the best presentations I've ever seen. The question I would

have – and I echo Glen's comments to some extent. Just let me relate an anecdote. When we built our house in west Calgary, it was the first house that was built on our street. We then had a collapse in the Calgary economy, and we were the only house on our street for about five years. Seriously.

**Mr. Fryett:** Been there.

**Mr. Graham:** So it's difficult to project the future. What occurs to me when I look at your presentation is that if you are seriously talking about splitting this one riding into three, if we were to adopt that same kind of view for all of Calgary, we would obviously be adding an awful lot of seats to this area. Have you addressed your mind to that?

**Mr. Fryett:** I haven't looked at north Calgary, but I know from my volunteer experience that there is a lot of development in the north. So I expect you're right, that you could make similar projections and arguments for north Calgary as well.

**Mr. Graham:** So, then, appreciating your frankness, is this really a position you're taking, or are you serious about splitting Calgary-Shaw into three ridings by itself?

**Mr. Fryett:** Well, I'm just looking at it from the perspective that if we're going to try and do something that makes sense for the next two elections so that we're not all here in 10 years saying, "Oops; it's completely out of whack again, by 130 percent," this makes sense to me for this particular area. I realize that you're stuck with 83 MLAs. Maybe if they had kind of said, "Well, you know, you could go up a dozen or so," you could do this in all the most rapidly growing areas and it would be a much easier problem. Yeah, I'm trying to do it forward-looking.

I guess you may have to come back to a point of compromise. You might have to split it into two somehow, and then we'll just have to, like we seem to do in all parts of our lives, muddle through for the next 10 years and then address it again, and I'll be here again.

**Mr. Graham:** I really appreciate your input. You've done tremendous work. I also appreciate your frankness. Thank you.

**Mr. Fryett:** Okay; thank you.

**The Chair:** You were so frank, and if you don't want to answer this question, just say: lookit, Bob, this is off the wall. I get told that quite often. If we were going to go to two, is there a logical kind of way of doing that? We haven't talked about this, but with the kind of detailed background you have here – or do you want to think about that and come back to us?

**Mr. Fryett:** Yeah. I mean, I guess one of the things is that I think the Bow River might be a bit of a stronger dividing line than Macleod Trail. The umbrella group that I look after is the communities of what I call south Fish Creek west of Macleod and south Fish Creek east of Macleod: mainly Mid-Sun, Chaparral, Somerset, Bridlewood, Shawnessy, Millrise. We're kind of isolated in there by the Bow River and Fish Creek. As you alluded to, there are only right now really two roads out of there, and the biggest issue people have is with their morning commute. If one of those roads shuts down due to an accident, nobody is moving anywhere for hours, so we're all together working really hard on that transportation problem.

The communities east of the Bow, like Douglasdale and that, are more on the Deerfoot Trail corridor. It will hopefully get done soon.

There is some movement and work being done on it. So they don't have quite the same issues we do. I guess there's more of a natural constituency there. I looked at that, but then it's really kind of lopsided, and it doesn't fit. I mean, for example, you could take Chaparral and put it in with the communities east of the Bow. I think that would work, or you may have to jiggle. I think we'd like to just see two MLAs so that Cindy is not quite as overworked and run off her feet as she is right now.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, on that. When you talk about the Bow River being a possible dividing line in this scenario, I take it that your community associations like Douglasdale and so on don't cross the river.

**Mr. Fryett:** They don't cross the river. Now, I understand that Douglasdale is a little bit unique; it crosses Deerfoot Trail. Normally you won't see them cross any major road. Like, nobody crosses Macleod Trail. They're all kind of separate.

**Mrs. Ady:** The Fish Creek rec. facility covers the east and the west sides of Macleod. Douglasdale: those guys are off in their own community associations; they're not part of Fish Creek.

**Mr. Fryett:** We do have common sports associations for hockey and soccer and so forth.

**Mr. Patterson:** Now, if I might also, Mr. Chair. Did I hear you say that the community associations don't go across Macleod Trail?

**Mr. Fryett:** No, they don't.

**Mr. Patterson:** So Shawnee doesn't go on to the east?

**Mr. Fryett:** No. Shawnee is sort of around the golf course. They are in a common association with Evergreen, which wraps up more toward the east, but they actually don't cross Macleod Trail. Then Mid-Sun is Midnapore-Sundance on the east side.

**Mrs. Ady:** We have a series of small groupings in the community associations, but we also just built what they call the south Fish Creek rec. facility, which is an umbrella organization that sits over all of those smaller community associations in one big centre. So Midnapore and Sundance, called Mid-Sun, Evergreen, Shawnessy, Millrise: you know, they're all in their own community associations, but the umbrella operation of south Fish Creek sits over all of them, and they're all contiguous.

**Mr. Patterson:** If I might have one last question, Mr. Chair. You said that part of Calgary-Shaw now is rural. That would be southwest of Macleod Trail?

**Mr. Fryett:** No. It actually cuts off on the west side. In fact, part of Bridlewood has grown into I believe the Highwood riding. I was thinking more toward the east, east of the Bow. Just looking at the map, there's an expanse. I'm not exactly sure how much population or whether it's mostly light industrial.

11:25

**The Chair:** One of the things that we were attempting to get from both the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton is the community association maps, because one of the things that I think it's fair to say we're really trying to do is that wherever we end up doing things, we want to try and live with the community association boundaries. So if I could impose on you, Dave, to look at the

community association maps and the advice you've given us on the two and get back to us, that would be really helpful.

**Mr. Fryett:** Okay.

**The Chair:** We in our informal discussions have said, you know, that we really want to try and accommodate the community associations. This is a difficult job, let alone breaking up community associations. So that would be really helpful to us.

Cindy, do you have anything you wanted to add?

**Mrs. Ady:** He always does a very fine job. He's a wonderful asset to our community. He's spent a lot of time advocating for it, and he just really sees the issues pretty clearly.

My association, like I said, will present tonight as well with I think just a little bit of a different but similar take for you. He'll probably talk to you a little bit about community associations and who associates with whom, those types of things, because we recognize that we'll probably even split up. It's just how. He's probably delineated the major boundaries that they've looked at and the numbers that they've looked at.

**The Chair:** Any further questions?

Well, might I say again, David, thank you very much. Your candour is most refreshing, because this is a tough job. We need folks like you to tell it to us the way it is, and you've done that. We're very, very grateful. Thank you very, very much.

**Mr. Fryett:** Thank you for hearing me.

**The Chair:** Now, according to my agenda, the next group comes in at 1:30, and that is the Alberta Association of MDs and Counties, to be followed by the Canada West Foundation after that. So we should get two interesting points of view.

We're now adjourned until 1:30. Thank you very much.

[The commission adjourned from 11:28 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Well, ladies and gentlemen, we're pleased to be back this afternoon and to welcome Mr. Jack Hayden and Mr. Larry Goodhope from the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. Gentlemen, thank you very much for accommodating us and being here in Calgary. We heard from the mayor of Calgary this morning, we're hearing from the Canada West Foundation and you people this afternoon, and I think we're hearing from your urban counterparts much later on in Westlock, I believe. So thank you very much for coming.

Just a few words about the commission. We operate under the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. They can pick a judge, a head of an academic institution, the Ethics Commissioner, or the Auditor General. I guess it was the Ethics Commissioner's turn to be chairman. That would be the sense, I think, that was used. The Leader of the Opposition after consultation nominated two people, and the Executive Council nominated two people.

I'm really pleased to have four people with me on the panel. To my far left is Doug Graham. Doug is a well-known lawyer in the city of Calgary. To my immediate left is Bauni Mackay. Bauni is a former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association. To my far right is Ernie Patterson, the long-standing mayor of the metropolis of Claresholm, and to my immediate right is Glen Clegg, whom you know better than you might like to admit.

**Mr. Hayden:** I won't admit that.

**The Chair:** The task that we have before us. I'd like to just make a few comments. Under the legislation after every two elections there is to be a redrawing of election boundaries. Under the legislation we are to use the last 10-year census information. Fortunately for us it's only one year old. The population we're using is 2.983 million. The legislation says that it's those figures we use, and the legislation also says that there'll be 83 ridings. So whether one uses the new math or the old math, you end up with about 35,900 people, or rounded off to 36,000.

The legislation, as you know, allows for a variance of up to 25 percent plus or minus. The last commission recommended only one constituency other than the two northern ridings, that I'll come to in a minute, at more than 15 percent. I think that was 16 percent. So that's kind of the ballpark number that we're aiming at, although it does allow us to go to 25 percent. Remember, these boundaries are going to stand in place for two elections. Then the legislation also calls for four constituencies of special circumstances where the variance can be up to 50 percent. Presently in Alberta there are two ridings that fit that category: Athabasca-Wabasca and Lesser Slave Lake.

Our time frames are these: we have to have our work finished by the first part of March next year. So keeping that in mind, we're in central Alberta tomorrow, then in Edmonton on Wednesday. We're in eastern Alberta next week. Then we're off for a couple of weeks, and then we're going to the north for the last three or four days of June. Then early in July we're going to get together and come to some conclusions and then make recommendations, and a report will commence to be written. It's our plan to have a report out and into the Speaker's hands in early September. You people will get a copy of that, Jack, along with anybody else who makes submissions, and of course it'll be public. Then we'd like you to look at it and come back and tell us, I was going to say, what kind of a good job we've done. We're under no illusion. This is not an easy job. We'd like you to come back then and give us your best judgment. Then we'll be having another set of hearings in December or early January with a view in mind of having a final report in place and in the Speaker's hands early in March. Then it goes to the Legislature.

As chairman I'm somewhat envious of the last chairman, Mr. Justice Wachowich. The Legislature accepted the reports of the committee virtually in their entirety, and that's certainly the desire of the chair. So that's really what we're about. We know that these are difficult issues for you people. They're difficult issues for us too. We heard this morning from one of the ridings here in Calgary where they have 82,000 people in one riding. We don't know, but we're looking to hear some suggestions and comments and cautions and advice from you people.

So the only further comments from me, Jack and Larry, are thanks for coming. This will be a very informal approach, and please have at us.

**Mr. Hayden:** Very good. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon to the honourable members of the commission. It's a great honour for me to appear before you today in my role as the president of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. I'm sure you know that our organization represents 67 incorporated rural municipalities in the province. Indirectly we represent more than 400,000 Albertans who live outside of Alberta's urban communities. Also, our association represents about 93 percent of the provincial land base. On this issue, though, it's not unreasonable to suggest that we represent the interests of most Albertans outside of Calgary and Edmonton; in other words, the folks that live in the towns and villages that are found within the boundaries of our counties and MDs.

Now, you talked about the regularity of this issue as it's being

dealt with. Our association has been dealing with electoral boundaries issues for decades now, and 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 an example, since 1989 we've appeared before two select special committees on electoral boundaries, two electoral boundaries commissions, a special MLA panel on effective representation, two constitutional references on Alberta's electoral boundaries legislation, and one Supreme Court hearing on Saskatchewan's Representation Act. So we're fairly active in this area, and in each case we've continued to promote the principle of effective representation. It's a concept that the Alberta Legislature and the Alberta courts and even the Supreme Court of Canada have all endorsed, yet it's a concept that we seem to be compelled to defend seemingly every few years.

I know that you are all briefed on the concept of effective representation and that there are many various factors that you're required by law to consider when you design the electoral boundaries to ensure that there is effective representation for all of Alberta. Now, we've submitted a written brief that sets out our arguments on effective representation in more detail, and I'd be happy to talk with you more about that if you would like. But rather than just repeat the facts and the criteria that we all know already, what I'd like to do is take a few minutes today and simply impress upon you the reasons why this is so important to us.

In 1991 in the Supreme Court ruling on Saskatchewan's Representation Act, Madam Justice McLachlin made this key point about the right to vote: "The purpose of the right to vote [is] enshrined in Section 3 of the Charter [and] is not equality of voting per se, but the right to 'effective representation.'" Ours is a representative democracy. Each citizen is entitled to be represented in government. As Justice McLachlin noted, the important thing here is that the citizens are represented in government, and to be represented, citizens need to have a voice in the decisions that are being made. That voice is meaningless if it's made so small and insignificant that it has no impact.

We all know that our situation in Alberta of course continues to concentrate our population toward the major centres, and we've all heard the cries in the media for greater representation to correspond with that population. But the fact is that a tremendous percentage of Alberta's economic productivity still begins in rural Alberta, and most of the economic strength of our cities still relies very heavily on what happens in our rural areas. This is the case whether it be the oil and gas sector or forestry or agriculture. The health and wealth of our cities depends very much on our renewable and nonrenewable resource activity, which of course all takes place in rural Alberta.

The people who live in rural Alberta help create that wealth, but they also have to live directly with the various implications of those activities. As examples, I would say that people in Edmonton and Calgary don't live next door to sour gas plants. They don't live next door to large hog operations. They also don't typically live next door to large electricity generation nor to oil wells, and they don't typically have large gravel trucks, oil field equipment, and B trains driving by on the roads right in front of their houses. City residents also don't have to ship their children off to school every day on bus rides that can last two to three hours in this province on roads that are often unpaved and that also have to share space with all kinds of industrial traffic. They don't have to worry about a 40-minute ambulance ride to the nearest hospital, and they don't have to worry about their local school closing, their local hospital disappearing, or how far their children will have to travel to go to university. Rural Albertans live with these complications and they accept these factors as part of rural life, but a critical part of that acceptance comes from knowing that rural Albertans will have a meaningful voice in developing the policy and standards that shape the activities that go

on in and around their communities.

1:40

Provincial legislation, regulation, and policy have a major impact on all of the issues that are critical to rural Albertans. More and more we hear about them in the news: water management and water quality, agricultural policy and support programs, transportation infrastructure, traffic safety, access to health care and education services, air quality, and it goes on and on and on. We need to have a meaningful voice in those decisions, and despite the best intentions of our city cousins in Calgary and Edmonton, Calgary residents simply are not in a position to make those decisions on our behalf. Whenever I see the editorials from some of the big-city papers raging on about the unfairness of the current electoral boundaries in Alberta and the need for these boundaries to be realigned to reflect the population growth in those cities, I remember back to these same papers that for years have trumpeted the need for a triple E Senate in Ottawa to protect Albertans and residents of other provinces from the domination of the population centres in central Canada. These papers made very good arguments about the importance of ensuring fair representation for all regions to ensure that Albertan's interests aren't overwhelmed by Ontario and Quebec.

Of course, rural Albertans believe in the triple E Senate as well, but we're asking basically for the same principles to apply here in Alberta. Rural citizens need to be represented in the Legislative Assembly, and we need a voice that cannot be outweighed on every issue by representation from urban centres. We need to be full partners in the governance of Alberta, and we already are in the economic prosperity of the province.

You all know the arguments about the added difficulties of being a rural MLA, I'm certain. There are larger geographic distances to travel to look after those that they represent, a greater number of communities and local governments to deal with. Greater expectations too is a tradition that I'm sure you're aware of. Rural citizens need the ability to meet and talk with their local MLAs on a one-to-one basis, and it's a service that they expect. These arguments have been stated and restated, and we certainly outline them in detail in our submission. They've been accepted by the courts and by the Alberta Legislature, and they will be factors that you as a commission member will be required to take into account.

I'm sure you're also aware that in Calgary and Edmonton the residents already have more MLAs than they in fact have city council members. They already have an MLA office within 15 minutes of their home on almost all occasions, and it's pretty hard to argue that city residents are underserved by government or don't have an effective say.

If we accept the goal of this exercise as effective representation – and the law says of course that it is – is the addition of more urban MLAs really going to result in any more effective representation for city people? On the other side, I can tell you that any reduction in the number of MLAs in rural Alberta will have an impact on their ability to access their representatives and to have the type of effective representation that these people expect.

The message that I'd like to leave you with today is simply that the process is ultimately about representing people; it's not about representing numbers. It's about ensuring that Alberta retains a system that provides to all citizens reasonable access to government with effective representation in that government.

In closing, I'd like to thank you for giving me this time to meet with you. I wish you all the best in what I know are going to be very challenging deliberations. I'd be very happy to answer any questions if I could.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you, Jack, very, very much.

Larry, is there anything you'd like to add?

**Mr. Goodhope:** No, thanks. That was sufficient, thank you.

**The Chair:** Well, I suppose I should offer the opportunity to a former member of your association to lead off with the first question or comment. Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. Hi, Jack. Hi, Larry. As you two know, I was with your association for seven years, and you know your thinking is as good as it was when I was there. I'm surprised at that. However, I really haven't got any questions, because I use the term "fair representation," and, Jack, I totally agree. I do know what the courts have said and so do you, but the seven key factors that you have here are all good points.

Having represented a very rural riding for 15 years, I understand that. Firstly, it was a six-hour drive to the capital. I represented 27 municipalities and a part of four school divisions and two hospital boards even after the reorganization of the hospital boards. I don't want to give a speech here, but I hear the comments that you can hire more people if you're rural. But the fact is – and I don't know in urban – that in rural Alberta the municipalities and school boards and hospital boards want to talk to the MLA. Not that he is any smarter than somebody you could hire, but they think that that is what they get the fair representation from, by talking to the person in charge, and they feel that they have a direct relation with the government. So to hire more people is not truly the answer in many cases. Sure, you can always hire people to do work, but . . .

I think we should also consider that if you look at rural ridings in Alberta, you will find that the biggest percentage of people that vote are in rural Alberta, although not in all cases. Now, we're not telling everybody that you have to vote or anything. We are only looking at numbers. So it tells me that in rural Alberta people are interested in who their MLA is and they use them.

I have no specific questions. I like your presentation. All I can say is: just keep sticking up for rural Alberta.

**Mr. Hayden:** Just one comment if I could, Mr. Chairman. When you talk about the distances in areas to be represented, we hear that from our people all the time. We have 130,000 kilometres of roads in our membership. My municipality is an example. It shares an MLA with another municipality approximately the same size, and that's 70 miles by 55 miles wide. Local roads that are the equivalent of a trip from Calgary to Toronto have to be open every day when it snows to get the kids to schools. The distances are huge, and of course that's the situation all across the province.

**The Chair:** Jack, where do you live?

**Mr. Hayden:** The county of Stettler. I live right close to a little town called Byemoor. I'm right between Hanna and Stettler. By the way, when I talk about those times and distances on buses, my children were three hours a day on a bus and never able to take part in extracurricular activities. I was the chairman of the school board at the time, but I actually couldn't do anything about it. Huge distances.

**Mr. Patterson:** I'd just like to thank you both for coming. I do like your reference to the matrix. I like the way you have laid that out in the seven factors in addition to the population. That is helpful because when we get to our final report, as you have so well outlined all of the court decisions and processes, it will help us to expand, or should we say emphasize, that matrix in the report, so I appreciate that. On your last page I kind of like your statement under

conclusion 4.

Recognize that the ultimate goal of this exercise is to represent people, not numbers, and that people have differing needs and priorities, and a right to representation regardless of where in the province they choose to live.

I guess that leads me then, although I don't want to get into – Glen's already given the speech, and I don't need to give another one here.

1:50

**The Chair:** I'm not sure we have time for two.

**Mr. Patterson:** No. Is there anything in effective representation in addition to what you've said here that you feel, in working with MLAs, would help MLAs do a better job or – I'll put it this way – help them be able to do their job more effectively, in addition to these factors here coming under the term "effective representation"? Any thoughts on that?

**Mr. Hayden:** We hear comments of course from across the province about the different ways that MLAs represent their areas. In some cases they have satellite offices so that they can be in those communities at different times, and it works well in those areas. Different MLAs attend different numbers of social functions and public functions where they get an opportunity to go around. I think that what we have in there is basically what you would expect from our association, and I think the ability to better represent those areas is going to have to be left in the hands of the MLAs because each community is different.

**Mr. Patterson:** With the MLAs that you are aware of who have more than one office, do you feel that helps? Is it significant?

**Mr. Hayden:** I think it has helped in some areas, and let's be honest about it: in some cases it makes you more electable too. I mean, sometimes these are the things that you have to do to get elected. It's one thing to have an address, and it's another thing to be there often enough to speak to people.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Ms Mackay:** I just want to clarify something. Obviously what the 2001 census has shown us is that the urban population is growing and the rural population in Alberta is going down. So would your association say that in spite of that the number of rural seats should remain the same, that basically we shouldn't be changing the ratio or changing the balance at all? Is that the position that you're putting forward?

**Mr. Hayden:** The position we're putting forward is that we don't want to lose any representation. We would not want to see the seats reduced in rural Alberta. As far as the population goes, while that statement is generally true, it isn't true in all cases. We have a number of our members where in fact the population is going up, and what was considered rural in the past changes a little now in some situations. The third largest municipality populationwise in the province is now the county of Strathcona. Different things are happening. The highway 2 corridor of course is expanding dramatically populationwise and businesswise, and some of that is spreading back out east and west into the rural areas. But I have to put a plug in for my friends from the north. We already, when we look at the maps and the boundaries, have some massive areas where I can't imagine how the MLAs up there can effectively represent their people to the satisfaction of their taxpayers and constituents and to the satisfaction of themselves. So I would hate to see a

reduction in numbers of MLAs that are out there now. There are difficulties in many areas accessing your MLA the way it is right now.

**Ms Mackay:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** I'd just like to follow that up, Mr. Chairman. In the interests of fairness I asked the mayor of Calgary this morning what he proposed specifically. He made a presentation that is similar to yours in many ways in that he cited various factors that we should consider, and of course we will and we're aware of that. I know what you want. But are you suggesting that there should be no transfer of seats whatsoever into the urban areas, bearing in mind, for instance, that we had a presentation just before lunch from Calgary-Shaw, which has approximately 85,000 people in it?

**Mr. Hayden:** I understand that problem. I work with Mayor Bronconnier, a very wise gentleman, and I'm sure he would like to see more representation in Calgary, but in our paper you will see that we talk about effective representation. I think that your job will be to look to see if those additional numbers will in fact provide more effective representation. I would ask Mayor Bronconnier the question: do you want more representation, or do you want more money for the operation of the city? I'd be interested in the answer there.

**The Chair:** Do you think the answer would be the same in all municipalities? I won't answer that.

**Mr. Hayden:** We'll take the money, but we need the representation that we have. We're not asking for more. We're asking for effective representation, and the numbers that are there now barely meet that criteria.

**The Chair:** One of the points that came up in discussion this morning with the mayor was that there are something like – what? – seven MPs, and there are I think 13 aldermen and 21 MLAs. I guess really what you're saying, Jack, is that if we were to go to 23 or 24 MLAs, would Calgary be any better represented? Or if we were to split Sherwood Park into two constituencies, would Sherwood Park be better represented?

**Mr. Hayden:** That's basically what I'm saying. I know that when we look at the maps, there are probably not going to be huge changes that would be contemplated on the one end on the part of your commission. At the same time, the changes that are going to be made will be made at the expense of rural Albertans. That is our concern. We just have to be right up front and say that to have effective representation in the best interests of this province, we have to very carefully look at where the wealth of this province is generated, where the activity is generated, how absolutely dependent we are on the resource industry, both renewable and nonrenewable, and how important, as we go down the road, having good representation, effective representation is going to be for water quality, for air quality, for many of the other issues that are going to be dealt with at the Legislature.

**The Chair:** One of the things that the last commission did was try something I think different, at least in Grande Prairie, where they really divided the city of Grande Prairie in the middle, as I understand, and then you have Grande Prairie-Wapiti on one side and Grande Prairie-Smoky on the other side. The former chairman explained to us that part of the rationale was that you had people from the area who were likely retiring in Grande Prairie – you could

likely make the same argument for Red Deer and other cities – and that the interests of people in Grande Prairie would be very similar to those surrounding the city, and the same thing perhaps with Red Deer or Lethbridge. How do you react to that? Because one of the things we want to find out when we are in Grande Prairie is: has it worked as well as we've been told it has? We've heard rather glowing reports to date.

**Mr. Hayden:** Of course, I know one of the representatives from Grande Prairie, the past president of AUMA, Gord Graydon, that I worked with quite a bit. There is a concern. Whether it's founded or not, I don't know, but when you talk about a mixture in a constituency between an urban centre, a highly populated centre, and then a broader rural centre on the outside, the political reality is that there's a smaller percentage of chance of ever electing anyone from the actual rural component just because of the concentration of population and the profile of the people from those communities, and that's selfish. There's no question that it's probably a selfish comment, but at the same time when you've got that many square miles of area with all different types of industries and everything else in them, you need a representative that knows firsthand what the effects of those are and what sorts of things need to be discussed in Edmonton. You do take a risk of losing your actual true rural representatives just because of the core electorate of a constituency that's a pie shape, as an example. It can definitely be weighted to the side of the urban centre.

**The Chair:** I think that in Grande Prairie they went right down the middle, so you've got more of a balance. I could be wrong here, but I believe one of the MLAs is Mr. Graydon, the former mayor. The other MLA, Mel Knight, is from outside, which seems to be one of those fortuitous situations.

**Mr. Hayden:** Yes. You picked a good example.

**The Chair:** Well, it's the first time that I think it's been used in Alberta. Just speaking totally on my own behalf, the more we can do – and I don't know how to do this – to get away from the urban/rural thing, as long as we have effective representation for the region, it seems to me that that's an avenue that all of us need to look at, because it's a sticky wicket for all concerned, you know.

2:00

**Mr. Hayden:** It is. There are some hugely qualified people out there representing different constituencies. Gordon Graydon is one of them. He's very aware of what's happening outside of his own municipality, as an example, and I know there are lots of good ones out there.

**The Chair:** I guess another example not too far from you would be Camrose – wouldn't it? – although the member there is from Camrose and represents Camrose and Wetaskiwin.

Any other questions or comments?

I pride myself on being pretty blunt, and I appreciate your frankness, but you understand that the difficult part of our task is going to be that whatever we do in Calgary, we're going to have to find some places elsewhere. If in the course of the next while you have some additional inspiration, please feel free to get back to us, because we're going to need the best thoughts of a lot of people to help come to a resolution. I don't want at the end of the day to have people saying: well, all you people have done is heighten the division between urban and rural. That's not what you people want; it's not what we want either. So any help you can give us in that area would be very much appreciated.

**Mr. Hayden:** Thank you very much. I know that you have a very difficult task, and I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you today.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much, Jack. Thanks very much, Larry. Okay. We'll reconvene in about five minutes.

[The commission adjourned from 2:01 p.m. to 2:04 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Well, ladies and gentlemen, we're now pleased to have Dr. Berdahl with us from the Canada West Foundation. One of the initiatives of the commission that I took part in before starting the hearings was to have Dr. Gibbons and Dr. Epp meet with us, Dr. Gibbons face-to-face and Dr. Epp by telephone. Dr. Epp is from Augustana University College and is a very well regarded authority on what's happening in rural areas of western Canada. We had him and Roger Gibbons together to give us the pros and cons on what they've seen happening, what's in the future.

We're very pleased that you're here today, Dr. Berdahl, and we look forward to your submission. You know kind of the ground rules that the commission is working under, having to have 83 seats and having to have a report finished by next March. So I'll restrain my comments and ask you to give us the benefit of your good judgment. Were you here when I introduced the members?

**Dr. Berdahl:** No.

**The Chair:** Ernie Patterson, the mayor of Claresholm; Glen Clegg, a former member of the Legislature from the Peace River country, the Dunvegan area; Bauni Mackay, the former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association; and well-known Calgary lawyer Doug Graham.

**Dr. Berdahl:** Thank you, and thank you very much for having me here today. Roger Gibbons is unable to be here because he's in sunny Italy, so he sends his regrets, but I'm not sure to what extent they're heartfelt. I'm sure he's having a wonderful time.

As you are very well aware, the Electoral Boundaries Commission has the essential task of adjusting provincial constituencies in the face of demographic change. I'm here to recommend that the commission do so by embracing Alberta's new urban reality. As I'm sure a lot of people presenting to you have given these numbers again and again, Alberta is a highly urbanized province. The 2001 census figures show that almost 64 percent of the population live in Calgary and Edmonton, and given their rapid growth rates, it is reasonable to assume that this will increase to two-thirds of the population by the end of the decade if not before.

Now, what I will argue is that this urbanization holds a lot of promise for Albertans, whether they be Albertans living in the two large cities of Calgary and Edmonton, whether they be living in smaller urban areas or within rural Alberta. The reason is that the large metro areas such as Calgary and Edmonton are emerging as the engines of the new knowledge-based economy. Large cities bring together research and development, innovation, and human capital, and really all Albertans have a stake in the economic vitality of Calgary and Edmonton. This is something that is being embraced internationally, that there's increasing recognition of the importance of cities to local, regional, and global economies, and I think this is something very positive for Alberta to embrace.

A second reason to embrace this urban reality is that cities are magnets for immigration. Demographers are emphatic that the future workforce of Alberta depends on our ability to attract and retain immigrants as well as attracting and retaining interprovincial migrants. So really our future labour market needs demand that

Alberta call attention to its urban strengths.

Another point is that businesses and individuals more often than not base their locational decisions, whether or not the company or the industry is going to base itself in Alberta versus Ontario or versus Washington state, for example, on urban quality of life. So we really need to be focusing on ensuring strong, dynamic cities to protect our long-term economic vitality.

In short, then, Alberta's competitive position depends on the competitive position of our major cities. All Albertans stand to gain from competitive cities. For this reason I would like to suggest that the commission's recommendations to the Legislative Assembly be cast within a competitive cities conceptual framework. In doing so, the commission would be embracing and celebrating Alberta's urban face. Doing so would also improve the ability of MLAs to represent complex urban constituencies.

It's very interesting to be following the presentation immediately before me. There was a lot of talk there about effective representation, which I think is a very important goal and something everyone stands behind. I think there's an incorrect assumption that because a constituency is perhaps physically smaller, it is easier to represent. Because Calgary and Edmonton are sites of immigration and interprovincial mobility, urban constituencies are far less homogenous than rural constituencies. Urban MLAs are faced with considerable social diversity and must devote a great deal of time to direct contact with citizens and a vast array of community groups. The interests that they're seeking to represent therefore are more diverse and more challenging.

It is possible for the commission to acknowledge Alberta's urban reality without undermining representation in less populated areas. Overrepresentation according to representation by population standards has in the past been based on geographic limitations. It is possible for these geographic limits to be partly overcome by technological advances. For example, the commission might try to stand behind the Alberta government's commitment to provide broadband linkage throughout the province or look at other ways to ensure effective representation for rural areas with different techniques.

So in summary I would like to recommend that the Electoral Boundaries Commission enhance urban representation in the Legislative Assembly. Doing so would benefit all Albertans and would promote our long-term prosperity and well-being.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, doctor. Succinct and to the point, I might add. I appreciate that.

Mr. Graham.

**Mr. Graham:** Yes. With respect to your comment about increased resources being devoted to communication in the large rural areas, such as broadband and increased assistance to allow MLAs to communicate with their electors, could you not make the same argument in the urban areas? That is to say, with respect to this diversity within the urban areas, couldn't you also argue that that problem could be solved by devoting additional resources to it; for instance, things like translators, additional staff, that sort of thing?

**Dr. Berdahl:** It's possible that the same argument would work, but if we accept the argument working for both, it still undermines the need for overrepresentation by rep-by-pop standards for the rural areas. So if we're going to be able to use technology effectively – and I think it is something that would be of benefit for the urban and the rural areas – it still then leads to the question: if we can use these technological advances, do we still need to be having such large overrepresentation by rep-by-pop standards for the rural areas?



One thing I didn't mention. I'm not suggesting at all that we move to pure rep by pop, and I think there are some very vast constituencies where it's hard to imagine how the north could be represented even with technology, but I think that trying to get a little bit more in line is something that should be a goal in terms of that urban framework. That was just one thing I didn't quite get to.

**Mr. Graham:** Thank you.

**Ms Mackay:** You talked about the need to recognize the knowledge-based economy being centred in urban Alberta as opposed to rural and the cities being the magnet for immigration and so on. I guess that by implication – I won't put the words in your mouth. Could you explain: what do you think would be the fallout if in this next set of boundary redrawing there isn't a recognition of the change in demographics in terms of the increased urbanization versus the decreasing ruralization of Alberta? Can you foresee any kind of fallout from that if that isn't recognized?

2:14

**Dr. Berdahl:** Just to be clear on the question, you're saying: what might happen if nothing changes?

**Ms Mackay:** Yeah. I guess what I'm asking you really is: are you seeing not giving that kind of recognition to the ratio having some negative effects on attracting immigrants, on the knowledge-based economy in the province, and so on? That's what I'm really asking you.

**Dr. Berdahl:** Well, I'll answer it, and I'll seem to be coming at it in a roundabout way. Canada West did research a year ago looking at building the new west, looking at what the components were for long-term regional prosperity. We did this through consultation across the four provinces and through an extensive amount of research. We found that there were five areas that needed to be focused on for long-term regional prosperity, and one of them was ensuring viable, competitive cities, that if we're going to be prosperous to 2020 and beyond, we need to be ensuring that we do have viable, competitive cities. Another was human capital, that we need to make sure that we can attract and retain human capital. We know very much from the research that human capital and competitive cities go hand in hand.

So coming back to the question of what would be the fallout, I think that if we do not recognize the urban reality, we are not going to be fully actualizing our competitive potential. I think that if we do not recognize the urban reality, I see the potential for increased political apathy in the cities to be something that needs to be considered. We've been doing work on cities and on western Canada for a fair amount of time now, and I've been very struck by a lot of the urban debate that's starting to emerge in Canada and that we're starting to see. We're seeing the federal government talking about an urban lens, we're seeing provincial governments looking at municipal legislation, and these are all good things. At the same time, I have to wonder when I look at these things: what is it about Canada and what is it about Alberta or any of the other western provinces that we actually need to apply an urban lens in the first place? When we have two-thirds of Alberta in urban areas and a slightly smaller percentage nationally in large urban areas, why is it that we need to remind people to think about urban competitiveness, urban quality of life? The reason is that with the way representation works in the country right now, we don't have the incentives for representatives to really be looking at urban issues.

To go back to my answer to your question, I think that our long-term competitiveness will be hurt if we don't start acknowledging the fact that we're an urban province, an urban country, and that

there's a larger trend of urbanization that has important economic ramifications.

**Ms Mackay:** Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** You talked a little about "a little bit more in line," doctor. I'm sure you're fully aware of the legislation under which we have to operate and all of the court cases that have come down. Could you define a little more precisely "a little bit more in line"? We have the variation of the 25 percent rule except for a few constituencies up north. Would you give us some thoughts on what you mean by a little more in line?

**Dr. Berdahl:** Well, I don't have exact numbers. Personally I would like to see it drop under 20 percent, just sort of in a gut sense, approaching 15 if it were mine to draw, but I realize that that's your job, so these are just suggestions.

**The Chair:** But we're open for advice.

**Dr. Berdahl:** Apparently.

One thing that I was really struck by is the idea: well, we're not representing numbers; we're representing people. Well, the numbers are a count of people. We are representing people, and there's a very famous quotation out of an American court case on electoral boundaries that Congress is to "represent people, not trees." With that sort of idea, that we have large groups of people in cities, I don't think there's anything wrong with starting with the numbers and then adjusting as needed to ensure effective representation in the rural areas but really starting on a rep-by-pop basis and then making the adjustments for effective representation. I think that would be the ideal way to begin.

**Mr. Patterson:** So I hear you saying that 15 percent would be good?

**Dr. Berdahl:** Fifteen percent is sort of a gut test. I haven't personally done the research to map it out. The larger point is that I think the more we can move towards rep by pop – given the northern areas, given some of the very large rural areas, we do need to acknowledge that a pure rep-by-pop approach is probably not practical for Alberta right now, but I think heading in that direction. I don't know how far along the continuum you can go before you bump into effective representation challenges.

**Mr. Patterson:** Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. I take it also, then, that you probably have some positive thoughts about the matrix that started to develop last time. Any comments on that?

**Dr. Berdahl:** I'm afraid I'm not entirely familiar with the matrix.

**Mr. Patterson:** Some of what we have to look at are the distance from the Legislature, geography, community of interest, those items. You're not up on that?

**Dr. Berdahl:** I'm not up on that. Sorry.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, doctor, for the enlightening words of wisdom. I'm sure that we are going to get enough words of wisdom before we finish all the hearings, but it's great to hear different views. I certainly do agree with you that Edmonton and Calgary need to be – I think all residents of the

province embrace those two cities in general. You have to have strong urban cities anywhere in the world, I think, to have a good system in place. I think you said that all Alberta should embrace, and I think they do, but I also think that urban Alberta should embrace rural Alberta. The last presenters said, you know, that a large volume of the dollars that keep Alberta going in an economic circle are from rural Alberta. We in the north – and I have to get this in – say that 70 percent of the wealth comes from the north and that only 10 percent is ever spent there. So we feel very strongly that although we need the strong urban centres, we also need to have a strong rural base for people that live there, although the numbers aren't great.

I'm extremely happy to hear you say, you know, that 15 percent is certainly a reasonable number. It's not reasonable to me unless we can use some system to come to that 15 or 20 or 10 or 25. If we can prove in my mind that there is a reason for it being 15 or 20 or 25 or 10 – it doesn't matter what figure because we haven't talked about this yet. To me there's got to be a reason for that number to be 15 percent. You can't pick out of the hat: well, this one's going to be 15 percent more than the other. But I think we have that with the matrix. Anyway, I think we can use that, and we have to use that before we start looking at boundaries. Let's face it; if we're kind of looking at the boundaries in Calgary, Calgary is a high-growth centre, so unless we use that firstly, then we won't know how to divide Calgary up. So it's a difficult job.

**The Chair:** I'm just about to ask you what your question is.

**Mr. Clegg:** I have no question. I'm just very pleased to be here and to hear what the remarks are.

**The Chair:** Okay. You can understand my challenge. Seriously.

I found one of the really heartening parts of what you had to say was when you said: yes, we start with rep by pop but then move away from that in the direction of effective representation. I think I heard you say 15 percent may be a reasonable balance. I made the same point to the group we just did before. I think it's really important that we develop some kind of a balance so that it isn't urban/rural. We're all Albertans, and I think we all have many of the same interests. I really believe that your comments this afternoon will help us in our deliberations.

Any more questions from my colleagues?

You'll be getting a copy of our initial findings. Please look them over and let us know your reaction. We'll have a second round of hearings in December or early January. The final report will be in the Speaker's hands in March. Thank you very much, doctor.

2:24

**Dr. Berdahl:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ladies and gentlemen, we have with us Mr. Doug Caswell. Doug is speaking on behalf of the Calgary-East Progressive Conservative Association, and I see that his MLA is safely seated in the second row from the back. Moe, good afternoon. I'm pleased that you're here.

I'd like to introduce you to my colleagues on the panel. To my far right is Doug Graham, whom I'm sure you know; Bauni Mackay, the former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association from Edmonton, Glen Clegg from the Peace River country; and Ernie Patterson, the mayor of Claresholm.

You've heard me outline what our task is in the simplest form. We have to use the last federal census. We're looking at 2.9 million divided by 83 seats because the Legislature has told us that there are to be 83 seats. You get very close to 36,000 as the target for constituencies. Then there's some provision for variance from there.

Doug, thank you very much for coming this afternoon. We look forward to hearing your presentation. Have at us, please.

**Mr. Caswell:** Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, commission members, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Doug Caswell. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. As you said, I'm here as a representative for the Calgary-East Progressive Conservative Association. Your commission has a very difficult and important task: to redraw the boundaries of the electoral map of our great province. We hope that my comments today will highlight for you some of the local issues which we think are important as you deliberate on the changes which you have the mandate to propose. I will be brief and to the point.

First, we believe that the number of MLAs that currently serve the city of Calgary is sufficient for the following reasons: federally seven Members of Parliament serve us, and municipally 14 aldermen and a mayor serve us. Does Calgary really need more representation in Edmonton than we have in Ottawa and city hall combined?

Looking at the statistics published by your commission in your brochure, Calgary has a total population at that point of 878,866. Divided equally into the current number of 21 constituencies, that would be 41,851 in each. That would leave each constituency at 15 percent below the top of the acceptable range as stated in your guidelines. To achieve such a balance, an equal distribution would require tremendous effort and skillful placement of the electoral boundaries. That is why the commission was formed with the individuals such as they are.

Second, in the placement of the electoral lines now is the time to set aside some of the previously considered natural divisions such as Deerfoot Trail, the Bow River, and Fish Creek park to assist you in the ability to reach equitable numbers within each of the 21 constituencies. These natural divisions are nothing other than easy-to-plot map lines. Consider the natural divisions over which rural constituencies stand.

Third, we urge you to continue to respect the dignity and unity of communities and their affiliations. It is important that a boundary line split no community or communities that work together on sports or common interests. While this may seem to be at odds with my previous point, it is not. One MLA can represent two unrelated communities with no problem, but it is hard for one community to be represented by two MLAs. If you begin plotting the electoral boundaries at the core of the city and move outward, drawing the constituency boundaries in an ever widening ring, you'll find an electoral boundaries solution that still leaves room for growth at the outer edge of the city, where the growth takes place.

In summary, we believe that the current number of 21 MLAs adequately serves us the population. We believe that natural divisions need not be a barrier to a good decision, and we believe that community dignity must prevail. Your work is challenging, and you will be presented with many suggestions and thoughts on which to deliberate, and I look forward to reading your preliminary report. I will be glad to answer any questions you have about these points.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Doug, we've already asked the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton for the maps of their community associations, so your point is right on there.

**Mr. Caswell:** I think you want to go a little bit beyond just community associations. I'm sure you're aware that groups of community associations often work together in sports alliances, and those can span quite a ways across a city, but with a little bit of investigation and input by those that know the areas I think you'll find that certain groups of communities do tend to cluster together.

An example of that is the Dover/Forest Lawn area.

**The Chair:** How would you suggest we best get that in addition to just the maps that were asked for from the cities?

**Mr. Caswell:** Well, I'm not sure what your relationship is allowed to be with the MLAs, but the MLAs would be an excellent resource.

The other point that I think I really want to bring out is the natural divisions that have for been there for the last number of years. Deerfoot Trail has been a natural split. The Bow River has been a natural split and Fish Creek Park. There's no reason why one MLA could not represent Mayland Heights and – what's on the other side there? Anyways, the two sides of the Deerfoot Trail. There's no reason why Deerfoot Trail has to be a division. I mean, heavens, rural MLAs go miles and miles and miles.

**The Chair:** Okay. Who has a question for Doug?

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you, Doug, for the presentation. I just want to confirm what I'm thinking. You're saying that if Calgary were divided into 21 equal constituencies, then you would have 41,000 each, and that's roughly 15 percent above the provincial average. Your presentation would recommend that, and you feel that they would be well represented by the 21.

**Mr. Caswell:** With the 21 MLAs or constituencies that Calgary currently has there's still room for growth if you're able to find a way to rejig the lines. I realize that by doing that, you're possibly going to move every line in the city and maybe even end up squeezing out a sitting MLA, but I don't think that's your concern. Your concern is to find the right way for representation within the guidelines, as you said, which is 83 for the province. I don't think Calgary needs 22 or more MLAs.

**Mr. Graham:** Doug, I was very interested in your comments on community-based representation. We're very aware of that, and as our chairman has indicated, we've asked for that information from the various municipalities. So I have two questions arising. One, is it your understanding or impression now that there are a significant number of communities in the city that have been split?

**Mr. Caswell:** I don't believe there is right now, but I know that in the last round that came up, back in '92 I think it was, in the initial report that came out, boy, there were lines right down the middle of communities, and I just want to make sure that that doesn't happen or attempt to happen again.

**Mr. Graham:** The second point that you made is that there are in fact associations of communities, and I'm well aware of that, being a hockey parent for the last 20 years and having to cope with the Properties Sports Association and being crushed by them from year to year. How could we get ahold of this information in any sort of reasonable degree that would allow us to understand what these groupings, or clusters, of communities are?

2:34

**Mr. Caswell:** I believe the Federation of Calgary Communities could give you a lot of that information and, failing that, the local MLAs. They definitely know it.

**Mr. Graham:** So the Federation of Calgary Communities would have that information. Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you for your presentation. It is a little bit in contrast to some of the other presentations we've heard today. I don't mean to be nasty with this question. [interjection] Well, you

know me; I have to ask.

It's a good presentation on the city of Calgary, but the thought I have here is – and maybe it's unfair to ask you for a response, but I want to express this concern – that what this then might do to us is create difficulties for getting other constituencies to come within the bounds of the 25 percent if we take the overall picture in the province. Like, in Calgary this would work out, what you're suggesting here, the 15 percent, but then when we take the population in the rest of the province and divide up the constituencies there – you know what I'm getting at. From the previous court decisions and so on that we've had, we have to recognize that it has to be for very, very good reasons. We are allowed up to four that can kind of go outside the boundaries. Any thoughts?

**Mr. Caswell:** I guess my response to that, Ernie, would be to approach it in the same manner which I suggested for the city of Calgary: start in the centre of your geographical area and work out. That way you'll possibly end up with the residual on the outer ring.

**Mr. Patterson:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other comments?

Well, Doug, you said that you were going to be short and to the point, and you were. You gave us a refreshing point of view and one that's going to help make the challenge more difficult. Thank you very much. Appreciate your being here, and appreciate your being here, Moe.

We'll take a quick five-minute break. I believe the next presenter is Mr. Allan Kiernan.

[The commission adjourned from 2:35 p.m. to 2:40 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Ladies and gentlemen, I'm pleased to introduce to you Mr. Allan Kiernan. Mr. Kiernan has the great attribute in his background of having grown up in the community of Crossfield, which is just south of where I grew up, in Carstairs. One of the things I remember about Mr. Kiernan was that as a baseball player he was quite skilled and was actively involved in giving us a few lessons. That was a few years ago, more years ago than I would like to admit, Allan.

We welcome you to meet with the panel. I think you were here when I introduced the panel members earlier. You know what we're about. We have Alberta's Chief Electoral Officer back there with his arms folded. He's trying to keep the chairman on time. To his left is the person who's doing the work, and that's Doug Olthof. Doug is a political science student from Simon Fraser who grew up in Alberta and is having a chance to experience a different side of politics. So, Allan, we're delighted you're here, and we look forward to hearing your presentation.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Well, thank you for the opportunity to address the commission on the matter of electoral boundaries in Alberta. I've been asked to attend today on behalf of the Calgary-Glenmore Progressive Conservative Association, but I'm also attending on my own behalf as a very interested individual.

By way of background, I'm not a city guy. I've spent almost my entire life in Alberta: born in Lloydminster, raised in Crossfield, lived in Crossfield, Calgary, Edmonton, and Fox Creek. My work as an engineer in the oil and gas business has taken me from High Level to Medicine Hat and from north of Fort McMurray to Waterton and virtually every city and town and village in between. I've been active in politics for years both federally and provincially, and my wife has been a returning officer for Calgary-Glenmore for many years and has helped me with some of the statistics here.

My submission has three major objectives: firstly, to urge the commission to make recommendations which will restore equitable representation to the people of Alberta; secondly, I'd like to outline six regions of Alberta which in my analysis are currently under or overrepresented. Finally, I'd like to offer some specific suggestions to bring these six regions into closer tolerance regarding voting power.

The federal census taken approximately one year ago gives this commission the opportunity to adjust the borders to be in tune with reality, which won't occur again for another 10 years. We've heard about the influx of people into Alberta, 430,000 since the last census. That's like 10 or 12 electoral districts having been added. The Electoral Boundaries Commission, as you well know, sets the maximum limit on deviations of population as plus or minus 25 percent, except for four special ridings which are permitted. A voter in a constituency at the lower level of this limit would enjoy 1.67 times the voting power of a voter in the higher end, so if the commission were to use the two extremes, quite a difference in the voting power of the individual constituent. I wouldn't suggest that that is fair or equitable.

Now, the principle of equal representation, or one person, one vote, is a fundamental tenet of democracy dating back to the Athenians. Alberta's range of plus or minus 25 percent is the highest in the land and to me appears almost shameful when compared to the plus or minus 5 percent in Saskatchewan and the plus or minus 10 percent in Manitoba and Newfoundland. I urge the commission to voluntarily try and stay within a plus or minus 10 percent level. I think the last commission succeeded in a 15 percent tolerance. I think we should try and narrow that up.

One of the major issues for the commission to consider is of course the existing bias in representation from urban ridings versus that from the so-called rural ridings. I've attached a table 1, which compares the population in a number of ridings. I've used exclusively urban ridings, ones which are exclusively within municipal urban boundaries. The bias is clear: 45 urban ridings average 6.8 percent above the provincial average, whereas 35 rural ridings average 9.3 percent below, a distinct bias.

The notion that a rural constituency is inherently more difficult to represent is in my mind unproven. Never in the history of man have transportation and communications been easier or faster. In order for an MLA to disseminate information, print media is available in virtually all Alberta communities on a next-day basis, electronic media is available instantaneously, and satellite dishes exist even in the most remote locations. Mail and courier service are nearly universal. The Internet can be accessed via cable, telephone, and even from satellite. In order for an MLA to receive information from constituents, letters, telephones, cell phones, faxes, and e-mails are all available. These same communication methods are used in the urban ridings to a large extent. Our extensive road system provides vehicle access in one day's drive from the Legislature in Edmonton, albeit a long day, to High Level, and daily scheduled air service is available to the four corners of the province. While there remain some logistical difficulties with rural MLAs having one-on-one constituent contacts, I submit that there are offsetting complexities in the urban MLA's portfolio due to complexity of issues and diversity of constituents.

The Alberta Court of Appeal in their judgment of October 24, 1994, reaffirmed that "there is no permissible variation if there is no justification and the onus to establish justification lies with those who suggest the variation." This prompted the commission in 1996 to use a rather complex model. I think we called it the matrix, and I might think as an engineer that it's a very arbitrary mathematical model. I think it's flawed, and I'll just try and cite where I think some of the problems are with this.

It fails to recognize the paramount importance of population in electoral districts. Not only does the model include area with the same weighting as population, but then it includes density, which in fact doubles the impact of area. For example, in just comparing two, Calgary-Currie, which scored the maximum of 10 points in the 1996 analysis by virtue of having the highest population, got only two points because of its small area and only two points because it has a high density, for a total of 14 points. By contrast Chinook, which doesn't exist anymore but which existed in that analysis, got only one point for having the smallest population, but it garnered nine more points for having a large area and a further 10 points for having the lowest density. So Chinook ends up getting 20 points out of this total, which is 43 percent more than Calgary-Currie. Could it really be 43 percent more difficult and fair for one MLA to represent 15,800 residents of Chinook compared to 37,800 in Calgary-Currie? I'd leave that question with you.

Further, Chinook got the full 10 points for having 10 unincorporated hamlets, while Calgary-Currie got zero points for having seven or eight community associations within its boundaries. Chinook got 10 more points for 1,899 kilometres of highway, maybe deserted country roads, while Calgary-Currie scored only one point for having two kilometres of highway and nothing for its complex network of congested city streets, transit systems, et cetera. In total the model gave Chinook 56 points, almost double the 30 assigned to Calgary-Currie. I suggest that the commission look with skepticism at this model. It can be made to work, but the individual assumptions must be very careful, and there must be a weighting.

So in summary of my first objective here I want to stress to the commission that I think you should hold population paramount in your recommendations. I think you should strive to stay within a plus or minus 10 percent variation except for the special ridings. I think you have to move toward a more balanced representation between urban and rural areas, and I think you've got to be wary of mathematical models.

I'd now like to quickly go through the six regions that I've identified that need some adjustment. The city of Calgary currently has 21 ridings for a population of 878,000 with 42,000 people per riding. I believe the addition of two seats in Calgary would bring the average down to 38,000, which is still 6.3 percent above the provincial average. Specifically, in Calgary the four ridings across the north boundary of the city – North West, Foothills, Nose Creek, and McCall – have a combined population of 222,000, 54 percent above the provincial average. Another riding could be added in this area and there is still lots left over. The Calgary-West riding is currently 40.6 percent above the provincial average and should have some readjustment with surrounding areas. I believe you heard this morning about the Calgary-Shaw riding at 82,500, which is more than double the provincial average. Calgary-Shaw can be split plus transfers to other ridings.

So I think that if the city of Calgary got two additional ridings and then those 23 were distributed, Calgary would end up being an average of 6 percent over the provincial average. I'm willing to accept that 6 percent above the average is reasonable.

There are three ridings bordering Calgary: Airdrie-Rocky View to the north, Banff-Cochrane to the west, and Highwood to the south. Those three ridings have a combined population of 142,000. There are almost enough people in those three ridings to form a fourth riding.

2:50

Where do we get those three ridings from? There are 10 rural ridings in southern Alberta which are 11 percent under on the average, and I believe that those could be condensed into nine. There are 11 rural ridings in northeast Alberta – and I've got a table attached – which have a combined population of 344,000. They are

12.8 percent below the provincial average. They could be consolidated into 10. Then there are 11 rural ridings in northwest Alberta, 335,000 people. If those 11 were condensed into 10, they would be 6.6 percent below.

Now, I don't see any changes required in the greater Edmonton area. Edmonton itself, the corporate boundaries, is a little under the average, but if you put St. Albert and Sherwood Park into the equation as part of the greater metropolitan Edmonton area, it's quite appropriate.

So in summary here, three additional ridings are required in and around Calgary and three ridings eliminated by consolidation of ridings in rural regions. All the new ridings can be within plus or minus 10 percent, except perhaps a couple of northern ridings. I've been in High Level. I've been in Fox Creek and Zama Lake. There are some issues up in that part of the country, north of Fort McMurray. With these suggestions I think that the average population difference between urban and rural ridings – currently urban are plus 6.8 and rural are minus 9.3 – could be changed to plus 2.5 for urban and minus 3.8 for rural. I'm using urban and rural. I realize that a lot of the rural ridings have some urban centres in them, towns and villages and even cities.

**The Chair:** You'd be including places like Camrose, Wetaskiwin, and Grande Prairie in the urban comments.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yes. Right.

Now, my final points here. Firstly, I'm concerned that we don't seem to co-ordinate with the federal constituencies. The federal redistribution is just kicking off here now, and we're going to increase from 26 to 28 federal seats in Alberta. In 1996 the province of Ontario passed the Fewer Politicians Act, which made the number and boundaries of their provincial electoral districts identical to the federal counterparts.

**The Chair:** Is that what they really called it?

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yes. That's the name of the act.

I believe that Ontario is somewhere around 104, 101, 103. That's how many MLAs they have. In Alberta, when we get up to 28 MPs, we'll have almost exactly three times as many MLAs as we have MPs. Ontario can get by with the same number. I know it's beyond the commission to do that, but if the boundaries were drawn the same, so that there would just automatically be three MLAs for one MP, perhaps it could be co-ordinated.

Secondly, in drawing these new boundaries and doing the fine-tuning, I'd like to suggest that the commission utilize the expertise of the local returning officers. These people are very knowledgeable as to where the people live and what communities are involved.

**The Chair:** We're fortunate in that situation in that under the legislation Alberta's Chief Electoral Officer works with us, and I'm sure that on a moment's notice he would be able to garner that support. We'll consider that very seriously.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Right.

I just have one final recommendation with regard to my own constituency, Calgary-Glenmore. We're a little bit under the representation now. We could easily be brought up to about 6.9 percent over, which would be average for the city of Calgary, if Kelvin Grove was added back into our constituency. It was carved out a few years ago and is part of the sort of normal community of Calgary-Glenmore.

That's my presentation.

**The Chair:** Well, might I congratulate you on a succinct, to-the-point presentation. You've done a lot of work, and you're the first presentation that I've seen or read where you looked at the whole province, tried to analyze the whole problem, and then came forward with some pretty pointed suggestions. I really commend you for that. That's the result of your good rural upbringing, I'm sure.

Now, who would like to start?

**Mr. Patterson:** I have a question. I picked up from you that you would be willing to live with 10 percent. You'd like to see 6 percent, but you'd accept it if we could come up with a 10 percent variation. As kind of a general basis you'd be reasonably happy with that.

**Mr. Kiernan:** I think a 10 percent maximum. I think the average should be a little lower than that, but I think that a 10 percent maximum – people would probably understand that. I tell you that I got a lot of feedback from the people in our constituency when we talked about this. They just were outraged that they didn't have one person, one vote. So that's from a city person's point of view.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Glen.

**Mr. Clegg:** I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms Mackay:** I have a question. Thank you for the presentation. It's really good to get one that's, you know, provincewide, looking at the big picture, because that's what we have to do. I have a question about the matrix. Would you just get rid of the matrix totally and not worry about trying to weight things or whatever? If you weren't going to get rid of it, could you give us some suggestions of things that maybe we could include if we're trying to put this on some kind of a mathematical basis?

**Mr. Kiernan:** Well, I'm an engineer, so I like matrixes and that kind of thing. I believe that where this one fell down was that it looks more at the problem of an MLA trying to represent the people and not at the person trying to be represented and trying to have their vote heard. I think that somehow that is the most important thing. I really disagree with every factor being weighted equally. I just don't think that's ever appropriate in those kinds of analyses. So you must decide: what is the factor? Probably you'd have to say that, well, maybe population should have five times the weight of any other factor – you know, one person, one vote – and then you could do the others from there. I believe that the matrix has some value, but I think it has to be examined very carefully and from the point of view of what we're trying to accomplish, which is a representation not top down but sort of bottom up.

How can a person have their views heard? For example, if all the rural people in Alberta voted one way for one party and all the urban people voted for the other party, could you have a change of government which would not reflect the popular vote? That was the problem they had in the U.S. the last time, and it was a lot closer between Bush and Gore than we have it. I think that if we ever got into that kind of situation and there was an imbalance between rural and urban, it would look very bad for us.

**Ms Mackay:** Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** I'd like to thank you for what I think is an excellent presentation. It's really very well done, and I'll be rereading it. Having said that, you know what's coming next, which is this: do

you acknowledge that there are any reasons to counterbalance strict representation by population? I'm thinking of things like the United States, which seems to me to be a reasonably well-functioning democracy, in which they have a Senate with 100 Senators. There are two Senators from Wyoming, which has 700,000 or 800,000 people, and two Senators from California, which has 35 million people. Do you think that that is just entirely wrong, or are there reasons for it? If there are reasons for it, are those reasons in any way applicable to our situation?

**Mr. Kiernan:** Well, I guess it's easier when you have a Senate and a House of Representatives and you have a balance between the two. We don't have that in our provincial situation. I guess I have to admit that there is certainly room for some movement off strictly a hundred percent representation by population. I'm suggesting that if you get down to narrower boundaries, it would do a lot for that.

**Mr. Graham:** So you have no objection to the principle. You just think it should be narrowed somewhat.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yes. I guess that's my major feeling.

**Mr. Graham:** The second question I would ask – and I don't know if I should ask this, Bauni; I'm getting ready to be elbowed here. One of the discrepancies I noticed in your tables and your analysis was that after you're through all of this, Calgary is still above the quotient but Edmonton isn't. So what reason would there be for that?

3:00

**Mr. Kiernan:** Well, I think that if Edmonton and St. Albert and Sherwood Park were put in together, they'd be closer.

**Mr. Graham:** So you would lump them all together and look at it that way?

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yeah. I'd suggest that St. Albert, for example, has more synergy with the city of Edmonton than it does with the rural.

**The Chair:** Sherwood Park the same way.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yeah. Sherwood Park more with the city of Edmonton than with the county of Strathcona really.

**Mr. Graham:** So you would rejig it in some way, and the result would be perhaps movement of seats out of central Edmonton somehow out towards the periphery or the suburban areas.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Allan, did I hear you say that you're retired?

**Mr. Kiernan:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Would you like to spend a little time looking at the matrix and giving us your best judgment on how that might be reshaped?

**Mr. Kiernan:** I could do that.

**The Chair:** We'd take it in a supplementary presentation. The pay would be the same as you're getting for this one. This is an excellent presentation – and I know that my colleagues have said this too – one that has looked over the whole waterfront. If you wouldn't mind taking that challenge on and then get it to Mr. Fjeldheim, that

would be extremely helpful.

In defence of the matrix – and I don't defend things from Ontario very often – this was really designed by a gentleman from Ontario who was out here during the last redistribution about eight or nine years ago, and it was perhaps a place to start. One of the important parts of that matrix is that if there are going to be deviations, we need to have reasons, and the matrix did go some distance towards providing that.

So if you'd take on that additional challenge for us, speaking on behalf of my colleagues, we'd be eternally grateful.

**Mr. Kiernan:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Okay. The next presenter is Jay Bortnik. Jay is a Calgarian who has taken his day off work to come and speak to us. Jay, to my right are Ernie Patterson, Glen Clegg, Bauni Mackay, Doug Graham. The commission will be having an interim report ready in the early part of September. It'll go out through the Speaker to everyone, like yourself, who has made presentations. Then we'll ask people like you to look at the report, come back with some suggested changes if you think there are some, and then there'll be a final set of hearings in the latter part of the year, first part of January. Then they have to get a final report into the Legislature by the early part of March next year. The legislation has said that we would have 83 constituencies, and as you heard, that works out to close to 36,000 people per constituency on a simple rep-by-pop basis.

If there are any questions about the way in which the commission is operating or things you want to know, please feel free to ask. We are very, very pleased you're here and particularly pleased to see a young gentleman like yourself taking an interest in politics and public issues, which are really important to everyone, young and old.

Thanks, Jay.

**Mr. Bortnik:** Well, thanks for the opportunity to speak here today. My name is Jay Bortnik, and I guess you can look at me as a little chipmunk in a big tree. I live in downtown Calgary, specifically in Rocky Mountain Court. I can look out my balcony window and see the Telus Building, the Delta Bow Valley, the river, and houses on top of the hill.

I guess that why I'm here today is that I moved into downtown Calgary about two years ago, and I've always been an avid reader of politics right from high school. I noticed that I wasn't in the downtown constituency by about a block. As I told you earlier off microphone, I work for Diversified Staffing here in town as well, so I walk to work through the park. I do most of my business in the downtown core. So I'm unusual for a Calgarian in that I don't commute for one hour one way, and that's the way my wife and I have set up our lives and a lot of people in our building. I noticed this anomaly where east downtown was being represented by an MLA that also represents Lynnview and Dover, those two other clusters of population in his riding, and anywhere else in the riding is basically just open field or industrial park.

**The Chair:** What's the name of the riding?

**Mr. Bortnik:** Calgary-Fort.

I took a look at the map and I took a look at your handout, and basically what I saw were four reasons to move us into the Calgary-Buffalo riding. Now, being a little chipmunk in a big tree and not looking at the big picture, I just figured that we had common interests with people in downtown, and my first point coincides with that. I live in a high-rise, and there are about nine or 10 other high-rises that are represented in downtown by an MLA other than

Calgary-Buffalo.

**The Chair:** How many people live in your high-rise?

**Mr. Bortnik:** There are 300 units. I have an estimated population of around 600 to 1,000 just in our high-rise. There's another high-rise right beside us, Carter Place. It's a seniors' dwelling. There are yet another few high-rises on the east side of city hall. There are no real what I would call drive-up dwellings with driveways, houses, one storey. We all live in buildings. I'm not sure who on the panel lives in a large building like that. I've considered it in the last six months. My wife and I have started a community forum, because there is really no community association in downtown Calgary. When you hand out a newsletter to 300 dwellings on 25 inhabited floors, that's almost the equivalent of walking 10 city blocks, give or take. It takes about an hour to do it. It's something that most Albertans don't live in, if you take a look at downtown Calgary. Most people live in a house. If you look on the government of Calgary's web site, they do an analysis of each community, and that might help you out there. You can pull that up. I actually pulled that up this morning and found that in the Calgary core you have 99.6 percent of people living in these dwellings, and in Calgary at large you have 26 percent living in apartment buildings. So that was my first reason for coming here.

The second reason is community boundaries. I've thought it odd that the confluence of the Bow and Elbow rivers was in Calgary-Fort, cutting us off on 1st Street and putting us in a whole different riding from where we should be.

The third reason. I skipped over the second reason and went right into the geographical features. Our community is the downtown core, and not having a community association doesn't mean that we don't have a community, so in essence the community isn't being respected boundarywise.

The fourth reason I came here today was that we had a meeting last month of some of our residents in Rocky Mountain Court, and I put forward the point: so do you know the boundaries of your constituency? "No, I don't know the boundaries, and furthermore I didn't know there was a commission actually studying this." So I said: did you know that we're being represented by a person that also represents people down by Glenmore Trail, for instance, or down by 52nd Street or across the Deerfoot? They didn't know that. I know that's hearsay and you're kind of taking my word for it, but to me that's not a clear and understandable boundary. I know I've only lived downtown for two years, but I figure anybody that moves around should move into an area and think: who's my representative and where can I get to him quickly without having to take the bus several times? As you can see, I'm a walker. I took my hat with me today. It's beautiful out there. You're missing a beautiful day.

3:10

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Bortnik:** I thought I'd just put that on the record.

**The Chair:** Take that off, please.

**Mr. Bortnik:** So my recommendation is that if you note the electoral boundary maps – I think Calgary-Fort is map 12 and Calgary-Buffalo is map 4 – polling stations or areas 1, 2, 3, and 4 – I don't know what you call them – would more logically be placed in that other riding.

**The Chair:** In Calgary-Buffalo?

**Mr. Bortnik:** In Calgary-Buffalo.

**The Chair:** How many people live in those four polls? Any idea? The Chief Electoral Officer will be able to get it just like that for us.

**Mr. Bortnik:** Yeah. I'm not sure. I don't have any exact figures there.

That's my recommendation.

**The Chair:** Okay. Great. Can we get those maps from you, please?

**Mr. Bortnik:** Sure.

**The Chair:** Good.

**Ms Mackay:** I can't think of a question right now. It was interesting to hear the arguments, though, which make a lot of sense to me.

**Mr. Graham:** I just want to thank you very much. What we've been getting and what we will get on and on – I don't mean to insult anyone – is that people generally speak in terms of generalities, and it's very, very helpful to get concrete information like this at this level. So I for one am filing this away under the Calgary-Fort/Calgary-Buffalo part of my file, and I'll be looking at it. I do want to thank you for looking at it in this very practical, concrete way.

**Mr. Patterson:** Just back on what Doug has said, when we get into this – and we are going to have to make some adjustments – it is helpful to have these specifics. Thank you.

**Mr. Clegg:** I want to thank Jay too. Certainly your presentation today is not different than what we've heard. I think what you've said, Jay, is that you should try to get the borders to fit community groups, and we've heard that on several occasions. So I appreciate your presentation and look forward to studying it in more detail.

**The Chair:** Jay, thanks. I have a bit of a bias because I was about your age when I first got involved in politics. It's so important to have young people like yourself who are bright and able and who can speak out to be actively involved in public business and public affairs. I commend you and thank you very much for a valuable presentation.

Our next presentation is from Jo-Anne Teed. What's the constituency association?

**Mrs. Teed:** I'm representing Calgary-Cross.

**The Chair:** Calgary-Cross. Okay. Would you be cross if we took a five-minute break?

**Mrs. Teed:** Not at all.

**The Chair:** Okay. Great. We'll be prompt. So we'll take a five-minute break and then Jo-Anne Teed from Calgary-Cross.

[The commission adjourned from 3:15 p.m. to 3:23 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Okay, ladies and gentlemen. We're delighted to have with us Jo-Anne Teed from the Calgary-Cross association, and it shouldn't go unnoticed that Jo-Anne's MLA, Yvonne Fritz, is here with us today, and we're pleased that you're here. Jo-Anne, you sat through my introductions, so I need not do that again. Thank you very much for coming forward, and we look forward to your

presentation.

**Mrs. Teed:** Thank you. I'm here on behalf of Calgary-Cross. I am a longtime resident of northeast Calgary. My husband and I are business owners in northeast Calgary. We've been actively involved in the Temple Community Association for where we live. I've sat as a school council chair at two different northeast schools, and I'm a member of the northeast Airways Business Association. I very much appreciate the opportunity that the commission has afforded me to speak to the issue of revised electoral boundaries in both the city of Calgary in general and in the northeast communities in particular.

As many of the people before me have probably pointed out, an initial overview of the population figures for electoral divisions in the province clearly indicates that the city of Calgary is in need of one, if not two, new electoral divisions to even out the existing growth in the city and to prepare for continued growth within the next few years. Should the final decision be to increase the number of electoral divisions in Calgary, restructuring of the current boundaries should be left until this decision is finalized.

However, we have to work within the status quo, and it is apparent from plotting the plus and minus figures, which I see you have on your map over there, for each Calgary constituency on the electoral division map that the core of the city, nine electoral divisions whose boundaries do not extend to the city limits, is currently well under the mean average of 35,951 people per constituency. To absorb the higher population levels in the periphery of the city, these constituencies must push outward from the current boundaries and significantly increase their overall population count beyond the mean average. The outer divisions should have their population numbers reduced to numbers that would prepare them for expected growth in the city.

No matter how you crunch it, ladies and gentlemen, the numbers crunched in Calgary need more electoral divisions if the population in every division is to remain below the currently acceptable maximum of 44,939, which is the plus 25 percent. However, if additional electoral divisions are not approved, then the core divisions, again those whose boundaries do not extend to the city limits, must take on additional population and increase their numbers to plus 25 percent. The divisions on the periphery of the city would then be left with populations of approximately plus 20 percent, about 43,000 people per constituency. This would allow for growth in these constituencies.

Calgary-Cross has the sixth largest population of all electoral divisions in the city. The population count is currently at 9.7 percent, very close to the 10 percent overall that one of the gentlemen previously had suggested be a maximum for divisions in this area. Boundary changes within the city of Calgary should take into consideration what is in the best interests of the communities. Ties within the communities of Temple, Pineridge, Rundle, Monterey Aurora, and Parkridge Estates are many and long standing. The newer communities of Monterey Aurora and Parkridge Estates make use of many facilities and businesses in Temple, Pineridge, and Rundle. The children from these areas attend schools in the older communities, and families attend churches and make use of programs offered through the community associations in the older communities. Their connection through their ties to the Calgary-Cross electoral division is another strong link binding these communities and should not be altered.

In the northeast quadrant of the city, as we are all aware, the electoral division of Calgary-McCall is faced with the greatest need for redistribution of population. The boundary between Calgary-McCall and Calgary-Cross should remain as it has existed for the past 10 years. This boundary works well and is a natural way of

maintaining the integrity of the schools and places of worship within the communities. The least disruptive solution for redistribution of the McCall population would be to extend the boundaries for those electoral districts with populations below the mean average which lie adjacent to Calgary-McCall on the west.

The commission is faced with a difficult task. I hope that this presentation, although brief, is considered in the wealth of knowledge that you will obtain prior to making adjustments to the electoral district boundaries in the city of Calgary. Thanks for your time.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for a succinct, to the point presentation. Just a question. In the second last paragraph you talked about those constituencies which lie adjacent to Calgary-McCall. Those would be which ridings? Do you recall offhand? I can go to the map and check.

**Mrs. Teed:** Calgary-Mountain View is somewhat west and south, and Calgary-North Hill is directly west of Calgary-McCall.

**The Chair:** As I recall, their numbers are down a bit; aren't they?

**Mrs. Teed:** Their numbers are down, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Anyone have any questions for Jo-Anne? Glen.

**Mr. Clegg:** Mr. Chairman, Jo-Anne, what I'm reading in this brief is that Calgary-Cross is very well represented, and I'd have to say that or Yvonne would be after me. But the fact is that the communities within Calgary-Cross don't overlap. Within Calgary-Cross the community leagues, if I can use that term, fit right in with Calgary-Cross. Would there be any reason to take any area out or put some more in? We've heard all day and we've heard before that the boundaries should be drawn to fit the community needs with the community leagues, if I can use that term broadly.

**Mrs. Teed:** I guess keeping in mind that if we're not able to obtain that magic plus 10 number that's been mentioned earlier today and we're looking at doing the plus 20, although Calgary-Cross is the sixth largest, they're still only at plus 10, and to keep the intrinsic grouping of that area, that constituency, it would require – before the previous boundary divisions Calgary-Cross had Monterey Park within its boundaries. Monterey Park is to the east, so it's part of a newer expansion area and was designed initially as part of kind of a package of Aurora Monterey and Parkridge Estates, which is a predominantly adult community, a seniors/50-plus community. Monterey Park was part of that at that time, and then when the boundaries were realigned, we lost that particular area. That might be a suggestion should you need to realign the boundaries and increase our population count. That might be considered, certainly.

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** I think you just anticipated what I was going to ask, which was this. Firstly, again I want to compliment you. We really appreciate practical presentations such as this. But it wasn't exactly clear to me what your presentation was suggesting. Are you suggesting that your constituency could basically remain within its present boundaries?

**Mrs. Teed:** It's a difficult question. We'd like it to maintain its boundaries or the makeup of its constituents because there are a lot of ties, community ties, with those various communities that are involved in Calgary-Cross, and we would like that to remain the same. These people have been interacting for a number of years.



We cross boundaries from one community to the other based on things like school use and facilities use, and that type of thing needs to be maintained within the communities.

The other question of course is the numbers in themselves. If we're going to live with 21 constituencies in the city of Calgary, which is the premise for this discussion, then you're going to have to look at adjusting the numbers somewhat in each area. Our focus was to tell you that the centre core is not going to particularly grow much more, but the periphery will, so to make these numbers work, you're going to have to up those numbers in the centre and you're going to have give the periphery a lower percentage, maintain it there, and wait until the city grows, which shouldn't take too long I'm sure.

**Mr. Graham:** And what I heard you say is that if we were to add something to Calgary-Cross, your preference would be Monterey Park?

**Mrs. Teed:** Well, preference only from the point of view that Monterey Park was initially part of the Calgary-Cross grouping previous to the last boundary redivisions. Monterey Park, Aurora Monterey, and Parkridge Estates formed the east boundary of our constituency to a certain degree. Monterey Park is linked in the same way that Aurora Monterey and Parkridge Estates are linked in the fact that many of the residents who now live in Monterey Park were residents of Temple and Pineridge who have moved into this newer area. So they are very familiar with all of that. They use the schools, they use the community facilities, and they use any of the other facilities that are within the Calgary-Cross area. So they would be more of a natural fit perhaps.

3:33

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Teed:** You're welcome.

**The Chair:** Ernie.

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes, Mr. Chair. Jo-Anne, when I'm reading your brief here, you kind of allude to the fact that Calgary should have more; I guess one if not two. How strongly do you feel about that?

**Mrs. Teed:** Well, representation by population is a recurring theme, and I would suggest that we in the city of Calgary are underrepresented considering the population that we have and the outlook for growth within this city even in the next five to 10 years. So with that in mind it seems that there should be an increase in the representation in the city of Calgary.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chairman, the only reason I'm asking that is because, you know, we've been hearing the other side of the coin. I wanted to know if you just kind of hoped or if you really felt strongly about it.

**Mrs. Teed:** No. I feel strongly about it in the fact that our numbers are – you know, we don't relate as well as the rest of the province does.

**Ms Mackay:** Doug asked my question, so I've got my answer.

**The Chair:** I think it was of value appearing late in the afternoon, Jo-Anne. People have had several of their questions answered.

Once again, thanks for a presentation that's to the point. It's factual. It gives us something to work on. I took your comment about two new ridings as that being what you think Calgary can get

along with as kind of the bare essential.

**Mrs. Teed:** Yes, definitely the bare essential.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much.

Shirley Milnes. Shirley, have you been here long this afternoon?

**Mrs. Milnes:** No.

**The Chair:** I'll just give you a real thumbnail sketch of what we're doing; okay? As you know, we're looking at electoral boundary changes. After every two elections in Alberta the law calls for a committee like this to be established to look after the boundaries within constituencies in the province. The legislation says that there will be 83 MLAs after this review and that we have to use the last 10-year census, which is 2.98 million. If we divide that by 83, you come very close to 36,000 people per constituency. That's the ideal. Then there's provision for us to have some variance on either side of that.

Then there's also provision in the legislation for four ridings that either border on other provinces or perhaps it's south of you, near the United States, where there could be up to a 50 percent variance. At this time there are two ridings that are like that. There are two ridings in the northeastern corner of the province, Athabasca-Wabasca and Lesser Slave Lake.

We're in the first day of really almost three weeks of hearings. Early in July we're going to get together and come to some conclusions, and then our report will be finished by early September. You along with everyone else who has made a presentation will get a copy of it. We'll ask people to give their reactions to it. Then we'll have another set of hearings in December or January because we need to have a final report in the Speaker's hands by the early part of March. Then it goes to the Legislature. The last time this was done was about eight years ago, and at that time the Legislature basically accepted all the recommendations. As the chairman I want this commission to be as successful as that so that in fact the work that's done by the commission, which I am sure will be good, will move ahead.

Have you had a chance to meet the members of the panel? Ernie Patterson is the mayor of Claresholm. Glen Clegg is a former member from the Peace River area, the Spirit River-Fairview area. Bauni Mackay is from Edmonton, and Bauni is a former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association. Doug Graham is a well-known, well-respected lawyer here in the city of Calgary. My name is Bob Clark. I'm the Ethics Commissioner. I work for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. The people were appointed by the cabinet and, too, by the Leader of the Opposition after consultation.

Please feel free; feel relaxed. We're very ordinary people. Don't worry about the presentation at all. We're really glad you've come forward. You have a few more minutes. If they told you five minutes, you have a little longer than that. Okay?

**Mrs. Milnes:** Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to put forth my opinions regarding changes in the electoral boundaries. My name is Shirley Milnes. I have been a resident of the community of Abbeydale for the last 12 years. Abbeydale is located in the constituency of Calgary-Montrose in northeast Calgary. I've been active in the community, have two children in the school system, and believe that my opinions reflect that of the average resident of Abbeydale. I would like to present some points that I believe are important for the commission to keep in mind when they're redrawing the electoral boundaries.

The first is that changes in the boundaries should be made in such

a way as to be the least disruptive to the current constituencies. It has been my experience that the average person sometimes finds it difficult to remember what constituency they're in, much less who their MLA is, and this is compounded when a community is bounced back and forth between constituencies.

**The Chair:** You've had that experience in your constituency; have you?

**Mrs. Milnes:** Yes.

**The Chair:** And where you live?

**Mrs. Milnes:** Yes.

Also, an MLA may not properly serve people living in communities affected by boundary changes during transition periods. It is important to minimize the boundary changes as much as possible.

Having said that, my second point is that it is important to be as close as possible to the one man equals one vote system. The population of Calgary in the 2001 census was approximately 880,000 people. If you divide that among the 21 constituencies within the city, you receive a total of upwards of 41,000 people per constituency. This is way more than the average population of 35,951 per constituency. Calgary continues to grow with no slowdown in sight. It's my understanding that another 50,000 people are expected to be added to Calgary on a yearly basis. We'll easily exceed the maximum allowable range of 44,939 people by the next election, in 2005. In order to account for our growth, I believe that the commission should give Calgary at least one more seat, preferably two.

Third, the committee should keep in mind the social and economic makeup of a riding. People living in the northwest of Calgary, for example, have different concerns from people living in the northeast of Calgary. The number of WCB cases is significantly higher in the northeast than the northwest, and I believe this is also true for the number of low-income people and therefore people requiring health care. This in turn puts a higher demand on northeast Calgary MLAs compared to northwest Calgary MLAs.

Fourth, Barlow Trail and Deerfoot Trail should not be used as natural boundaries to prevent the committee from drawing a constituency on both sides. Many aldermanic wards in Calgary include communities on both sides of these roads. Constituencies to the west of Calgary-McCall, for example, could then be able to pick up part of its population.

Lastly, the inner-city ridings will not grow much, while the ridings on the outskirts of Calgary still have a huge growth potential, and this should be taken into consideration.

Thank you again for allowing me to voice my thoughts on this important issue.

3:43

**The Chair:** Thanks very much.

The chairman is going to use the prerogative of asking the first question.

**Mrs. Milnes:** Go ahead.

**The Chair:** I understand that what you're saying, then, is that we should get the numbers in the core ridings in Calgary up to, shall we say, 10 percent for lack of a better percentage, something like that, and then take those away from the outlying ridings now so that there'll be more potential for growth in the outlying ridings. That's the thesis basically.

**Mrs. Milnes:** Basically.

**The Chair:** Then, secondly, you don't want us to move places from one area back to a constituency after each redistribution.

**Mrs. Milnes:** I think that would sum it up. It's just that I think it's hard for people when they find themselves bounced about.

**The Chair:** Sure.

Any of my colleagues? Glen.

**Mr. Clegg:** Yes. Thank you, Shirley, for this presentation. Are you specifically happy with the way your community – you have community leagues. I'll use that for a better term. Are you satisfied that where you are located your community league is not cut in half? I mean, we've heard today that we should try, when you have to adjust borders – and there's no secret about it: somewhere in Alberta there are going to be some border changes. So they said: well, keep the community leagues; a road doesn't matter as much as to keep the community. Are you satisfied that you are in a community where your MLA represents the total community league?

**Mrs. Milnes:** I believe so.

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** Shirley, thank you for coming today. I know it takes a lot of courage to do that, but that's good, and we're glad that you're here.

You say that you're familiar with some of the aldermanic ridings in the city that go across Barlow Trail and Deerfoot Trail and that you haven't felt that there are any problems with that. You're saying that those should not necessarily be arbitrarily set as boundaries. From your constituency or in any of the work that you've done, can you tell us if you have any examples of where things have worked back and forth across these main thoroughfares?

**Mrs. Milnes:** I guess what it is is that I think that Barlow, for example – it's just a road. I mean, why would it stop anybody from crossing the road? I can't see it as being a boundary.

**Mr. Patterson:** You feel the same way about Deerfoot?

**Mrs. Milnes:** Yeah. A bigger road but still a road.

**Mr. Patterson:** Okay. Thank you.

**Ms Mackay:** Thank you for your presentation and for coming out today.

You say that you think that we should try to keep the boundaries as close to the status quo as possible in terms of any individual constituency. That's your point; right?

**Mrs. Milnes:** Although I do understand that there have to be changes. I mean, it can't stay the way it is.

**Ms Mackay:** Okay. You basically answered my question before I've asked it. Which to you is more important: getting additional seats for Calgary or maintaining the boundaries of your constituency in particular but I guess all of them?

**Mrs. Milnes:** I would have to say that probably gaining another seat would be more important.

**Mr. Graham:** Just one follow-up point. I thank you very much for

your presentation. It's very helpful. What I'm gleaning from what you've said is, firstly, that these major freeways such as Barlow and Deerfoot are not that important, but I also gather from what you're saying – and I just want to understand this because it seems to be a theme we're running into – that if you were to jump one of these major freeways, you would jump it on a community basis. Am I right? So you would go to one side or the other of these major freeways and you would take in another community.

**Mrs. Milnes:** A full community.

**Mr. Graham:** Another full community. So you wouldn't split the community.

**Mrs. Milnes:** I wouldn't split a community.

**Mr. Graham:** Right. That's what I heard you to say. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any further questions?  
Well, Shirley, thank you very much.

**Mrs. Milnes:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** It wasn't so bad now; was it?

**Mrs. Milnes:** No.

**The Chair:** Thank you very, very much.

Is there anyone else to make presentations for us this afternoon or anyone who is here this afternoon who feels the urge or is compelled to make a few comments? This is an opportunity to get up and give us some sound, concise advice if you're so inclined.

Well, then, that being the case, Brian, what time do we convene this evening?

**Mr. Fjeldheim:** At 7 p.m.

**The Chair:** At 7 p.m. For those of you who are here, I don't know if you've had a chance to see these maps. They're coloured maps, just a little more dramatic than the ones back there. I'll leave one of them out here, and please have a look at it. It shows you what the dilemma is in Calgary, at least as the colours show it. Please leave them here so that we have them for tonight.

Thank you very much. We look forward to seeing you at 7 o'clock tonight.

[The commission adjourned from 3:50 p.m. to 7 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call this evening's session to order. We have, it seems to me, eight presentations, so we want to move along. The chair will try and make his opening remarks short, and the chair promises to make no speeches during the course of the questions and answers. We will try and move along well.

Welcome to really the third part of the first day of the meetings of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. My name is Bob Clark. I'm the Ethics Commissioner of the province of Alberta. Under the Electoral Boundaries Commission legislation I've been selected to be the chairman of the commission. When I was first asked, I went and talked to the Leader of the Opposition, and he said that he thought that this was not a bad idea. So in a moment of foolishness I said: yes, I'll take this on. I must confess that during the last little while and more in the future I wonder about my sanity, but frankly the first day has gone very well thanks to the generosity of Calgarians.

We're extremely fortunate to have four very fine people working with me on the commission. To my right is the longtime mayor of the town of Claresholm, Ernie Patterson. To my immediate right is Glen Clegg. Glen used to be the member of the Legislature for the Dunvegan area. That's Spirit River, Fairview, that part of the world. Then to my immediate left is Bauni Mackay. Bauni is an Edmontonian and is the former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association. To my far left is Doug Graham, who is a well-known and respected lawyer here in the city of Calgary. So we are the five people who are the commission. We're starting today, and tomorrow we're in central Alberta, then in Edmonton on Wednesday. The following week we start in St. Paul and get down to Medicine Hat and Lethbridge. Then the last week in June we hit the northern part of the province.

Immediately following that, the commission will get together and come together with some conclusions. Then it's our plan to have the first draft of our report available to the Speaker of the Legislature, who I'm confident in turn will make it available to everyone across the province, in the early part of September. Then that's another time for you people to become involved after tonight, because we'd like you to look at the first draft and then get back to us with suggestions and comments. In the early part of December or the first part of January we'll be out for a second set of hearings across the province. Then we'll come up with some final conclusions, and our final report will be in the Speaker's hands early in March of next year. After that it goes to the Legislative Assembly. The chairman hopes that this commission will be as successful as the last commission, which was chaired by Mr. Justice Ed Wachowich, where the Legislature accepted basically holus-bolus the recommendations, and those became the boundaries for the last two provincial elections.

Under the law this is done every eight years or after every two provincial elections. The legislation says that we have to use the latest Stats Canada stats in their 10-year census, so we're using the figures of the population of the province at 2.98 million. The legislation also says that there'll be 83 seats in the Legislature. Whether you use the new math or the old math, that comes out to 35,951, so approximately 36,000. Now, as you know, the legislation then says that there can be some variance up to 25 percent one way or the other. The last commission, though, had only one where the variance was more than 15 percent – that was 16 percent – with the exception of the two ridings in the northeastern corner of the province. If you look at the maps on the wall over there, the middle map is a map of the province. In the upper right-hand corner is Athabasca-Wabasca, and the next riding to that is Lesser Slave Lake. Those are the two ridings where they used the 50 percent variance thing. The legislation says that there can be four, but the last redistribution resulted in only two.

So that's what we're about. We look forward to your involvement and your presentations tonight.

Without any further ado I'd like to introduce Mr. Paul Breeze, who is from the Calgary-Shaw constituency association. Paul, if you'd introduce your sidekick, Stephen Hope. We look forward to hearing what you have to say.

**Mr. Breeze:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the commission. Yes, I'd like to introduce Stephen Hope. He's the president of the Calgary-Shaw Progressive Conservative Association. I'll probably also refer to Doug Hayes, who is sitting here. Doug did a lot of work on some maps that hopefully we're going to show you this evening.

I understand that you have received our written submission, so I don't have to ask you that question. We have a very brief written presentation, and I can leave copies of this with the commission. It

parallels our written submission but is somewhat briefer.

To put Calgary-Shaw into perspective, Calgary-Shaw is the third largest community in Alberta. It has a population in excess of 80,000, which interestingly enough exceeds the populations of Red Deer and/or Lethbridge, so we gain some notoriety by being the third largest community in Alberta. I think that's important because it puts some of the numbers into perspective. The numbers become overwhelming. I'm not going to quote too many numbers to you here this evening. Calgary-Shaw right now has no public high school or hospital, and it has a population, as I say, in excess of 80,000. I believe and we believe that the citizens of south Calgary deserve a little better than that.

In effect, Calgary-Shaw right now qualifies as two ridings under the provincial population statistics, so it gives you some idea of how large Calgary-Shaw is. Based on the 2001 census, the city of Calgary needs between 24 and 25 MLAs, in our humble opinion. This would bring each riding into line with the provincial average. Right now Calgary is around 16 percent greater than the provincial average.

One of the interesting things about Calgary-Shaw is that it's also in a high-growth area. South Calgary is one of the fastest growing groups of communities in Alberta, and the population growth is likely to exceed 5 percent on an annual basis. If the boundaries of Calgary-Shaw are changed to allow for the maximum population of 125 percent of the provincial average, the population by 2005 is likely to be 7,000 over the maximum limit. We are concerned that exceeding the provincial maximum may give rise to a court challenge besides the more important issue of the population being underrepresented. So although the commission is dealing with the 2001 census, I believe and we believe that the commission should look at the growing areas and, if anything, put them into the lower or less than the median of 35,000 and look at the nongrowth areas and perhaps go nearer to the maximum.

We'd like to present two solutions to you this evening. We have a strong preference for one, but on the basis that maybe we don't have all the information, we thought it was only fair to provide two. Using the commission's criteria, we looked at natural boundaries and contiguous communities. For example, in Calgary-Shaw the Bow River is a natural boundary through the riding. With three more MLAs in Calgary, the average Calgary riding would have a population of around 36,600, still above the provincial average. One thing we did do – and we're not going to present it this evening – is that we looked at a 'rurban' situation. In other words, Calgary-Shaw being on the city limits, could we contemplate looking at a new riding that stretched out into the rural area? We believe that there are community ramifications and the interests and the expertise of the MLA to consider before going that route, and we think that that might be a longer term solution: you know, 10 years out or so. But right now we don't think that's a reasonable solution for Calgary-Shaw, and this option was discarded.

So to get into our first option – and this is our primary option – we looked at the ridings south of the Bow River. We found that by adding three MLAs, it became too complicated for us to look at the whole city, so we looked at the situation south of the Bow River and to the west of the Bow River. The new Calgary-Shaw would look something like this. It would involve the communities of Chaparral, Midnapore, Shawnessy, Somerset, and Sundance, all to the west of the Bow River. The new population approximates to 37,600. Once again, that is still above the provincial average. We believe that these communities are contiguous. The existing communities on the west side of the present riding, primarily Bridlewood and Evergreen, are presently already split between Calgary-Shaw and Calgary-Lougheed. Our association would like to put forward that solution as our primary option.

7:10

**Mr. Hope:** Perhaps, Paul, we should just make mention that we have also rejigged the other constituencies south of Glenmore.

**Mr. Breeze:** Thank you, Stephen. Yeah; a very good point. Do we need to examine this anymore?

**The Chair:** Give it to Mr. Fjeldheim. I'm sure you all know Brian Fjeldheim. Brian is the Chief Electoral Officer for the province, and he and his office are ably assisting the commission.

Carry on, Paul, please.

**Mr. Breeze:** Option two. I emphasize that this is our secondary option, and this assumes that there would be no increase in the number of city ridings for whatever reason. There may be impediments that we're not aware of. The average riding population under this scenario in the city of Calgary is 41,850, plus or minus one or two. We did look at the whole of the city under this scenario and came to the conclusion that all the division boundaries within the city of Calgary would have to be rejigged. We provided not only a map of this scenario, but in our written submission there's a breakdown of communities in a spreadsheet format.

What we tried to achieve was to bring the inner-city ridings up closer to the maximum, which is approximately 45,000. Under this scenario we believe that Calgary-Shaw would include the communities of Chaparral, Midnapore, Millrise, Shawnessy, Somerset, and Sundance. This would bring the population to around 43,300, which is extremely close to the maximum based on the 2001 census. As I mentioned earlier, we are rather concerned that by 2005 there could easily be at least a 7,000-persons increase in that number, so the riding would end up around 50,000 by 2005.

In summary, we urge the commission to find solutions that will stand up to scrutiny between now and, say, 2005, and we'd prefer not to subject Calgary-Shaw to severe surgery again in the future. We thank you very much, and we'd be prepared to answer your questions.

**The Chair:** The joy of being the chairman is that the very obvious first question, I think, is: did you look at two ridings, splitting Calgary-Shaw in two?

**Mr. Hope:** Do you mean dividing it in two?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Hope:** Yes, we did. Once again, we looked at the Bow River, and we said: what happens if we take the Bow River and look at the populations each side of the Bow River? On one side of the Bow River we have a population of 51,000 approximately, and on the other side of the Bow River we have a population of 29,000. So the 29,000 wouldn't be a bad fit because you'd say: a lot of room for growth, under the provincial average but still fits within the plus or minus 25 percent. But where do the other 51,000 go? So really under that scenario you have to divide Calgary-Shaw into three. We didn't take that option any further.

**The Chair:** Okay.  
Bauni.

**Ms Mackay:** I don't have a question yet.

**The Chair:** No question yet, but look out.  
Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Yes. Thanks for the presentation. When you drew this last map, did you take into account the community leagues, if I can use that term? Many people have told us: make sure that whatever lines you draw, you don't cut communities in half. They are definite: you've got a community here and there. When you drew this last map, did you take that into consideration?

**Mr. Hayes:** Mr. Chairman, can I speak to that? I'm the cartographer.

**The Chair:** Sure.

**Mr. Hayes:** Yes, we did. As a matter of fact, we even joined two of the communities that had been previously split. Both the communities of Bridlewood and Evergreen were. The line was drawn to come down an imaginary 19th Street. Of course, the development of those communities came after that line was drawn by the commission. At the last election we had part of Lougheed in Bridlewood and part of Lougheed in Shaw, so the new lines that we've drawn have put them back together. Of course, we've addressed what will happen eventually in Evergreen by the same type of thing. We've drawn the line so that it puts everything back together. As far as we know, every community in Calgary is kept together in the various constituencies that we're redoing.

**The Chair:** When you've done this redrawing with no new boundaries in Calgary, what's the average population?

**Mr. Breeze:** With no new ridings?

**The Chair:** With no new ridings.

**Mr. Hope:** With the existing numbers?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Breeze:** With the existing numbers and no new ridings, the average population per riding is in excess of 41,000. In Calgary-Shaw it would be 43,300. That's no increase in ridings and the 2001 census.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Patterson:** Well, I just want to compliment you on the work that you've done. I think it's excellent, and it will give us a lot of good information for us to start making our decisions. I don't think I have any questions because it's very, very clear. I do like the work that you've done here. I'm a little surprised that you would even, if I might say this, consider the fact that there might not be any change, but that's just E. Patterson's comment.

**Mr. Breeze:** It's not our preference.

**The Chair:** I think you made that clear.

**Mr. Graham:** I would echo the compliments that have been handed out. This is one of the better presentations that we've seen. It really is good. One small question. You indicated a 5 percent growth rate. Would you care to share with us what that is based on or where you got that from, if you know?

**Mr. Breeze:** I took the provincial estimated growth rate of 3 and a half percent, and I said that in Calgary it will be 5 percent. So it wasn't a scientific approach, but based on the population increase in

Calgary over the last few years, certainly a growth rate of somewhere between 4 and 6 percent is not an unreasonable number.

**Mr. Hayes:** Paul, I believe that Calgary-Shaw from the 1993 election to date has grown by 47 percent.

**The Chair:** Therein is one of our massive problems; isn't it?

**Mr. Graham:** Did you say since 1983?

**Mr. Breeze:** Ninety-three.

**The Chair:** I see that a member of the Legislature is here, and I think she's compelled to say something.

**Mrs. Ady:** I just wanted to add that on the one larger map that they did where they redivided constituencies, we are particularly attentive to our own constituency. We understand the community associations and where they lie. When we got above our own area, we were drawing lines for numbers, and we are not particularly sensitive in those lines to where those community associations, you know, play together. We wouldn't be aware. I would say that that's accurate. Would you guys agree?

**Mr. Hope:** Yes.

**Mrs. Ady:** So those are just lines for numbers' sake, not necessarily with any understanding beyond our own area for who would or wouldn't be contiguous and who would have community associations in common. Just so that you're aware of that one.

**The Chair:** Are there any other questions of the good folks from Calgary-Shaw?

Paul, to you and your colleagues: thank you very, very much. You've obviously put a lot of work into this, and we appreciate that very, very much. Thank you.

The next presenter is Rebecca Aizenman. I pointed out to Rebecca when I was talking to her that this is a rather laid-back kind of approach. Please feel comfortable, and I assure you that everyone who has presented things to us has escaped intact. Rebecca.

7:20

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to present some broad ideas to you with respect to electoral boundary changes. I welcome this opportunity, and at the present time I do not have a formal written presentation to give you as I feel I can make my points more effectively as I speak to you. I would like to point out that the views I present to you are strictly those of my own. I've given some thought to the broad suggestions I'm going to make to you. I have some knowledge of what I will call political geography. I like to play with these kinds of maps, be they electoral constituencies or be they census areas, right down to census enumeration areas, which are very, very small areas on a map to the point where you can identify your neighbourhood.

I'm going to approach some of my suggestions from the point of view of living in a community within a larger neighbourhood within a constituency. I'd like to make some suggestions. Has the commission given any thought to contiguous boundaries as is the case, I believe, in Ontario? I don't have too much background, but I would respectfully suggest that perhaps this aspect should be looked at. I know that in Toronto at one time I could relate to my provincial constituency and my federal constituency. If you can't do that, the onus is on the voter to become politically aware and become educated as to which ridings he or she lives in. The onus falls on the voter.

**The Chair:** Perhaps I can just respond by saying that the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act clearly says that there'll be 83 constituencies, so that's part of the conditions that the commission must work with.

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you.

I just want to give one example where boundaries were contiguous. I've done a lot of work as a resident in Calgary-Elbow, and I found it very interesting until this fall, when the city ward boundaries were redrawn. A good example was that Calgary-Elbow and ward 11 almost overlapped each other. You could take a transparency and put it on top of either one and the boundaries matched. I found that rather interesting, and this is why I make this kind of suggestion. I'm not too familiar with the Calgary-Shaw area as it's in the deep south, and I seldom go down there, but if I go across 14th Street and I dare to go south on 14th Street and over to 37th Street, Calgary-Lougheed would include a number of communities where again the lines could be drawn similar to each other.

May I respectfully suggest – and I say this because it's very sensitive – that there not be any gerrymandering of constituencies. If you're going to redo the constituency boundaries as you have to based on representation by population and given your formula, please don't take out a chunk of this constituency because it was favourable to party A, B, C, or D and substitute that community because it was unfavourable to party A, B, C, or D. I say that on the basis of knowing my constituency and comparing the boundaries in 1993 with the boundary map in 1997. A comparison was made of a winning area and a losing area. The winning area was taken out and given to Calgary-Egmont. A losing area was added in the far northwest, called Rutland, to make up for the numbers.

May I suggest that when you set up your boundaries, please don't cut communities in half or in quarters. Those of us who live in Calgary – and Calgary-Shaw alluded to it previously – are very sensitive to our communities. We're Calgarians, Albertans, but on a daily level we relate to our community. I live in a community which was added to the constituency map. My neighbour who lives on the north side of 75th Avenue is in Calgary-Elbow. My friends who live on the south side of 75th Avenue are in Calgary-Glenmore. In my own case my community was taken out and stuck on the map to make up for numbers, and I would suggest that you look at community boundaries. There is a map of community boundaries in Calgary that can be accessed from the city clerk's office or from the planning department library, and the boundaries are very clear. It makes for easier political sociology. It makes it easier for one who is running because you are familiar with the ethos of a particular community or a group of communities.

We tend to look at ourselves as being bound together by circumstance and adversity or cut off from each other by major barriers such as expressways and major roadways, like 14th Street, so my next suggestion to the commission – and it is a suggestion – is that major roadways and major expressways be used as the dividing lines. A major roadway would be 37th Street, which is a natural demarcation between – again I'll use my own constituency – Calgary-Elbow and Calgary-West. Another major line on the map is the Glenmore Trail. You either live north of Glenmore Trail or you live south of Glenmore Trail, and the best divider of all in the southwest corner of Calgary is 14th Street. So let the lines not go across those major boundaries.

When you set up polling stations, would you take into account the location of these polling stations? Based on experience, it was brought to my attention that sometimes senior citizens have to go to polling stations that require them to cross very busy intersections. The case in point was made in north Glenmore, where people from

the area around Central Memorial high school, which is 50th Avenue and Crowchild – people from the area south of 50th Avenue had to go out on Crowchild and make their way to a polling station in that vicinity, and for a senior person who may not have access to transportation, that's quite a trip. So I would ask that you take that into account.

When you redo your map, may I suggest that you keep the actual polls consistent as long as possible? For example, in 1997 there were approximately 63 polls in Calgary-Elbow. In 2001 there were, I believe, 74. It makes for an interesting exercise to have to redo your poll maps every five years. Again I would suggest that if you're going to do this, as is required by numbers, so many people or homes to a poll, given the impact on voter turnout at a polling or voting station – if you're going to change the poll lines, may I suggest that you develop a computer-generated map that shows these poll lines on a map and that you have this information on a disk – and I am not a computer expert – for a nominal fee. Maybe it should go with the voters list to the various political parties. You can generate your poll maps, et cetera, by use of a computer disk instead of having to do it manually. It is a very time-consuming process. I speak from experience, even though I love doing it. In this age you should be able to push a button and there is your map.

**The Chair:** One of the things that the commission has done – the people in Alberta Finance, the people that used to be in the old statistics branch of the Alberta government, have taken the 2001 Stats Canada information and put it into their program now. So when the commission is looking at having to move boundaries here and there and so on, they'll be able to say, "If we do this, this would affect this many people," which is the very kind of thing you're talking about, and I'm sure it's the kind of thing that the Chief Electoral Officer will be using also.

**Ms Aizenman:** There's another reference that I'd like to refer you to, and the exact name of the reference I have forgotten, which doesn't happen often. There is a very handy census book on Calgary about that thick, and it breaks down the last local census in Calgary every which way: by cohorts and age groups of five, by single dwellings, multiple dwellings, males, females, school-age children, you name it. You can abstract it from the information from the city library. It's a wealth of information, and even though it would be based on last year's local census, I can't recommend it enough, because it's a very, very helpful profile on what Calgary looks like. It's updated every single year. It costs \$20, but it's a very useful reference. I think your commission would find it very, very handy.

I'd like to talk about the numbers game. I'm aware of the frame of reference where you can't increase the number of MLAs and you can't decrease the number of MLAs, but I'd like to compare the workload of 83 MLAs provincially, 21 MLAs in Calgary, with the city of Calgary ward map, where we have 14 aldermen and one mayor. I look at the salaries involved for an MLA, roughly \$78,000, according to the information I have. Quick arithmetic: 83 MLAs times \$78,000 per year amounts to roughly \$6.5 million. A ward alderman is paid roughly \$50,000 a year, and again I'm going to suggest that the workloads are significantly different. A ward alderman by my count works at least 60 to 70 hours a week, 11 months a year, one month off or he or she would lose their sanity, especially if they were my alderman, because I live in a community where the traffic issue is a major, major concern.

7:30

The point I'm trying to make is that the demands on a local representative of government, 11 months of the year, and those on an MLA – and I know the figure. "Well, they only sat 38 days for the last session" is often used, and that's my point. I look at the

infrastructure that an alderman has: one assistant in his or her office. I look at the infrastructure provided to the MLAs, especially if they are sitting members of the government. You have a constituency office paid for and staffed by the government, and you also have an office in Edmonton. If you're a backbencher and if you're not a cabinet minister, I look at the workload and that concerns me. I think that's something that should be looked at if not through the Electoral Boundaries Commission in general – in my humble estimation we are overrepresented. Fifteen people to do the work of 800,000 people in Calgary. Twenty-one people to do the same work of a less onerous nature. If you live in the new suburbs as an alderman, the growing concerns of an urban suburb are one thing. If you live in the inner city, it's another issue. I may be mixing up my examples, but it does concern me that we will have 83 representatives. The constituencies may be bigger or smaller, but the workload and the remuneration is something that concerns me as an interested, active citizen in this province, and I would suggest that this aspect be looked at.

I would also suggest that when election time draws near, roughly a year before we know we're going into an election, when your returning officers are appointed for the various constituencies, they have a great deal of familiarity with the constituency and the communities, and again I refer you back to the community map produced by the city of Calgary so that names that are used to refer to polling stations match the community mind-set that people live in. Parkhill is Parkhill. It's not Stanley Park. Mayfair is Mayfair, and Meadowlark Park is Meadowlark Park. I'm just using a couple of examples where names were really altered, and it made for very difficult instant contact for someone who was going out into those communities.

**The Chair:** Rebecca, if you think I'm getting a little fidgety, I am.

**Ms Aizenman:** My time is up.

**The Chair:** I see the Chief Electoral Officer is over there, and we'll draw those matters to his attention, but we need to kind of zero in on the things that we have to deal with.

**Ms Aizenman:** Those are some suggestions I pass on to you. I'm not going to deal with the number issue. I think I've made my point, and I thank you for the opportunity to present.

**The Chair:** Good. Thank you very much. Obviously, you're a pretty thought-provoking person, I can assure you.

Who would have a question? Bauni has a question and then Mr. Patterson.

**Ms Mackay:** I'm just sort of intrigued with your comments about the workload of the aldermen versus the MLAs. I take it from that that you're suggesting that Calgary should have fewer MLAs than it currently has so that it would be more in line with the number of aldermen, and then, if that is the case, are you suggesting that this shouldn't just apply to Calgary but provincewide? Of course, keep in mind that we can't do anything about the number of seats. I mean, we have to work with 83 ridings.

**Ms Aizenman:** I'm fascinated by the fact that my alderman has to represent 60,000 people in a ward that has humongous traffic problems. Then I look at my ward, and it takes in two or three constituencies. Calgary-Elbow, Calgary-Glenmore, and a little bit of Calgary-Lougheed are in what is now the new ward 11. It's a concept that I present to you, and it's something that should be thought about. My MLA happens to be the Premier. His workload

is different because he is the Premier. If I lived in Calgary-Glenmore, my MLA would be a cabinet minister, and I'd respect the fact that he is a cabinet minister and has a workload consistent with his portfolio. But I look at people who do not have these high-profile positions, and I question their workload in comparison to an alderman who has to represent a very large area in Calgary northeast, for example.

**The Chair:** Mr. Patterson.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for coming and making your presentation tonight. There's only one little statement I'd just like to make. You mentioned gerrymandering. In all of the work that we have done in preparing ourselves for this, we've made no decisions. Nowhere has it come up that we're looking at how people voted. I just wanted to point that out. We're going to do this, as far as I understand, on the basis of population, community leagues. Your comments on that are very pertinent, and I just wanted to point that out.

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you. I won't reply. It would be disrespectful of me, but when you do political analysis, you look at these things. Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** We're not going to do that.

**Ms Aizenman:** Good.

**Mr. Graham:** I was just interested in what community you're in, which is the community that you say has been split. It wasn't clear to me.

**Ms Aizenman:** It's referred to as CKE: Chinook Park, Kelvin Grove, Eagle Ridge. We are a single community entity, and that community is bounded by Glenmore Trail on the north, Elbow Drive on the east, Heritage Drive on the south, and 14th Street. But we include Eagle Ridge because it's over there and there isn't another community close by, and the line goes down 75th Avenue. Chinook is on the south side of 75th Avenue. I'm on the north side. In 1993 we were one entity.

**The Chair:** Any other questions or comments?

Okay, Rebecca. Thank you very, very much. We appreciate your input, and you'll get a copy of the report when it's out. Let us know what you think, and somehow I suspect we'll hear from you.

**Ms Aizenman:** I think you will.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Okay. Rolly Thomas. Mr. Thomas advised me when I came in that he and I rode up in the plane not so long ago.

**Mr. Thomas:** A very long time ago actually. A different life of yours and a different life of mine.

**Mr. Clegg:** Was that in the 1800s?

**The Chair:** You don't tell and I won't tell either. How's that?

Okay. Mr. Thomas, you heard my introduction earlier?

**Mr. Thomas:** Yes, I did.

**The Chair:** We look forward to your presentation. Thank you very much for coming.

**Mr. Thomas:** Well, I see you have received a copy of the writeup I sent. What I'm going to say now is virtually a precis of that. In the first instance, let me say that it's a pleasure to meet you good people, but the fact is that I've been at every commission from 1989 until now, and I've repeated the same arguments and little has been done about it.

My principal concerns are, first of all, that I believe in the principle in a democratic society of one man, one vote. For that reason, I take exception to the fact that certain rural areas – and we're in the 21st century – have a greater say in the Legislature than I would in my riding in Calgary, and I think that is wrong. I think Pat Ledgerwood, a previous officer of the Legislature – he was on the commission in '92 if I remember rightly – made a point when he said that the purpose of sorting out the administration of the voting system is that people have votes, not areas of land, and I think that's a very real consideration.

7:40

The other issue I have is one which actually relates to what the previous lady was talking about, and this is the disparity in workloads between backbenchers and cabinet personnel. I think that's very true and is something that's a luxury which we can ill afford to maintain.

I think one should take note of what has been done in Ontario. I can't remember the detail in relation to its size, but Ontario is 1.62 times the area of Alberta and has four times the population, yet a couple of years back they reduced the number of MLAs from 130 to 103, which equates to the number of Members of Parliament. That is a system which seems to work very effectively, and of course they are behaving I think with economic considerations foremost. I mean, it's a large province. To compare it with Calgary, it has the same problems that Alberta has in terms of difficulties of reaching areas out in the boondocks. But, again, this is the 21st century; we have so many more media, as it were, to let the voter meet his representative and vice versa. Therefore, there shouldn't be any consideration in relation to greater consideration being given to somebody living out in the sticks compared to somebody living in the centre of Calgary.

**The Chair:** The result of that would be that we would end up with 28 MLAs, I guess soon to be 30, because there are going to be two seats added to Alberta under the federal redistribution; aren't there?

**Mr. Thomas:** Yes, that's right. The thing is, you see, that I take exception too to the fact that you cannot operate independent of the Legislature. You have been given terms of reference, which I think are possibly something of a hidden agenda that you could possibly encounter with a one-party dominated Legislature. This is historically what has happened in Alberta. I think in actual fact that you call yourselves an independent commission. It cannot be so. You are led, first of all, by a servant of the Legislature in yourself, Bob, and you've been told what you can do. You can't . . .

**The Chair:** Well, I have to stop you there, pretty frankly. If anyone knows me, I don't get told what I can do very well. I should point out to you that two of my colleagues here have been appointed by the Leader of the Opposition, and the other two have been appointed by the government of the day. Knowing the people who are here, they don't follow anyone's instructions, least of all mine.

**Mr. Thomas:** But the point I make is this. I certainly wasn't aware of the backgrounds of the appointees here. Anyway, I accept that that has been done in a relatively democratic way, but the case remains, I think, that you shouldn't be told to keep the number of seats at 83. You shouldn't have been told to have the variance at

plus or minus 25 when if you look across the border to Saskatchewan, they are restricted to plus or minus 10 percent. Now, why can't we do the same here in Alberta? This is the question I ask.

For the same reason, we've mentioned the number of MLAs and the underemployment of a great many of them, I think, in relation to possibly aldermen and people who are in the actual government as portfolio holders. We should consider the fact that we should have an economic number. Now, if Ontario with its much larger population can equate Members of Parliament to MLAs, is it unreasonable to expect Alberta to do the same? Everybody would be working maybe 70 hours a week – I don't know – if that were the case, but my feeling is that we should look at the economics of it. We don't require 83 MLAs, and I think something should be done about that.

That's basically what I have to say, Bob.

**The Chair:** So if I could summarize what you've told us: rep by pop. Look at the Ontario situation, where there's the same number of MLAs as there are federal seats. You're concerned about the independence of the commission, which I hope I've been able to take out of your concern, and that we should look at the economics of having the number of members we have.

**Mr. Thomas:** In terms of the independence of the commission I feel again that you must not be restricted by these terms of reference. Eighty-three seats, plus or minus 25 percent variance, and there we are. Those are the two prime things in relation to the arguments that I have.

**The Chair:** Okay. Good. Who has a question of Rolly?

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, I did hear one other thing that Mr. Thomas has said. That is that if we do have to have a variance, you'd like it down around 10 percent, I did hear that. But I also want to assure you, if you knew me, that nobody tells me how to think, and I can be a very difficult person at times.

**The Chair:** We can vouch for that.

**Mr. Patterson:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Anyone else? Any comments?

**Mr. Graham:** I don't have any questions.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

Mr. Clegg, I should tell you, used to be a member of the Legislature.

**Mr. Thomas:** Yes. I appreciate that.

**Mr. Clegg:** Just a comment. Your brief is very well done. There are a lot of points brought up, but I think a lot of your points in here actually should go to MLAs to take to government. I say that because our mandate is very clear. Like you say, they don't need this many MLAs and those kinds of things. We have the mandate, and we can't change that. If we could change that, our job would be much easier. Either way, it would be much easier, but I think your brief is very well done, and we'll certainly take it into consideration.

**Mr. Thomas:** You know, I think it's wrong. You guys should have been given that freedom. It doesn't give you the freedom to do things to satisfy the majority of voters.



**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

**Mr. Thomas:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Good to see you again, Rolly, and next time I see you on a plane, I'll remember. How's that?

**Mr. Thomas:** I don't know whether I can afford to go on a plane now that I'm retired.

**The Chair:** I think I'll leave that alone. Thank you very much. I'd now like to call Mr. Bill Longstaff.

**Mr. Longstaff:** Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members. Let me say first that I'm delighted to be appearing before this esteemed group of highly independent thinkers.

**The Chair:** I detect a note of sarcasm, but I'll let that go past.

**Mr. Longstaff:** Just a little buttering up.

I'm sure the commission would agree with me if I said that the premier instrument of a democratic citizen is the vote. We're all different in many ways, in our incomes and in our skills and in our luck, but when we confront the ballot box, we are, in a proper democracy, equal. In fact, if democracy is about anything, it's about political equality, so I think that the business of this commission when it does its work is to emphasize political equality above all. I'm going to suggest two objectives – and there are I'm sure others – to achieve that: first, the ideal of one citizen, one vote and, secondly, representation in the Legislature that truly reflects the will of the people.

Now, on the issue of one citizen, one vote, I think there are three things to consider: first, as far as your commission is concerned, a tight population range; secondly, eliminate any exceptions to that range; thirdly, extrapolate to account for population trends. As far as the population range is concerned, under the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act of course you're allowed 25 percent, which isn't even close to equality. In fact, if you ratio a division 25 percent over to a division 25 percent under, I think you get a ratio of about 1.7, if my mathematics is correct, which in effect says that one voter has 70 percent more influence than another voter. This is both excessive and unnecessary. Our sister province of Saskatchewan has with the exception of two northern ridings achieved 5 percent, and we in Alberta, the province of advantage, can surely do as well as Saskatchewan. Now, I realize that the parameter is set for you, 25 percent, but I don't think there's anything that restrains you from achieving a higher standard.

7:50

The second point that I would make is regarding exceptions. The act allows you to except four divisions, where the range can be up to 50 percent. The criteria that involve these exceptions seem to revolve around area, distance, those kinds of things. The result is gross inequities. I'm looking at Athabasca-Wabasca, if I'm pronouncing that correctly, with a population of about 21,000, and a population in Calgary-Shaw of about 83,000. That's a ratio of 4 to 1. So again one voter gets four times the power of another voter. Curiously, the criteria for diverging is distance and area, and that may have had some foundation when communication was difficult, but that's just no longer the case. Communication today is extremely easy by telephone or e-mail or even snail mail, instantaneous in fact.

Probably the most difficult divisions to represent today are those divisions in our inner-city neighbourhoods. Here's where you find

a great divergence of wealth, a great range of ethnic groups, with many people whose first language isn't English. In fact, I'm in one of those divisions, but I'm not going to ask you to give us any special consideration, because there's always a justification for special consideration. There are always characteristics of a division that make it more difficult to represent. The response to that should not be betraying one citizen, one vote. We should not betray one of the fundamental principles of democracy.

There are many other ways to do it: if distance is a problem, then perhaps a travel allowance or perhaps satellite constituency offices or something of that sort, or if you have a particular difficulty in an inner-city neighbourhood with different languages, perhaps translation or something. There are always ways to handle that, and it should be handled. If a division is more difficult, that should not be ignored but not by betraying fundamental principles.

My last point is the extrapolation of population trends. Immediately when you establish boundaries, they start to become unfair because populations change, and much of that is unpredictable, but a lot of it is predictable. Some divisions have been changing the same way for a long time: some increasing in population, some decreasing in population. So I suggest that you might attempt to extrapolate these changes, say perhaps to the midpoint of the next survey, in order to make up for this kind of change.

My second major point was fair representation of parties in the Legislature. Now, in the last provincial election the Progressive Conservative Party won 62 percent of the popular vote, a very impressive victory, but they were excessively rewarded. They got almost 90 percent of the seats. In Calgary, for example, 86,000 citizens voted for other parties and never elected a single MLA. I don't remember the turnout. I think it was barely over 50 percent. So we should probably be thinking more like double that 86,000, to 170,000. That's four divisions. It almost makes boundaries look like a secondary issue. In fact, it may sound cynical, but those 86,000 citizens might as well have stayed home, because they didn't change the results. Something is gravely wrong when we're literally wasting the votes of thousands of voters. Now, I know where the problem lies, and it isn't something that's within your mandate. It lies with our archaic electoral system, first past the post, but I would nonetheless hope that you would take a very close look at this and see if there's anything that can be done to try to correct that and make some of these people's votes valuable.

So, in conclusion, I would recommend the following: number one, that the commission attempt to set a much higher standard than the 25 percent for population range. Certainly if Saskatchewan can do 5 percent, we can do it. I would suggest that there should be no exceptions to this and that if we do want to allow for the difficulty of representing certain divisions, then that should be done in other ways, not by undermining fundamental principles. Thirdly, I would recommend that the commission use some extrapolation to take into account those constituencies that have a record of a change up or down over time. Finally, I hope that you'll look at the problem of unfair representation of parties and representation in the Legislature. Maybe, if this isn't beyond your mandate, you might recommend a further commission to take a look at voting systems so that Albertans can adopt a system that is both fair and makes sure that every vote counts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Bill. I should say that you're not the first person today who's talked to us about some kind of proportional system.

**Mr. Longstaff:** Well, I hoped that everybody would be talking to

you about that. I'm disappointed.

**The Chair:** Well, you're disappointed, but there were some people who made the same point to us.

Okay, my colleagues.

**Mr. Patterson:** Well, one of the things I see that you're really emphasizing in here is to get down from the 25 percent. Of course, that is within our mandate. We haven't, you know, gotten to the point yet because we didn't want to make any decisions before we heard from people, but I do appreciate your emphasis on that, the fact that the disparity shouldn't be so great.

On proportional representation, we've had it in Alberta, a form of it. I think it was taken out in the 1950s.

**Mr. Longstaff:** That's right. Yes. The single transferable vote.

**Mr. Patterson:** Your point there is very interesting and valid, I believe, but it may be outside of our mandate. But who knows? Maybe a footnote may appear somewhere.

**Mr. Longstaff:** I'd appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Graham:** Well, the one point I'd make is that obviously, Mr. Longstaff, you hold some very strong views, and I encourage you to continue holding them. I think that that sort of passion is very good for our political system. I personally don't believe that anyone's vote is wasted when they cast a vote and they cast it in accordance with their views.

I wonder if you've had an opportunity to review the law that we are bound by, in particular the Supreme Court of Canada cases that of course we're subject to. The Supreme Court of Canada has indeed considered the very issue that you bring up, and it was raised in dissent by one of the judges in the case and expressly rejected by the majority of the court and Beverley McLachlin. So the principle of strictly one person, one vote is not a law of this country, and of course we're bound by the law. I wondered if you are aware of that.

**Mr. Longstaff:** Yes. Actually the cases were fairly well reviewed in the last commission. Are you addressing the point of the 25 percent?

**Mr. Graham:** No. So you're not saying that it should be strictly one person, one vote. You just want it brought down.

**Mr. Longstaff:** I am saying that it should be strictly one person, one vote, as close as reasonable. I mean, obviously you can't draw boundaries such that you achieve perfection, but yes, that's the direction that you should take, I would say. Again, yes, all the way up to the Supreme Court the law has accepted 25 percent, but the law doesn't prevent us from setting a much higher standard, as Saskatchewan in fact has done.

**The Chair:** Any further questions or comments?

**Ms Mackay:** Do you have any particular things that you think we should be measuring then? If what you're saying is that we should be aiming at one person, one vote but you're recognizing that there's a law that actually prevents that from happening, on what basis would we make our measurements?

**Mr. Longstaff:** I'm not sure that there's a law that prevents you from setting a higher standard than 25 percent.

8:00

**Ms Mackay:** No. That isn't what I meant. The thing is that it does recognize the fact that one person, one vote would be unfair to many, many people in this province, because you'd have to ignore some of the difficulties that are inherent in some of the rural constituencies in order to be able to do that.

**Mr. Longstaff:** I realize that there are differences, perhaps significant ones, in representing different divisions, but I'm suggesting that the way to take care of that is not by undermining the fundamental principle. There are other ways to do it. I'm not ignoring the fact that some divisions are more difficult to represent. It's a question of: how do you respond to those difficulties? I mean, I live in an inner-city community, and I could make a pretty good argument that it's one of the most difficult divisions in the province to represent, but I'm not going to make that argument, because I don't think my vote should be better than anybody else's.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any further questions of Bill?

Bill, thank you very much. You were very thought provoking. Thank you very much.

The commission will take a five-minute break, and then we'll hear from Maureen McConaghy from Calgary-West. Thank you.

[The commission adjourned from 8:01 p.m. to 8:07 p.m.]

**The Chair:** The next presenter is Maureen McConaghy, and I would say that she's ably assisted, but I'll leave that to a decision later on.

**Mrs. McConaghy:** This is my able colleague Ron Liepert. He actually wrote the proposal, and I'd like to thank him. We'd also like to thank you for the opportunity to present this to you.

Essentially Calgary-West is significantly over the required number now, so it will be necessary that our boundaries be redefined. We took it upon ourselves to look at each specific poll, and we tallied the numbers, and we have come up with a written proposal, which you have in front of you. The numbers work quite neatly in terms of where we would suggest our boundaries be redrawn.

There are essentially two areas in Calgary-West that are quite easily definable. One is the area east of Sarcee Trail, and the other is the area west of Sarcee Trail. The eastern community is a community sort of unto its own, much older than the western portion and significantly different, older roots in the community than the areas west of Sarcee. The areas west of Sarcee have grown significantly and continue to grow with young families, young communities, and form a very homogenous group. Coincidental with the community designation are the numbers. They are very, very neat, and it's almost like they were designed to fall into the requirements of the act. We currently have 50,000. Our suggestion to you is that we actually just eliminate the area east of Sarcee. That area is 13,152 to our best calculation. That would bring our number down to approximately 37,000, which is exactly the target number that we are required to achieve. So that is our suggestion to you in terms of redesigning the boundary.

**The Chair:** That would move those people possibly over to Calgary-Currie or Calgary-Bow, both of which need some numbers.

**Mrs. McConaghy:** Yes. And we anticipate Calgary-West expanding significantly farther west. It already is. Even if we are looking at an allowance of 8,000 sort of in the next eight to 16 years, that would still maintain the parameters of our required allotment.

So that's essentially it. It's a very neat kind of redesigning. It just happened to fall into the numbers and also the congruity and the

homogenous nature of the two communities.

**The Chair:** Well, this kind of representation is very helpful to us. As you say, I've got a map here that says Calgary-West with 41 percent, so we have to do something with that. So here what he's saying is to leave the east side of the trail and the west side will be the new Calgary-West and then push a bit farther west.

**Mrs. McConaghy:** Yes. That's our proposal to you.

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, I think that in addition to that, we're not suggesting where the 13,000 people east of Sarcee Trail are added. It's your job to decide which constituencies in what I would call the inner-city constituencies of Calgary, which are probably not going to have a lot of growth in the next eight to 16 years. This would help preserve some of those constituencies, but we're not suggesting where those actually are added to.

**The Chair:** Any comments or any questions?

**Mr. Patterson:** Well, Mr. Chair, if I might.

**The Chair:** You might.

**Mr. Patterson:** You first mentioned that you had looked at polls, and then you mentioned communities. I just want to clarify that actually you looked at communities, that these 13,152 are not polls but communities.

**Mrs. McConaghy:** I'm sorry. I misstated. It wasn't polls. We had broken it down.

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, actually you're correct. The only way we had numbers was to look at the polls from the voters list, and then we correlated those to the communities. So she's not incorrect.

**Mr. Patterson:** Okay. That's the point I was really trying to get at.

**Mr. Liepert:** The only numbers we had were to work from the voters list of the last election.

**Mr. Patterson:** We're trying very hard not to split communities, so that's what I was really interested in.

**Mr. Liepert:** This doesn't.

**The Chair:** Any other questions or comments?

**Mr. Graham:** So these numbers are from the last election? They're not from the last census to your knowledge, or do we know?

**Mr. Liepert:** We worked off the numbers from the last election. However, I believe that the numbers from the last election – were they not from the last census?

**The Chair:** No. They would have been from the '91 census.

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, we're not going to sit here and say that our numbers are precise; however, recently it was indicated to our MLA by the Legislative Assembly that her constituency allowance was being increased because she has now surpassed the 54,000 mark. So they're within a thousand.

**The Chair:** My understanding of how that works is that for the sake of MLAs being compensated for constituency work as far as their constituency offices and so on, they take the most recent figures that the Department of Finance has, where under the legislation we're bound by using the last census, which is 2001. That's what the difference is, Ron.

**Mr. Liepert:** The numbers we had were from the list that we had for the last election, which listed every poll and the number of people who were in every poll, and then you could correlate that to the constituency. That's where the numbers came from. I'm not sure where those numbers for the last election came from.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, I might add that Calgary-West is my constituency, and I've known Maureen for 20 years or something and have the utmost respect for her. Since that time, both our families have done their best to increase the population of Calgary-West as best we can.

**The Chair:** Thank goodness you're not in Calgary-Shaw.

**Mr. Graham:** I do have one question apart from that, and this alludes to something that Mr. Patterson asks about quite often. How would you feel about whether there's a community of interest between Calgary-West and, say, parts of East Springbank? You know, if it were necessary to move the boundary out a little bit farther – we're very sensitive to not splitting communities or dividing communities, yet it's my experience, for instance, that while a lot of the people live out in Springbank, they have a lot in common with Calgary-West as well. Do you have any comment on that?

**Mr. Liepert:** I'll make one comment. When I was sort of running some things through here, that was one of the things that we I guess added to it as a second option, looking at the potential of extending the west boundary of Calgary-West to 22X and highway 1 and probably highway 8 on either side. What I was told by those folks who live in East Springbank, several of whom are currently involved in the Calgary-West constituency association, was that what that would do was split the school district, I believe it was, in that area, and they felt that that wasn't a natural boundary even though a lot of those folks who live a mile or two west of the city boundary have a lot more in common with Calgary-West than they do possibly with Banff-Cochrane, where they presently reside. That was the reason given that we shouldn't look at that.

**Ms Mackay:** I don't have a question. Just thanks for your very concrete comments. Maybe we have one constituency drawn.

**The Chair:** And 82 left.

Well, Maureen and Ron, thank you very much. You were concise and to the point, and with the guiding hand of Ron I would expect that. Thank you very much.

Neil Hughes. We met and talked to you earlier today, Neil, so you understand the drill quite well, I'm sure.

**Mr. Hughes:** I do.

**The Chair:** Good.

**Mr. Hughes:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, I was here this afternoon. I'm a resident of Calgary-Buffalo and here representing the PC association of Calgary-Buffalo. I have been influenced and we have been influenced by some of the earlier presentations made today

with respect to what we would propose to the commission about the electoral boundaries of Calgary-Buffalo, and as a result I've changed my earlier presentation, which I was going to deliver to you in a written form, because I want to recognize what was said this afternoon about some of the mandate of the commission and also certainly the numbers of people that need to be in each electoral district in the province.

8:17

Just to tell you who I am, I'm Neil Hughes. I'm a member of the PC Party in Calgary-Buffalo. I'm also the immediate past-president of the Scarboro Community Association. I've been active in Calgary-Buffalo for many years.

This particular riding, Calgary-Buffalo, is nine square kilometres, and I want to contrast that to the largest constituency in the province, which is Athabasca-Wabasca at 124,000 square kilometres. Interestingly, Athabasca-Wabasca contains 38,000 people, slightly over 7 percent of the average throughout the province. Currently Calgary-Buffalo contains a population of about 37,000, about 5.2 percent over the average of the province.

I will talk first of all specifically about the Calgary-Buffalo constituency, because I intend to propose specific boundaries for this riding which would get it up to about 40,000 people inside those boundaries. Calgary-Buffalo has the highest population density of any constituency in Alberta right now. The average voter turnout in this, just to let you know, is one of the lowest in the province at about 40.8 percent. Earlier today you heard a young gentleman speak about the fact that he didn't know exactly where his boundaries were, and when he discovered it, he was surprised by that. That is not uncommon inside inner-city Calgary, and we certainly know from having worked on many campaigns, whether they be provincial or federal or municipal, that geographic boundaries or recognizable boundaries inside an urban constituency are extremely important, as they are anywhere in the province.

The specific boundaries that we wish to address in Calgary-Buffalo would take Calgary-Buffalo from approximately 37,000 people to 40,000 or 41,000 people. It would mean that this particular constituency would retain all the urban boundaries and communities it currently has without fracturing any of them in other communities.

I have a map here. Very briefly, Calgary-Buffalo is bounded by Crowchild Trail on the west, by the Bow River on the north, by 1st Street E. on the east, and by a combination of the left bank of the Elbow River on the south and 17th Avenue and Lower Mount Royal on the further south boundaries. The specific changes we want to propose to the commission would mean the elimination of Lower Mount Royal from Calgary-Buffalo, specifically polls 47, 48, 49, and 50, which you see, approximately 2,000 in population. We propose adding to this constituency all the area east of 1st Street – it's not listed entirely on your map – to the west bank of the Elbow River. The net change is actually zero at the present time according to the 2001 census; that is, if you were to eliminate polls 47, 48, 49, and 50 and add the west bank of the Elbow River, that is currently in Calgary-Fort, you get no change in population.

Now, after having examined some of the earlier presentations and realizing that the commission is looking to expand the existing population of each constituency, or that it may have to examine that, we would propose adding to Calgary-Buffalo an area west of Crowchild Trail to 37th Street S.W. and following the south bank of the Bow River to include the west boundary of Shaganappi golf course. This would include the contiguous communities of upper Scarboro, Rosscarrock, and Shaganappi, increasing the population by about 4,000, bringing the population of Calgary-Buffalo up to about 41,000. It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, to provide you with both the map and the demographics inside this riding so that you can

more readily see what Calgary-Buffalo would look like, and it would conform to the challenge of making these ridings larger in the population base.

Earlier today you also heard that there's additional information available to us from the Federation of Calgary Communities. I am active in several community associations inside Calgary-Buffalo, and such a change as proposed actually conforms to what is happening inside the community associations in this particular riding. The community associations of Connaught and Victoria Park have recently joined, and as we know, Stampede expansion taking place in the Victoria Park area means that it is a logical and consistent application of your mandate as well as the communities' roles to see these communities represented whole and not split between two or more provincial ridings.

Those are specific comments. I'd like to comment on a more general aspect that you've heard today having to do with the representation of 25 percent plus or minus. I'm a petroleum landman and have had the opportunity to travel not only in Alberta but in Saskatchewan and even northern Canada and in the United States in areas such as North and South Dakota and into Montana. I've had an opportunity to meet with both congressmen and MLAs in various provinces. One of the things that has struck me is that while the idea of representation by population is extremely important and is to be sought after, to have effective representation and quality representation means that an elected representative often must meet personally with his or her constituents.

Now, I come from a constituency that has the highest population density. There are 28 languages spoken in Calgary-Buffalo. It is an extremely diverse riding. The MLA works very hard to meet constituents in that riding. I'm also familiar with ridings in Saskatchewan and in other parts of this province where the MLA must travel great distances in order to do exactly the same job as happens in Calgary-Buffalo. While I represent an urban riding here tonight, I have to tell you that having seen what a rural MLA in, say, Saskatchewan or Alberta or a congressman in North or South Dakota must do to represent their electorate, the rule of 25 plus or minus is in my view completely reasonable in order to effect representation inside the Legislature.

There are a million people in Saskatchewan. They're represented in 63 ridings, with approximately 15,000, almost 16,000 per riding. Here in Alberta the application of those same numbers means that our population would be represented by one MLA for roughly every 40,000 under the new census. The difference is that in Saskatchewan, while the constituencies are actually larger, the number of people inside them is less. The MLA will spend great gobs of time traveling between meetings, but he's representing far fewer people throughout the province. Here an application of that rule of getting down to 10 percent or less in variance would cause ridings such as Athabasca-Wabasca or Peace River or Dunvegan to expand perhaps to twice the size they are, representing an area of perhaps more than 200,000 square kilometres. I do not believe it is possible for any member of the Legislature or any elected representative to effectively represent their constituents in a riding that is that large.

8:27

One other issue has not been brought up and I'm not sure is within the mandate of your commission to look at, but I do want to make mention of it. That has to do with the competitiveness of the electoral process in ridings that are substantially larger than the norm to take into account the population difference. I'm familiar with how many ridings in rural Alberta and Saskatchewan conduct election campaigns, and they are quite different from what happens in urban campaigns. In many instances in seeing how candidates run for office, it has been my experience that the larger the constituency, the much greater the difficulty to campaign in those constituencies.

Ultimately, I believe, residents in far-flung ridings are not well served in an electoral process where the candidates have to cover exceptionally large pieces of territory in order to get their message out. Even though we have Internet and other devices, the personal contact is not there. I think the court has recognized this in its earlier decisions. Even though I stand here representing the smallest geographic area, I would like to support the idea that you maintain the 25 plus or minus rule and not go below it, for reasons of quality of representation in Alberta.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Neil. Just so I have this right, you are going to give us a more detailed breakdown of this. Can you have that to us before the 1st of July?

**Mr. Hughes:** Yes. I think the deadline is June 28?

**The Chair:** That's before the 1st of July.

**Mr. Hughes:** That's before the 1st of July. We'll make that known.

**The Chair:** Good.

You should introduce your MLA to the group, please.

**Mr. Hughes:** This is the current MLA for Calgary-Buffalo, Mr. Harvey Cenaiko.

**Mr. Cenaiko:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to add to one of Neil's points regarding splitting a community association or community league. That was done and is being done presently with Lower Mount Royal. So with the change that you see with the hard line going along 17th Avenue, that would put Lower Mount Royal back into the community of Mount Royal. When I have meetings with community representatives on a regular basis, their spokesperson comes from Mount Royal because of the fact that that part of their community is in my area. So it would make a fit for them to go back into Calgary-Currie more so than leaving them separate and without a voice in their community, so to speak.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Harvey.

Any questions? Mr. Clegg, a question, sir?

**Mr. Clegg:** All right. Thanks. What do you think is more important, to have the community organizations in one constituency or to use a main road or, say, a river? Which do you think would be more important? We have to someday make a tough decision.

**Mr. Cenaiko:** From my vast experience of 14 months as an MLA, I would suggest that the community association is more important than a roadway. It's the community association that works together in building their community. When we talk about building communities or safer communities, we're talking about the community as a whole.

In Mr. Hughes' presentation regarding Calgary-Buffalo, by going east it sort of follows the geographic boundaries but does maintain as well the downtown and the city's east end, for example, which is just starting to be more attractive to high-rises and to future development. As well, as you said, Connaught and Victoria Park are talking about soon amalgamating into one larger community association. So by sort of following the geographic boundaries of the Elbow River to the Bow River, it gives us natural boundaries as well as keeping those community associations intact.

**Mr. Hughes:** I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the current boundaries of Calgary-Buffalo and Calgary-Fort split the very active

Chinese community in central Calgary. It is a continuing difficulty that this riding has undergone over several years, where if you live on one side of the street, you're voting in Calgary-Buffalo, and if you live on the other side of the street, you're voting in Calgary-Fort. In actual fact families are split by residence, by one street. It makes better sense to include that entire community and neighbourhood in one constituency, and whether you wish to do it in Calgary-Fort or Calgary-Buffalo doesn't matter, but it makes it easier if it's all in one. I might add that these difficulties span all candidates and have gone on for more than 10 years. I think there's a certain unanimity amongst all of us who have participated in election campaigns that if the communities were whole, such as the Chinese community and Lower Mount Royal, it would make it far easier for voter identification.

Finally and most importantly, because voter turnout is so low, can I tell you what the effect is of boundaries which are unclear in an inner city? Very briefly what happens is that you have people returning from work at 5 o'clock in the evening perhaps not knowing exactly where they might vote but wanting to and being unable to identify their polling place. In the last three elections, '93, '97, and 2000, there were many people inside Calgary-Buffalo who for one reason or another were unable to identify their polling place even though all candidates made yeoman efforts to identify that, and they attended upon a polling place outside their constituency because the geographic identification of the neighbourhood was somewhere else. I just explained to you about Mount Royal and the Chinese community. As a result, the votes cast in those polls were significantly less than might otherwise have been the case. That's three elections running, and I think now that we have identified that as a concern, the commission would do well to look at that and see that as increasing voter participation, by making sure that geographic boundaries and community boundaries are respected.

**Ms Mackay:** I'm just curious about the demographics of your constituency. I mean, do you have any particular challenges because of the particular location? For example, is it a very transient area?

**Mr. Hughes:** Yes. Over 40 percent of the electorate changes over a four-year period. That is, between 1997 and 2001 inside Calgary-Buffalo 40 percent of residents were new to the constituency. That is the highest of any provincial constituency in Alberta.

The other interesting thing about Calgary-Buffalo is that it is rapidly changing with respect to its ethnic makeup. It used to be a riding where new immigrants first landed in Calgary. That's now not the case because Calgary-Buffalo has had a change of housing mix. Condominium conversions have pushed up the price of real estate and rentals, so there are more and greater immigrant populations in constituencies in east Calgary: Montrose, McCall, those constituencies. This is even different from Edmonton-Centre, which is the only other constituency that closely resembles what Calgary-Buffalo is going through.

8:37

**Ms Mackay:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Doug.

**Mr. Graham:** Yeah. One small question. Firstly, I thought this presentation was excellent, and I really appreciate the map.

I have one query with respect to this little area you're adding, and maybe you can help me. My map appears to indicate that there are some areas which I guess are in Scarboro: Superior, Sonora, et cetera, et cetera. On the other side of that, there are a whole bunch of other S's. Is that part of Scarboro as well? If so, are we splitting a community if we do this?

**Mr. Hughes:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we're even asking to go further. The current boundary is the east side of Crowchild Trail. In order to reach the 41,000 maximum that you're going to need if you're going to create other constituencies, we need to go west of that boundary to 37th Street S.W. All right?

**Mr. Graham:** So this map with the bold line around it does not show . . .

**Mr. Hughes:** This is what I meant to say. I've changed the map just by virtue of what I've heard earlier today and this evening, going further west to 37th.

**Mr. Graham:** All right.

**Mr. Hughes:** By the way, I will tell you that that means that those community associations are also whole. That is, it's Shaganappi, Upper Scarboro, Rosscarrock. That would move those communities into a new constituency, but it would move them whole. It would not split them in any way.

**Mr. Graham:** I see. The nature of the confusion is that we have two maps in front of us, which we'd better correct, I guess.

**Ms Mackay:** No. Because you're turning that upside down.

**Mr. Graham:** Right. Okay. No, we don't.

But this map does not show what you propose. You propose an annexation even further west than this map shows.

**Mr. Cenaiko:** That's correct. This map doesn't have where the two rivers meet here. Then, as well, after the Calgary-Shaw presentation it confirms even more that we can go further west.

**Mr. Graham:** You know, if I could just ask you a favour, it would be this. We are going to have a lot of presentations. It's going to be very difficult to keep a lot of this stuff straight. When we come down to doing this, I would really very much appreciate a further map indicating what it is you propose tonight.

**Mr. Hughes:** Yeah. Absolutely.

**Mr. Graham:** Otherwise, a month from now I'm liable to look at this and forget. None of the other people will, because they're already smarter than me.

**Mr. Patterson:** My concerns, Mr. Chair, have been answered. I was concerned about these polls 47, 48, and you've cleared that up.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Neil, thank you very much and, Harvey, thank you very much.

**Mr. Cenaiko:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** And we look forward to you getting that in by the 28th.

**Mr. Hughes:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much.

Okay. Now we're ready to hear from Mr. Harry Chase.

**Mr. Chase:** I'm going to depart a little bit from the script, but I will be under five minutes, I promise you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for coming.

**Mr. Chase:** Oh, thank you. I'm just going to make some very quick, philosophical statements, and then I'll get to the mathematics, and you have the mathematics before you.

Thirty-three years ago, when I was doing my student teaching – I'm currently a teacher – a principal asked me: what's important to you in education? My statement was: getting to know each of my kids. I was going in an elementary route, and there were only 30 kids in the class at that particular moment. The principal said to me that it was an impossible task to get to know each of the students. If you expound upon that sort of theory, yes, it's probably equally as hard to get to know 40,000 people as it would be to get to know 60,000, but what I'm concerned about is that by enlarging the boundaries, people aren't being represented.

This province, whether it's federally or provincially or municipally, suffers from voter apathy. For whatever reason, people feel disconnected. Maybe they're happy with the current regime, and therefore they feel that they don't need to cast their vote. Maybe they're unhappy, but they don't think their vote matters. So by having an equivalent constituency population across the province, I think people at least have a fair chance of being represented equally throughout the province.

The worst example of voter turnout was three years ago, when Dr. Oberg dismissed the current Calgary board of education. The headlines in the paper read that 70 percent of Calgarians thought that it was a good idea to disband the current board, but when the election was called, fewer than 10 percent of Calgarians bothered to turn out. Obviously I'm prejudiced. I feel that education is a very important area.

One of the sort of little jokes following my election loss was that I was one of the biggest losers in this province and very proud of that fact. The reason I say that is that the number of votes I received was larger than the total number of votes cast in Wetaskiwin. It gets at the point that, you know, in a rural circumstance possibly I would have been elected based on the large number of voters that turned out.

What I'm suggesting – and here's the mathematics of it. Calgary-Foothills is way over the provincial average. A very simplistic approach would be instead of having the Foothills constituency extend all the way to the city limits, if you were to cut it off at the northern extremity of Country Hills, you would fit into the population you're looking for. What I'm suggesting is that if you looked at Country Hills and you carried it all the way across west and into the east, there is sufficient population north of Country Hills Boulevard to create a new constituency and thus have potentially a better representation for those particular people.

I have one little pet peeve. Former speakers have talked about people on one side of the street voting in a particular constituency and people on the other side of the street voting in another. To me it makes geographic sense to contain an entire community. Right now the southeast portion of Calgary-Foothills snakes around to such a point – I gather that the original division was based on the soccer communities of the Triwood communities. While it made soccer registration rather handy – and I've coached soccer – I don't think that should be the mandate that considers provincial voting patterns. So I'm suggesting that instead of running like a snake through the community, make Charleswood Drive the eastern boundary. Then, of course, we have the large population of Calgary-Nose Hill in the midst of it. I tried to entice some of the deer and the antelope to come and vote for me, but I didn't have much more luck than I had with some of the changing Conservative opinions. I think it would make sense to have, as I've noted, Crowchild Trail to the south, Sarcee Trail to the west, Country Hills to the north, and then if we want to include the little snake from Charleswood to 14th to include MacEwan, that's fine.

**The Chair:** What population do you guess that would be?

**Mr. Chase:** When you make that change, it's in that 40,000 to about 43,000. So it's pretty close to the mandates that the commission is suggesting.

**The Chair:** Okay. The fact that you're a teacher should give you some additional support because three of the members of this panel formerly have been teachers. So you're in reasonably friendly territory.

**Mr. Chase:** Well, thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any questions or comments?

This kind of specific recommendation is helpful because it allows us to zero right in.

**Mr. Chase:** Thank you.

**Mr. Graham:** I have one comment, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman; that is, again I compliment the presenter. I thought this was really good because it is concrete, and I would very much appreciate it if I could get a map showing this. I really relate to that a lot better.

**Mr. Chase:** Okay.

**Mr. Graham:** If I could get a map tracing out what you propose here, it would be helpful.

**Mr. Chase:** Right. Do you have any generic copies out in the hall that I could just trace the boundaries around?

**Mr. Graham:** We may well have. If I could just get a map that I could file with your presentation, I would be very appreciative.

**Mr. Chase:** Great. I'll ask in the hall then.

**The Chair:** If you can't, get back to us and we'll try and accommodate you there.

**Mr. Chase:** Okay. Great. Thank you.

**The Chair:** You can talk to Mr. Fjeldheim perhaps. I'm sure he can get that.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Chase:** Thank you.

8:47

**The Chair:** Sandra Wilson, Calgary-Fort. Thank you very much, Sandra, for coming and bringing the views of Calgary-Fort to us. I know that you've been here for some time, and you've watched the way we've been moving things along. We look forward to hearing your presentation.

**Ms Wilson:** Thank you. I have several members of the Calgary-Fort constituency here with me tonight, but they'd like me to present. My name is Sandra Wilson. I'm the constituency assistant to Wayne Cao, the MLA for the area. He would like to be here tonight, but he's at an event, so he can't be.

Calgary-Fort is made up of inner-city communities, although they don't necessarily look like it. The most southern community, Ogden, is a hundred years old. At one point it was far out of the city; now it's considered inner city. It has a variety of problems of

low income and an increasing amount of ethnic people moving into the area. It is also suffering from a lot of urban renewal and a lot of change. So those are all things to be involved.

First of all, we would like to say that changes should be made based on the following principles: considering Calgary's population growth as a whole, past and future; recognizing the directions of the population growth pressure in Calgary, which is to the south, the west, and the north, the general expansion of constituencies should be from the inner city going outwards to the south, the north, and the west to help relieve this growth pressure; and also trying to make the least changes to existing constituency boundaries while maintaining communities intact.

**The Chair:** You're going to have to slow down a half a minute. My shorthand with my left hand isn't working very well.

**Ms Wilson:** You should have this in writing in front of you.

**The Chair:** Oh. I'm sorry. Oh, great. Then you can speed up.

**Ms Wilson:** In keeping with the general trend within Canada to have consistent urban growth and a shrinking of the rural population, the most logical way to alleviate growth in Calgary would be to make more constituencies within Alberta, thus adding three or more constituencies to Calgary or amalgamating the rural ridings in the north of Alberta into larger population areas and adding the needed urban constituencies in this way. Given the reluctance to reduce the rural constituencies or to add new constituencies, the only other alternative would be to increase the size of all Calgary constituencies to be 120 percent of the suggested size. This would cover the current population but not necessarily alleviate the future growth rate in Calgary of approximately 35,000 per year, or at least one constituency per year. The only way to accommodate this growth would be to add constituencies as the city grows or constantly change the borders of the constituencies to keep up with this population growth.

The main population growth in Calgary is along the north/south corridor, with some less dense population growth to the west with its larger areas and less compact communities to the west. Growth to the east is curtailed by the large industrial parks that are growing there and the fact that most people wish to live west, towards the mountains. The current constituency borders should be expanded from Centre Street west and from the Bow River and Memorial Drive, both north and south.

Based on the existing location of the Calgary-Fort constituency, the primary objective logically is to share in population growth to the south. The secondary is to share in population growth in the west. The north boundary would have no change as underpopulated constituencies with little growth potential exist there, and the east boundary is industrial, so there's no residential growth. Please note that Calgary-Fort will also experience some growth within its existing borders over the next few years from urban renewal projects. East Village, which was mentioned by Calgary-Buffalo, will experience a growth in population in the next 10 years of over 7,000 people, perhaps 10,000 as the area redevelopment plan has given the go-ahead to many new multihousing complexes in the area, ranging from apartment buildings to townhouses to condo complexes. The city of Calgary has committed to increasing density in the downtown area and in the city overall, and current projects under way in Ogden should result in a population increase of 500 to 1,000 people in the next two years. The zoning of the area is such that single-family housing could be increased to duplex housing, or double the size, within 20 years.

So given that, the Calgary-Fort constituency should help in the relief of the population growth and pressures as follows. Keep the

north boundary of the constituency unchanged as the Calgary-East, Calgary-Montrose, and Calgary-Mountain View constituencies in the north are underpopulated and should grow north and east to help relieve population pressure in that direction. Calgary-Fort should not grow north. The addition of the Riverbend community to the south of Calgary-Fort – the Riverbend community is an adjacent neighbour to the south of Calgary-Fort and has only one road entrance, directly opposite Ogden. Many constituents there believe they are part of Calgary-Fort now. In fact, I have it on authority from some members that they voted for Wayne in the last election, believing that they were there. The members at the polling booth believed they were, too, and let them vote.

**The Chair:** Where's the Chief Electoral Officer?

**Ms Wilson:** I only have this as hearsay. I have no proof.

There is an area south of Glenmore Trail called South Hill, part of Riverbend now, that is over a hundred years old and existed with Ogden, and they still believe they are a part of Ogden. The constituency of Calgary-Egmont, currently covering Riverbend, should grow further south to help alleviate the population pressure in that direction; i.e., Douglas Glen and Douglasdale.

Community alignment. The downtown part of the west boundary of the Calgary-Fort constituency should remain constant or expand west to align with Centre Street. The community of Victoria Park has been split by the existing riding boundary and should be reunited and given either to Calgary-Buffalo or Calgary-Fort. Right now the largest amount of the population is actually in Calgary-Buffalo and the smaller amount in Calgary-Fort due to the Stampede grounds reconstruction. The Calgary-Fort constituency should remain at its present west border or expand further west to Centre Street to include Victoria Park or Chinatown.

**The Chair:** So you and Calgary-Buffalo need to speak.

**Ms Wilson:** We need to move them one way or the other to unite those two communities, and it might be that you juggle them – one goes one way and one goes the other way – to include the full communities. This would help to relieve the population growth pressure to the west. The constituency of Calgary-Buffalo should grow further west and north to help relieve the population pressure from that direction.

Wayne would like it to be noted that he has faxed this report to all the communities involved. He has tried to talk to most of them, and there has been no negative feedback about these ideas.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much.

**Ms Wilson:** Certainly.

**The Chair:** You heard previously the comments that the map was so helpful and that the precise recommendations are really helpful to us. We appreciate that.

**Ms Wilson:** Now, I haven't shown where we propose to go, just with arrows down to Riverbend, but we could include the map later on with that.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any questions or any comments?

**Mr. Patterson:** Well, Mr. Chair, this information, so precise, is excellent. Thank you.

**Ms Wilson:** You should note, too, that where Calgary-Buffalo said

that they should take East Village, East Village is going to expand by 7,000 to 10,000 people. So if you're juggling East Village, look at that in the future.

**The Chair:** One of the challenges the commission has is to keep in mind that we have to use as a central reference the 2001 population numbers, or we'll end up trying to guess what areas are going to grow and what areas aren't going to grow, and that's a challenge.

**Ms Wilson:** East Village is currently a level parking lot with a few apartment buildings, and there are plans to build huge apartment buildings all over it. The plan is in existence now.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any other comments or questions from my colleagues?

**Mr. Graham:** Well, again the comment I'd have is that this is extremely well done and very much appreciated. I think it's a credit to both your constituency association and your MLA. I've always found Wayne Cao to be one of the most rational, reasonable people that I've ever met, and this is another example of that. I really appreciate it, and I think we all do.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Clegg has a question.

8:57

**Mr. Clegg:** I just want to very quickly comment that I'm just impressed with the work you've done, where you took Calgary and put it into different groups like the northeast group, the northwest. Really, they are amazing figures that come out of there, and I want to personally thank you for the work that you and your group did.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

The next presenter is Oscar Fech. Oscar, if you'd proceed please, keeping in mind to try and zero in on the issues that we have an impact on. Thanks, Oscar.

**Mr. Fech:** Mr. Chairman and board, my name is Oscar Fech. I like what was said, but the whole problem is that we are creating such a big bureaucracy. Last time, about seven, eight years ago, I went to the electoral meeting also – Judge Wachowich was the chairman at that time – and there was a lot of talk of reducing from 83 to 53, to what they had in the '30s or the '20s or whatever. There was so much talk about it, but it got swept under the carpet. I still feel very strongly that we should reduce government, not increase government. It creates chaos. It's almost like the Roman empire days when you go back in history. I just wanted to make a comment on that.

I study world history. I've traveled to over 50 countries. I've lived here in Calgary since 1951 and had a business since 1961, so I'm quite well versed about Calgary. There's always talk that we're going to reduce, but it seems like we've been sort of manipulated, being told so many things: we're going to make changes for the better. It seems like we've been led down the garden path. When you go back 20, 30 years, high tech came in very strong, and they indicated that as soon as we have good high tech, we can use less paper, but we've gone to using five times more. There's more paper being used. There is more paper being used to distribute, to let people know that you need a copy of this. This is what we're living with: promises, promises, promises.

We have to take the bull by the horns as a board, as a commission, and say: "Look; we've analyzed everything. Our feeling is, from what we've heard from the people, that we've got to turn the clock



back somewhat. We've got to lower taxes, help the poor, the homeless, the needy." There's so much talk, flip-flop going on between each government – city, provincial, and federal – a lot of this talk. "Well, we're going to come up with something by 2000. By 2008 or '12, we can have it all figured out. We can have such a good system that you won't believe it." But this is the rhetoric that we hear all the time. It seems like the MLAs or city aldermen or the MPs or the Senate or the House of Commons are not running the government. It's the system created. The bureaucracy runs the system itself, just like in the Roman empire days. All of a sudden what happened? They couldn't go any further; they had a self-implosion. That's where we're heading right now.

That's why I stress very strongly that we need less government, fewer MLAs, good government, and to create an honest, fair, accountable system. That's what we need. We don't need anything else.

**The Chair:** Okay. You're straight to the point. I appreciate that. When Judge Wachowich met with us when we first met as a commission, he said that one of the things he heard often last time was the concern expressed by some people that there should be fewer MLAs. I think I mentioned earlier today that I would say that certainly 60 percent, perhaps even 70 percent of the presentations we've had in written form, not oral, have stressed that point. I don't pretend to be so presumptuous as to speak on behalf of my colleagues here, but I'm sure there will be reference in our report to that point being made time and time again to us. You can count on that.

**Mr. Fech:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other questions of Oscar?

**Mr. Fech:** Can I make one more quick comment?

**The Chair:** One more quick comment.

**Mr. Fech:** I go to the Legislature, I go to the city hall, and I've been in Ottawa. It seems that all three governments have the same platforms. They never had it before. It seems like we are repeating three times the same thing, and nothing gets done. All they're doing is playing ping-pong back and forth and blaming each other: they should do it; they should do it. I just wanted to make that point.

**The Chair:** I thought I heard Mr. Clegg snorting when you were saying that, in agreement I might say.

Any questions or comments of Oscar?

**Mr. Graham:** I agree.

**Mr. Clegg:** I agree too, but then how would you blame somebody else if you didn't have this system?

**Mr. Fech:** You hit it right on.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Oscar.

**Mr. Fech:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Now, there was someone else, a lady right down here, who wanted to say a few words. I talked to Lorraine, and she said that she wanted to make a point to us on reducing the number of MLAs. She said that she would be short and to the point, and I said that we would listen to a short, to-the-point presentation from

Lorraine Weller. Lorraine, you're on.

**Mrs. Weller:** Thank you very much. I appreciate this comment from the floor. I have nothing prepared, but I've enjoyed the presentations, and certainly some people really did the job you asked them to do.

It does concern me. I have to agree a lot with Oscar, the last gentleman that presented. I think it was when I finally realized that Calgary is represented by 21 MLAs, Edmonton by 19, that I thought: no wonder we have such massive government expenditure. I mean, those people cost money. My needs in Calgary-North West are not any different than in Calgary-Foothills or Calgary-Egmont. Calgary-North West is Calgary-North West. Don't give me a new border, because I'm not going to pay attention to it anyway. It just creates apathy. The common citizen, i.e. me, is dumb. We do not go into this. We want things done, but we don't go into the detail of it.

I know that a lot of these things come from: we've got to do it because of democracy. Trust me; I believe in democracy and representation by population, but we've got to get creative with this. This is why the west has no clout in federal politics, because they've got the population down east, and this whole system we have is not doing us a damn bit of good. I'm sorry that I don't have the answers, but this is where we've got to get our intellect and our new generation thinking and bring in the Internet and bring in whatever. We've got to get this representation by population somehow modified so that every vote does count. I mean, we're sick and tired of our representation in Ottawa, but it's not going to change until Ontario changes, until Quebec changes. We have no clout.

So I really appreciate all the time and effort you're going to spend, the money and effort and these long meetings, about changing a boundary from one street to the next and this community there and that community there. We don't care. Basically, we want to vote, and we want the city of Calgary to be prosperous. I want the garbage picked up, and that's a citizen thing. I mean, we cannot ever make another constituency in this province. Eighty-three in this province is ridiculous. Twenty-one and 19 coming out of the cities is too much, especially when you take it to the rural setting and those people have got so many miles to make but maybe the same number of people to represent. So that definitely is one point that you would get from almost every average citizen.

9:07

I think somebody mentioned proportional representation. I don't know. I think that that's what we have to look at, some other way of delivering and maintaining democracy. If you have to redo these boundaries every election, it's a waste of your time. You're talented people. Redoing boundaries?

**The Chair:** We certainly agree with that part about talent.

**Mrs. Weller:** Maybe you'll remember my other point about creative thinking on government.

**The Chair:** Oh yes, we do. We also have you written down here: we don't need more MLAs.

**Mrs. Weller:** Please, no more.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any other questions or comments?  
Thanks very much, Lorraine.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you for your passion.

**The Chair:** Yes, and your enthusiasm.

**Mrs. Weller:** You're welcome.

**The Chair:** Now, is there anyone else who wanted to say a few words to us tonight?

**Mr. Istvanffy:** Yes. Thank you. My name is James Istvanffy.

**The Chair:** Hi, James. It's very good to meet you.

**Mr. Istvanffy:** It's good to meet you. I'll try and be brief because I know that it's getting late. I appreciate your taking a few minutes. I ran up here at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and unfortunately you guys had closed down. So I'm glad to have come back this evening to present what I wanted to say. I apologize that I don't have something in writing, because that would give you more meat to chew on. Maybe next time.

I fear – and I just want to say this for your benefit – that it's going to be very hard with a massive majority government to get significant electoral change. Many people of course would say that we don't need 83. You know, when you deal with a large body of people in a parliamentary style democracy, I don't think that the number is that key, whether it is 75 or 50 or 100. I don't mind it going up a little bit, personally. I think that there is a lot of apathy out there, and we have to jig things such that if the government ever does change, we have a more democratic representation of the people's will.

This is why I'm an advocate for proportional representation. I wouldn't mind the cities getting a few more seats because of increased population. We can maybe take it up to 90 instead of 83 and have 10 by proportional representation. I think that it's going to be very hard to convince MLAs to do that because there is so much opposition to more politicians, and I understand that. It's extremely difficult of course politically to reduce the number of MLAs, because nobody's going to vote themselves out of a job. It's just the way of human nature. To convince a group of people to get rid of a third of themselves is unlikely if not impossible. Really, there's nothing magical about 83. Let's think about what makes sense in the long run.

I think what makes sense in the long run is that the people be given an opportunity occasionally to change their governments. I would encourage you to strongly impress upon the minds of the sitting MLAs in a large majority government that some day – it may not be in the next five years, and it may not be in the next 15 years, maybe 25 years – the people of Alberta are going to change the government, and you want to prepare the system for that day.

I just want to tell you a brief story. Back in the 1980s I was a member of the federal Progressive Conservative Party, and I remember advocating with some of the MPs: hey, why don't we have a few seats in the House of Commons by proportional representation? They were saying: well, we don't want that; that's more Liberals and NDPers. It's very hard to see, as I say, past their interests the system that got them there, being a massive majority government, the largest in Canadian history, 177 federal seats for the PCs at that time. It was very hard to see past their interests of keeping the system the way it was to changing it in any significant way because that's the system that they had succeeded in. When they went down to two seats, you know, they were a little bit humbled by that.

You know, it's funny, because I've brought up the idea of having a few seats, maybe only 10 percent – you see, 10 percent wouldn't make a radical change in the government, giving the opposition a few seats, like 10 percent, for the people on a split ballot where they'd vote for the person in their riding and the party they represent, and then they'd vote for the party. So they could advocate for protest parties and alternative parties. I don't think that it would

suddenly make tons of minority governments. I think it would give opposition more of a fighting chance to present different points of view within the province.

Anyhow, I presented this to MPs in the Conservative Party, and they didn't see past their interests. As I say, often I find that when there's a conflict between some people's interests and their ideals, for most people most of the time their interests win out. So if you're part of a majority government, we don't want much change. I have to admit that I've spoken to many MLAs over the last number of years saying: hey, why don't we change it to have a few seats for proportional representation? The argument almost invariably, not a hundred percent but I'd say 90 percent, would be: "Well, that's more Liberals and NDs in the Legislature. You really don't want that; do you?" It's funny, and I have to bring up the example of the Conservatives in the '80s. They said the same thing, and they went down to two seats. Now, wouldn't it be a little easier if you had a place to survive in when the people eventually do decide to change the government? We have to make it a little bit easier for opposition parties to have a voice in the parliament.

So I hope that you have some success in dealing with the powers that be. I don't envy you your task, because I feel that the political winds, the way they blow – and I've been a member of the Progressive Conservative Party in Alberta for 20 years now. It's very hard for people to see past their current interests to say: "Okay. What would be ideal, especially if we ever do change the government? It would be nice to have somewhere to hang on until we can fight our way back into government."

Anyhow, I've taken enough of your time, and I stand open for questions from the panel.

**The Chair:** Thanks, James. I must ask. Any relation in your family with the first name, Dan, who used to be the head statistician for the province of Alberta?

**Mr. Istvanffy:** Yes, he was my uncle. He passed away a couple of years ago.

**The Chair:** He had an enviable reputation as one of the leading people in his field across the country. I recall that from the 1960s and the early '70s.

Glen Clegg, you have a comment.

**Mr. Clegg:** Just a very quick comment. I certainly agree with you, James, in the fact that when you get there – and I was there for 15 years, and I've never seen a company or MLAs say to the boss: well, you don't need me. So that's truly what happens in companies; it happens in governments. I'm not picking on any government. Hey, you won't get an MP to go down to Ottawa and say: well, I think we should cut out 50 MPs, because you don't need me. I mean, they fought very hard to get there. I've yet to see somebody ever say that, so it'll take time.

If you believe that we don't need that many or that we need more, we haven't got the mandate to do it. So I think that you should be working with your MLAs or your MPs or whatever. We've mentioned that in council too, city council or municipal council. It isn't our mandate to look at that. Certainly, I just wanted to comment that I've never seen anybody in any large society say: I'm no good; you might as well get rid of me. It just won't happen.

**Mr. Istvanffy:** It just won't happen. It's hard for everybody to support proportional representation. I think it's only by adding seats, because you'll never convince a group of people to cut down the number of seats that are first past the post. So I'm hoping for even 10 percent – you know, if it's eight seats, five seats – some percentage, and give the smallest parties their first cracks. If you make it 10 seats, then if you get at least 5 percent of the vote, you

get one seat.

Anyhow, I don't want to keep you too long. You have a question?

9:17

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, I just want to say that being much older than you are, I can remember when the Social Credit government was in Alberta. I was a supporter of that government, and they thought they were going to be there forever. There isn't one of them left now anywhere or even getting close.

It's kind of an interesting thing how your observations are correct that political parties somehow develop the concept that they're going to be around forever, never thinking that someday the people will change. So I commend you on your astuteness in saying that this might be one way to preserve some form of different lines of thoughts in politics.

**The Chair:** Doug or Bauni?

I'm not sure that this is a consoling thought, James. You're obviously a bit of a history buff. If you go back and look at the history of the province of Alberta, a government that's been elected in Alberta, once defeated, has never been re-elected. We've only had four governments in this province: the Liberals, the United Farmers, the Socreds, and the Conservatives. I was a minister in the Socred government when the government changed, and you could just feel the wind. Those are the politics of Alberta compared to the politics of B.C. and Saskatchewan, where they change with monotonous regularity; don't they?

**Mr. Istvanffy:** They do. I do think, though, that also there's a question of the system creating the type of governments we get, so as I say, that's why if we give the opposition a few more seats by true proportional representation, I think there might be more to-and-fro in our politics.

**The Chair:** You're the third or fourth person today who's made a point to us about some form of proportional representation. Thank you very much, James.

**Mr. Istvanffy:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Olthof, is there anyone else?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for making your presentations to us. We've had a full day. We've got a lot to think about. We started in Calgary – and when you look at the maps, you can see why we started in Calgary – and then have to move on from here. We're in Olds and Red Deer tomorrow and Edmonton on Wednesday. Please, when you get the report, look at it. We'll make an earnest effort to keep in mind the representations you have made to us and do the best that we can given the challenge before us.

Thank you very much.

[The commission adjourned at 9:22 p.m.]

