

3:05 p.m.

Wednesday, December 18, 2002

[Mr. Clark in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to welcome you to the final public hearing of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. We started this experience in Calgary back in the last week of May this year. We were in Calgary, then to Olds, Red Deer, and Edmonton. The week after that, we were in St. Paul, Wainwright, Drumheller, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, and Wetaskiwin. Then we had a lapse of two weeks. Then we were in Westlock, Edson, Slave Lake, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, and Peace River. We finished that by the end of June. Then we spent the month of July coming to a number of conclusions, which you I'm sure will have a variety of points of view on. Those conclusions are in our interim report.

The legislation that this commission is working under has said that there will be 83 MLAs. It says that we should use the population decided by the 2001 national census, which is 2,900,000. If you take that population and divide it by 83, you'll get a figure of 35,951 and a half. That's ideally the number of people that are to be in a constituency. Obviously that can't be the case. The legislation also says that there can be up to a 25 percent variance within constituencies, although this commission has tried to keep that variance in the vicinity of 10 to 15 percent. I think there's one at 19 percent, which is the Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo area. The legislation does provide for four special ridings, and those special ridings are ridings where there would be a population of less than 20 percent of the provincial average. Presently in the Legislature there are two special areas. Those are the ridings of Athabasca-Wabasca and the riding of Lesser Slave Lake.

We handed our report in to the Speaker, and you've all seen it and all agree with it or you wouldn't be here. The legislation says that then there will be an opportunity for the public to respond to the interim report, and this is what we've been doing. This is the third day. The first day we were in Athabasca. In the afternoon there would've likely been twice as many people as there are here. That evening there were about, I guess, 60, 70 people in Athabasca. There was representation from the northeast part of the province there.

Yesterday we were in Edmonton from 10 till 11:30, from 2 to 5:30, and then from 6:30 until about 8 o'clock. We heard a large number of rural presentations, especially east but some north and south of Edmonton also. Then we had a number of presentations from Edmonton.

This morning at 9 o'clock we were in Red Deer. We heard, I believe, 12 presentations in Red Deer primarily dealing with the central Alberta area.

We've returned to where we started, which is here in Calgary. I believe we have nine individuals and groups who are going to make presentations to us. Some of you have sent those presentations in before, and we're very appreciative, and we have read those.

The practice we've followed is that individuals will make a presentation to us up to but no more than 10 minutes. Then there's a trap door, and you fall down. Yes, Moe, I'm saying this especially for you because you're first. Ten minutes, and then my colleagues on the commission will have some questions. Generally speaking, the questions come from this side. Generally speaking, the comments come from this side. So you can understand the challenge the chair has, but I've been extremely fortunate with the makeup of the commission.

Under the Alberta Electoral Boundaries legislation after every two elections a commission such as this is established. The chairman of the commission is to be one of either the Auditor General for the

province, the Ethics Commissioner, a member of the judiciary, or the head of an academic institution. For some strange reason it was the Ethics Commissioner's turn this time, and so that's why I'm the chairman, I gather. My name is Bob Clark. I am the Ethics Commissioner for the Alberta Legislature. I live in a little community just north of the city here called Carstairs.

Two members are then appointed by the leader of the government, and two members are appointed by the leader of the opposition after sufficient consultation. I say without any hesitation at all that I've been richly blessed in having four excellent people sit on the commission with me.

In no particular order I'll start first of all to my far right – although that really isn't where he is most of the time – with Ernie Patterson, the mayor of Claresholm. Mr. Patterson has been the mayor of Claresholm for more than 33 years. He's also the first vice-president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, and he brings to our task a remarkable experience of municipal politics and good common sense.

To my right is Glen Clegg. Glen is one of the characters of the Peace River country. He lives in the community of Fairview and was the Member for Dunvegan for a number of years but in the Dunvegan riding that included Fairview, Spirit River, and Falher, that part of the province. Glen was also with municipal government for about 19 years before he became a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

To my immediate left is someone whom many of you recognize as an education leader in the province, Bauni Mackay. Bauni is the former president of the Alberta Teachers' Association and is from the city of Edmonton.

To my far left, not really, is Doug Graham. Doug is a well-known and well-respected lawyer here in the city of Calgary. Doug has taken unto himself to be the person who has sat down and listened to a number of groups in Calgary who have had concerns prior to, during, and up till now, I guess.

So these are the members of the panel. In the corner over here the gentleman with the smiley face is Mr. Brian Fjeldheim. Brian is Alberta's Chief Electoral Officer. If you've had trouble running in the last election, please talk to Mr. Clegg. To Brian's right is Bill Sage. Bill is the fellow who makes that office really work.

Over here is Doug Olthof. Doug is the administrative assistant for the commission, and if you haven't already registered with Doug, it's best you do so or your chances of making a presentation to us are somewhat limited.

I think I've covered the essential points. Oh, I should say that the procedure following today will be that we will take into consideration those things which we've heard during the last two and a half days and certainly what we hear here today. We will be, then, shortly after this coming to some conclusions. I think it's fair to say that there will be some changes to the report, but I think it's also fair to say that they will not be massive changes. We're not going to redo the boundaries all across the province as a result of the last three days. We've likely had presentations made from perhaps a third of the constituencies in the province, maybe even less than that, and we've not got any Christmas cards, but we haven't had any hate mail either.

The procedure from here on is this: once we get our report in the hands of the Speaker, which will be the 1st of March, then our responsibilities are finished. The report then goes to the Legislature. It then becomes the responsibility of Alberta's 83 MLAs as to how they deal with the recommendations that we've made, keeping in mind that there must be redistribution in place before the next election.

I think that covers what I wanted to say. I'd like to ask Doug who the first presenter is.

**Mr. Olthof:** Moe Amery, MLA for Calgary-East.

**The Chair:** Moe, I understand that you've spent some time with the people of Elections Alberta and also with Mr. Graham, so give us the highlights, sir.

**Mr. Amery:** Yes, I did. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to Calgary. I think this is the only place in the country where you can play golf in December.

**The Chair:** Hurry up and make your presentation then.

**Mr. Amery:** Then we can go and play.

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, ladies and gentlemen. I wish to begin by thanking each member of the commission for taking time out of your busy professional and personal lives to dedicate yourselves to this tremendous task. As an elected representative I appreciate the long days, the often tough decisions, and especially the time spent away from family. Thank you very much for taking this responsibility seriously and for your contribution in making the boundaries in Alberta equitable and effective.

3:15

One of the guiding principles for this commission is to find a formula that guarantees effective representation for the people of Alberta. The commission stated in the interim report on page 17 that members were impressed by comments made by Jo-Ann Teed, a representative of the Calgary-Cross riding association, during the first round of the hearing as she said essentially that "the Commission should decide what should be done before trying to do it, i.e. decide on the distribution before worrying about individual boundaries." I would add to this that the commission must put the interests of a community or a riding ahead of the interests of an MLA. MLAs come and go. The average political life for an MLA is eight to 12 years; however, Mr. Chairman, I personally know people in my riding who have been living in the same home for over 50 years.

I make this submission today on behalf of the residents of my current constituency of Calgary-East. At present my constituency consists of the following communities: Southview, Albert Park, Radisson Heights, Forest Lawn, Forest Heights, and Marlborough. Allow me to outline the current geographical boundaries for Calgary-East. To the west is Barlow Trail, to the north is 16th Avenue, to the east is 52nd Street, and on the southern border is 26th Avenue S.E.

The changes that we are proposing today will not impact any of our neighbours in any negative way, shape, or form. It only makes for common sense, logic, and effective representation. The changes are simply some housekeeping amendments to the newly proposed Calgary-East riding, which I believe may have been caused by an oversight or a computer glitch.

Mr. Chairman, I'm genuinely concerned that an extensive change of boundaries to any riding would result in further confusion and voter apathy. I should point out that following this redistribution Calgary-East will have undergone three major redistributions in four elections. It has been proven that confusing the residents will result in more voter apathy. The last redistribution of 1997 caused the constituency of Calgary-East to lose 93 percent of its communities. It's also not fair for residents of one constituency to experience three major boundary changes while neighbouring constituencies remain intact for five consecutive elections.

The changes that we are proposing today are as follows: extend 52nd Street north to 32nd Avenue. This would include the

community of Rundle, but it would exclude the community of Whitehorn. There is neither a geographical or natural connection between Whitehorn and the rest of the constituency of Calgary-East, as it shows on this map right here. Should the community of Whitehorn become a part of the Calgary-East constituency, this would cause an unnatural division and a disconnection that again will cause major confusion in the riding.

The logical addition would be the community of Rundle, as it borders the community of Marlborough, the most northern community of the current Calgary-East riding. Rundle is a natural addition. The reasons for suggesting that the community of Rundle be a part of the constituency of Calgary-East are that, as stated, it borders the community of Marlborough, which is the northern part of this constituency, which is right here. Marlborough, Rundle, and Whitehorn border 52nd Street on the east side and border 36th Street on the west. Having Calgary-East campaign signs during an election along 52nd Street in Marlborough, then having Calgary-Cross signs in Rundle, then having Calgary-East signs in Whitehorn along 52nd Street and along 36th Street would create tremendous confusion for voters. The residents of Whitehorn are already questioning the location of the constituency office for Calgary-East, whether it will be located in the most northern community or in the south end of the riding, where 75 percent of the population resides.

The second proposal is to extend and connect 32nd Avenue to the west. That will get Rundle connected with the rest of the constituency.

The third one is to extend Memorial Drive west to 44th Street S.E., as 44th Street is more of a natural corridor than 47th Street. Again, 44th Street is a four-lane roadway, while 47th Street is a residential thoroughfare. At the same time, it takes approximately 700 people out of the Calgary-East riding and gives them to Calgary-Montrose. This makes the two constituencies within the acceptable level with regard to population.

The fourth and last request is to extend 36th Street S.E. to 26th Avenue S. and 26th Avenue west to the right bank of the river. The reason for this change might appear to some people as being selfish.

**The Chair:** I would never associate that.

**Mr. Amery:** However, I have been living in the community of Southview for the last 22 years, and I have no plans of moving. Our four children were born and raised in this community, so there's a lot of attachment to this community, and I strongly believe that an elected representative should live within the area he or she is elected to represent. This is in addition to the historical links that exist between the community of Southview and the community of Albert Park/Radisson Heights.

We strongly request that the following communities form the constituency of Calgary-East: the communities of Southview, Albert Park/Radisson Heights, Forest Heights, Mayland Heights, Marlborough, and Rundle. I did not mention Franklin, Meridian, Sunridge, and Horizon, which make up this industrial area right here, which has no people whatsoever. Zero population. Eighteen people but no dwellings whatsoever. I don't know where they are living. Maybe a tent, or they could be residents in a hotel. So the total population for this riding would be about 39,578. I should also point out that the growth potential for the future is virtually nonexistent. All communities are fully developed. Therefore, if a new residential site is to be built, something will have to come down first.

In conclusion, before the trap door opens here, I believe that effective representation will come about with equality in the number of people represented within each boundary together with natural and commonsense division. Perhaps rather than trying to meet the impossible, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission – namely, trying to please all constituencies – the commission should

consider making all the constituencies equally unhappy.

**The Chair:** I think I'll leave that alone.

**Mr. Amery:** I mean, not pleasing someone to the extreme and displeasing another to the extreme.

Again, I thank you for your time and consideration of this submission. I sincerely appreciate the difficult task you have in recreating the boundaries, and I ask for your co-operation in providing Calgary-East with logical, community-based divisions.

May I take this opportunity to wish each and every one of you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

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

Okay, we'll start on the left side. Any question or comment?

**Mr. Graham:** Well, Moe, thank you very much. As I said to my fellow panel members, we've now been in three days of hearings, and up until now I've been absolutely perfect.

**The Chair:** He hasn't said a thing.

**Mr. Amery:** Up until now.

**Mr. Graham:** I didn't think it was going to last.

A couple of other comments. One is that this is a great commission, because I can assure you that we've been sitting for three days and nobody has been happy.

**Mr. Amery:** As long as they're equally unhappy.

**Mr. Graham:** And the final comment I'd have, Moe, is that if there's no potential for population growth anymore in your constituency, I guess that means your family is complete? You're not having any more children?

**Mr. Amery:** Doug, do you know something? Well, I don't know about that. That remains to be seen.

**Mr. Graham:** But thank you very much. You have made these representations before, and as I've indicated to you before and as I've indicated to everyone in the room – I think I've talked to a large number of you – the process is a very good process. The process calls for essentially a draft, input, and a redraft because none of us, aside from, I don't know . . .

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

3:25

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Clegg may be perfect, but none of us is perfect.

So the intent of the report is to try to get the basics in place, try to elicit response, which is what we've got, and then try to do a better job. So we are going to try to do a better job, and as our chairman said, there will be significant changes. Exactly what they are, obviously we can't tell you at this point, but there are going to be changes.

So thank you very much for your presentation, and Merry Christmas to you as well.

**Mr. Amery:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Amery:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Where's the elusive Mr. Olthof?

**Ms Mackay:** He's out in the hallway.

**Mr. Olthof:** Ian Seright, Southview Community Association.

**The Chair:** Good afternoon, Ian.

**Mr. Seright:** Good afternoon.

**The Chair:** Thank you for taking the time to come and make your views known to us. We appreciate that.

**Mr. Seright:** The reason I'm here is because we wish to thank the commission for giving us the opportunity to make this submission on behalf of the Southview residents in the Southview community. Now, this community exists in an area of Forest Lawn, and I mean, I've been a longtime resident of Southview, and what's going to change with this boundary is that we're going to lose Moe as our representative.

**Mr. Clegg:** Is that bad?

**Mr. Seright:** Terrible. It's really a bad situation. The area that I'm really acquainted with is the town of Forest Lawn. You see, at one time it was part and parcel of three hamlets, which included Albert Park, Forest Lawn, and Hubalta. When the development started in Southview back in 1958, we were a separate community. We've had the same alderman for going on nine years, but we've been jacked around by the boundary changes, which is terrible because at one time we were all – Albert Park, Southview, Forest Lawn, Hubalta – one group. So they take and they split it in '97 and subdivide 17th Avenue one side and the other side.

As a community association we ask for your understanding and assistance. We believe that keeping these communities together in Calgary-East will not decrease voter turnout. Confusing the residents has proven that voter apathy will increase. According to this map in all the new areas that he's going to get, I think the total is 18 people in that whole area. Southview, which is only 2,237 people, is small. Albert Park is 6,403. Forest Heights is 4,347. Franklin, which is strictly a commercial/industrial area, has no population. Mayland, which is just west of the Barlow Trail at 26th Street, has a big population because it's a big area: 5,747 in Mayland Heights and 356 in Mayland proper. Then Marlborough is a big one, 8,963. And Rundle is huge, but it could cut in on Yvonne Fritz's territory, which is pretty well Whitehorn north. It doesn't make sense to see it split. The idea would be to keep all these areas – Calgary East, Southview, Albert Park, Radisson Heights, Forest Heights, Franklin, Mayland Heights, Mayland, Marlborough, Sundridge, and Rundle – together, which, of course, Moe stated was 39,578 people.

So as a community it's getting to be where it's a tight-knit community because as these people move on to nursing homes and everything else, their families take over the houses, and then their families keep on going into these other houses. If we get an MLA that doesn't have a clue about the area, well, it's going to be very hard for the Southview community.

**The Chair:** I take it, Ian, that Southview community is in the very south portion.

**Mr. Seright:** Southview is just off 17th Avenue and 26th Street.

**The Chair:** Right down at the bottom there. Is that right?

**Mr. Seright:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Seright:** It's a small area. Well, it was an area that was developed by a contractor. At one time Albert Park existed all the way from 16th Avenue in the north to 26th Avenue in the south. Until 1958 that was all Albert Park, and then Forest Lawn was separated by these massive landowners. I know of one farmer there. He owned a thousand acres from 28th Street to 52nd Street.

**The Chair:** I take it, Ian, that what you're telling us is that you basically agree with what Moe has told us.

**Mr. Seright:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Secondly, you want to even emphasize more than that that Southview stay in the constituency as Moe proposed.

**Mr. Seright:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** You don't want to be cut adrift.

**Mr. Seright:** No, no, because once we're cut adrift, we're going to be tied in with . . . I mean, the situation is that Dover, which has got a population of maybe 35,000 people, borders on Southview. Southview is 2,000-something people. It's just like a big dog picking on a little dog as far as population goes.

**The Chair:** Okay. I think we certainly understand what you're telling us, and I can assure you that we'll very seriously consider it.

**Mr. Seright:** Well, that's nice to know, because it's like everything else. In the meantime, that's about all I can say.

**The Chair:** Okay. In the meantime, have any of you got any questions or comments?

**Mr. Graham:** No. Thank you very much. We understand your position.

**Mr. Seright:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Good. Thank you very much. You have a good Christmas.

**Mr. Seright:** Okay. Thank you. All the best of the season to you.

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

**Mr. Olthof:** Paul Breeze and Doug Hayes, Calgary-Shaw PC Constituency Association.

**The Chair:** Gentlemen, thank you very much for your attendance today. I recall that one of the first presenters to us when we started this experience back in the last week in May was your MLA or a group from Calgary-Shaw. If my memory is correct, we were talking about something like 82,000 people in that part of the city.

**Mr. Breeze:** That is correct.

**The Chair:** We're waiting to find out how you assessed what job we did.

**Mr. Breeze:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Good.

**Mr. Breeze:** Well, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, and ladies and gentlemen, certainly we'd like to thank the commission for preparing an excellent interim report. We found it very meaningful.

**The Chair:** That'll be good enough. Thank you very much. Have a good Christmas.

Now we'll come to the box. You can go ahead, Paul. Thanks.

**Mr. Breeze:** Season's greetings.

We do have a couple of points which we outlined in our letter to you dated October 30, 2002. We would just like to emphasize those points, and in doing so, we would, if you had it available, refer to the city of Calgary map that appears in your interim report.

**The Chair:** Okay. Just a minute.

**Mr. Breeze:** Firstly, we would like to recommend that the names of Calgary-Shaw and Calgary-Hays as identified in the report be interchanged. Our preference for that is based on the fact that what is now Calgary-Hays contains the community of Shawnessy, and there's the history there of Shaw. So we would propose a minor change to the report, that the names of those two ridings be interchanged.

**The Chair:** I think that's a suggestion that's come forward from other quarters, and I think it's one that we'll deal with quickly and with dispatch.

**Mr. Breeze:** Okay. Sometimes it's the little things that are difficult to deal with.

**The Chair:** Yes. Isn't that right?

3:35

**Mr. Breeze:** Now, our second point related to a small enclave that the commission created. Looking at the map of Calgary-Hays and the boundary with Calgary-Fish Creek, just where it says Sun Valley Boulevard, you'll notice a little niche in what is Calgary-Hays. When one looks at an aerial photograph – and you're welcome to keep this. Unfortunately, I didn't bring seven copies with me, but I can leave one. This is the northeast sector of the riding. The boundary with Calgary-Fish Creek comes down here. This is the community of Parkland, and this is the enclave here that has been created.

Our suggestion is that that enclave be returned to what we would call Calgary-Shaw, which the commission at the moment calls Calgary-Hays. There are two reasons for that. First of all, the people in that enclave would prefer to remain part of Sundance. They have been so since the creation of Sundance in the 1960s and '70s. There is no direct access from the enclave over to the community of Parkland. I shouldn't call it a wasteland, but Fish Creek is a very open area, and most people would not traverse that area, go backwards and forwards. If whichever MLA you were talking to wanted to get into this enclave, they've actually got to drive halfway around the city to get into it. So we thought that it seemed natural that this enclave be returned to the community of Sundance.

**The Chair:** How many people are there?

**Mr. Hayes:** About 1,600. Just a couple of hundred households.

**Mr. Breeze:** There are approximately 400 homes, a population of 1,600, and we believe that it's within the flexibility of the act. I believe in the city you've been fairly tight on the differences in population between various ridings, and we believe that there is a little bit of flexibility within the act to allow that enclave and that boundary to be changed.

To reinforce our position – and I didn't bring seven copies of this either – in this envelope you will find 527 signed forms from the residents of that area. These are 527 voters. They're not people that are not eligible to vote; they are people that are eligible to vote. They have a strong feeling that they would like to be returned to the community of Sundance.

**The Chair:** Which would be a half or two-thirds of the voters; wouldn't it?

**Mr. Hayes:** The 1,600 includes children too.

**The Chair:** That's why I say that 500 would be maybe a third.

**Mr. Breeze:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** My math wasn't very good; was it?

**Mr. Breeze:** I don't know what the relationship is between population and voters. You'd probably know.

**The Chair:** It'd be 2 to 1, something like that.

**Mr. Breeze:** About 2 to 1. Okay.

**Mr. Patterson:** You said about 400 homes?

**Mr. Breeze:** Yes.

**Mr. Patterson:** According to the latest census it's about 2.25, or somewhere in there, persons per household. That seems to be the average. That's just a young community.

**Mr. Breeze:** I'll have to refer to my stats man. You counted the number of homes as . . .

**Mr. Hope:** I think 423.

**The Chair:** So we're very close to all of them then; aren't we?

**Mr. Breeze:** Yes.

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

**Mr. Patterson:** When I look at the map and then when you show that – I think it would be good if you could leave that with us – that really illustrates the situation there, so thank you.

**The Chair:** Doug.

**Mr. Graham:** No, no. We've got the point, Paul.

**The Chair:** We've got both of them, Paul. The names too.

**Mr. Breeze:** Thank you very much. Well, once again, like the previous speakers we wish the commission a great holiday and

seasons greetings to you and wish you well in concluding your report.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. Would you give the brown envelope to Mr. Fjeldheim, please, and perhaps that too.

**Mr. Olthof:** Jo-Anne Teed from Calgary-Cross.

**The Chair:** Hello again.

**Mrs. Teed:** Mr. Clark, Ms Mackay, gentlemen, as you know, I was here in May to see you.

**The Chair:** We mentioned you in the report. Did you notice that?

**Mrs. Teed:** Yes. Thank you so much for getting my name in print.

**Mr. Clegg:** You're younger looking now, I might add.

**Mrs. Teed:** Thank you, Mr. Clegg. I appreciate those comments, especially in this hairy Christmas season.

I'm here to do a follow-up submission regarding the proposed changes to the Calgary-Cross electoral boundaries. In reading the commission's interim report, we were pleased to see that the commission took into consideration not only the request to pick a number and work with that but also the request of maintaining the community connections within our constituency as much as was feasible. At the same time, we are supportive of the adjustments made to the population density of our constituency to bring it down slightly, as it was the sixth largest constituency in the city, and make it more in line with the acceptable norm within the city of Calgary and across the province.

As I detailed to you in my previous submission, the communities of Pineridge, Temple, Parkridge Estates, Aurora, Monterey, and Rundle have had strong ties for many years. Not only do they share community services such as schools, but they work together sharing volunteer resources between communities in a number of areas, including the greatly important fund-raising area. One example of this is the Parkridge Estate seniors who volunteer regularly to work at the Pineridge community fund-raising bingos and help share in the wealth as well.

In keeping with the open communication between our MLA, Yvonne Fritz, and our communities, Mrs. Fritz provided the community association presidents and their boards of directors with copies of the commission's interim report and met with them to answer any questions. I have with me for submission copies of letters from the various community associations of Rundle, Pineridge, Temple, Aurora, Monterey, and Parkridge Estates expressing their support of the proposed boundary changes to Calgary-Cross. With these in hand, I am here today to request that the Calgary-Cross electoral boundaries remain as outlined in your interim report of September 2002.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Graham:** Thanks, Jo-Anne.

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

**The Chair:** You might.

**Mr. Patterson:** I'm somewhat troubled now, because after hearing the submission by Mr. Amery and then you coming in here, basically

you're saying to ignore the previous submission. That's what I understand you're saying.

**Mrs. Teed:** Well, I can understand Mr. Amery's concerns, but the Calgary-Cross constituency had some minor changes made to it with your interim report to help bring our numbers down, which was necessary. I know that the commission's focus has been to try to maintain the communities within the areas as much as possible. We were a much larger constituency to start with than Calgary-East, so changes to our constituency don't necessarily have to be as major as what they might have to be in other areas.

**Mr. Patterson:** My question really is: why should the Calgary-East constituency be set up in such a way as to divide two residential areas with a large industrial area in between?

**Mrs. Teed:** Well, the boundaries of Calgary-Cross include Rundle. Rundle has been a part of the communities and has worked integrally with both the constituency and the rest of the communities within that area. We don't feel that it is necessary to disrupt that. We feel that the area and the communities work well together. We'd like to maintain that and the extension a little north into Whitehorn as much as possible. I realize Whitehorn is somewhat of a dangling participle, but it would certainly work as part of that corridor and seems to be a fit. Otherwise I guess it would have to go further east or up into the north. Then you're having to change more boundaries when you start to do that.

**The Chair:** I think, Jo-Anne, I've come to the conclusion that we've had two bits of advice. They're not consistent, and the commission is going to have to make a decision.

**Mrs. Teed:** Granted. That's the bottom line.

**The Chair:** That's calling a spade a spade.

**Mrs. Teed:** That's right.

I appreciate your time, and if there are any more questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

3:45

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

**Mr. Graham:** We've got your point, Jo-Anne, and obviously we've got a difficult decision ahead of us. We'll look at them both in detail.

**Mrs. Teed:** Good. Thanks very much.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thanks very much, Jo-Anne.

Things were moving along so smoothly; weren't they?

**Mr. Olthof:** John Murray, Airdrie-Rocky View PC Association.

**The Chair:** Hi, Mr. Murray. Thank you very much for coming.

**Mr. Murray:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** I wouldn't want to ever refer to you as one of Carol Haley's henchmen, but . . .

**Mr. Murray:** In a hurry? Call Murray.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much for coming, and we look

forward to your presentation.

**Mr. Murray:** Thank you. There's been quite a bit of table talk around our community about the boundary change. If I can, I'd like to thank you all for the opportunity to come before the commission and introduce for Airdrie-Rocky View where we're going with this.

This has been a learning curve for us all. Our association met, and the committee was struck with myself as chair to review the proposed electoral boundaries map. We the committee reported back to our association, and we drafted our proposal. The proposed electoral boundary changes fully the essence of which the present Airdrie-Rocky View is comprised, the horseshoe of land east, west, and north of the city of Calgary.

Now, some of our discussion was with rivers and lakes making really good boundaries. Highways make good boundaries, and traditionally when highways are built, then usually you find the cities growing on both sides, and that's a natural part of the way a city or a town would develop. So as time elapses, things happen.

Now, in talking with a number of people I got used to holding our map up like this. As you can see, I'm always covering the town of Cochrane. It kind of looks like a sore thumb sticking out into what the proposed change is going to be. One gentleman said that he spent some 30-odd years with the federal government, some of it here in Alberta, and he's now moved back to Alberta. I wrote down a comment he said to me. He said, "That's the way we do it in Ottawa, and then we hire hundreds to explain why it's relevant that we do this," and he took his finger and he moved it around my thumb. So I kind of looked at that and wondered: well, maybe we should rethink the way we do some of this.

In Airdrie-Chestermere our proposal, if I can, is to take the map here, and from highway 772 north of the city of Calgary – and I've drawn over your lines here. So highway 772 north to highway 567 and then west on highway 567 to highway 766, and then go north to the county of Mountain View. Now, on the map here the Crossfield-Madden roads system and trading area flows into the city of Airdrie and down to Calgary. The links to Airdrie are all stronger from the Crossfield-Madden area, both east and west. It's not cut and dried. The links to the Crossfield-Airdrie-Balzac-Calgary corridor are all natural, and that's actually this community's process of evolution in the province.

The Crossfield-Madden police, ambulance, fire response from this area all flow down to Calgary and Airdrie and area. The telephone exchanges are all the same. Right now if you were in Airdrie and you wanted to phone out into Cochrane, it's long distance. The recreational areas that service both east and west of Crossfield centre in the Crossfield area and then down into Airdrie and all flow together. They are the same recreational areas. The agricultural societies and their memberships use the twin arenas in the surrounding areas and around Airdrie both east and west . . .

**The Chair:** Does Crossfield too?

**Mr. Murray:** Crossfield as well. Now, they have some . . .

**The Chair:** I live in Carstairs. Now, be careful.

**Mr. Murray:** Okay. Now, some of their own areas are here, but some of this recreational area flows down to the twin arenas, and there's some joint use.

**The Chair:** Some of it, yeah.

**Mr. Murray:** Yes. Not all of it, and I know that you're involved in that. Usually it's with a baseball team or, you know, some

competition of some sort.

**The Chair:** Okay. Sorry. Just carry on, please.

**Mr. Murray:** So some of these areas and the community associations were built by these folks, and some of the money was injected by the farm community years ago.

The school attendance boundaries and the transporting of students in these areas – now, in Crossfield, east and west, and Madden, but not all the way, there's some pickup beyond this boundary. But the children on both sides flow into Crossfield for speciality classes like IOP, French immersion. The children in here all flow down into the Airdrie area. Otherwise, it's all in here.

Outside of the boundary in the west part here into the Westbrook area the children will flow into Westbrook school. There are about 152 kids. South into the Bearspaw area and south where the 772/567 boundary is, these kids will all flow down into the new Bearspaw school on highway 1A or into Cochrane for any one of the schools from grades K to 12 in the town of Cochrane. The picked up areas are very similar to the separate school division as well in these areas.

As sort of a rationale I'll go back to my previous life when I used to live on the east side. Part of Stan Schumacher's riding was in the Chestermere-Drumheller area. It really made no sense. Stan one time told me when I was campaigning for him that it really didn't make sense as the town of Chestermere was growing. Well, when it changed and became all Airdrie-Rocky View in here, it made more sense.

The trading area, the police, the fire on this west side, using the city of Calgary, the Bow river, and actually Strathmore up to Mountain View – police, fire, ambulance, schools, recreation all kind of flow together here. On the west the city of Calgary, the Bow River, that highway 1 – at one time highway 1 was a divider between the Springbank community until Banff-Cochrane came into existence. Before Banff-Cochrane it was separated, and this was all one area for one MLA. Then, of course, as populations changed, it kind of divided this community. They're beginning to feel that they're together again. The main trading area, the town of Cochrane, the Springbank area, the Westbrook folks here – either you have the town of Cochrane you deal in or in Airdrie or up into Olds. From where I am up in the northwest area, it looks the same distance driving to go to Airdrie as it is to go to Olds, and it's about an hour for some of our kids when they go down to Cochrane to the high school.

The Banff-Canmore corridor, this Kananaskis area we really didn't touch and speak to many people down here because it wasn't really being affected. I don't know if they're presenting or not. Some of it made sense and some didn't make sense. Highwood has their own school divisions here. Any of the social services and the health services are all handled out of a different area. You probably know that.

**The Chair:** The wretched problem with the Highwood area has been the growth in High River-Okotoks. That arrangement we have on the west side of the city may have been designed by a federal bureaucrat also.

**Mr. Murray:** I understand your dilemma, and we do too. We didn't really discuss that.

As for Airdrie-Chestermere our main point that I think we wanted to let you know on behalf of the people in here was that people to the east had no problem with any of the change. Their MLA remains the same. Their trading area is there. Their schools, their social services, that kind of stuff all flows. Where there'll be change and some resistance and people getting used to something will be whatever you do over here.

**The Chair:** So you'd like us basically to go west of highway 2 someplace . . .

**Mr. Murray:** To 772.

**The Chair:** . . . between Airdrie and Crossfield.

**Mr. Murray:** Yes. That way you're catching all the new growth in the Balzac area, up in the Madden community, Golden Rod, and the town of Crossfield and trying to keep all these folks together.

**The Chair:** So you'd have that top corner on the left side there, then you'd have Airdrie, and then you'd have Chestermere in your riding.

**Mr. Murray:** In the riding, yes.

**The Chair:** Do you have a population number for us?

**Mr. Murray:** About 3,000 people.

**The Chair:** So 3,000 more.

3:55

**Mr. Murray:** Three thousand more folks, yes.

In your paperwork here I have for you from the town of Crossfield – I presented at the town council meeting, myself, Lorne Kosack, a former school trustee as well and councillor of the town – a motion passed by the town that they would like to see this happen, also a letter from the Golden Rod Community Association in support, a letter from the Balzac community association as well in support of this change being included in the Airdrie-Chestermere riding. The folks in the Madden area, the third letter in your file there on behalf of the Madden district, would like us to go one more road over, from the Lockend Road over to range road 4, so go one more road west. Their feeling is that more of these people are in the Madden and Crossfield area than . . .

**The Chair:** How far west of Madden is that?

**Mr. Murray:** About a mile or two.

**The Chair:** Two miles, is it? Okay. So you come down two miles, really, west of Madden down to about halfway between Airdrie and Crossfield and then out to Airdrie. Is that it?

**Mr. Murray:** Yes. To Madden. Go to Madden past highway 766 two roads, go south, because you can come right south to 567.

**The Chair:** Where's 567? Where's that?

**Mr. Murray:** That's the Big Hill Springs Road. That's the east/west one.

**The Chair:** That's the one south of . . .

**Mr. Murray:** On the south side of Airdrie, and that runs straight through to highway 22.

**The Chair:** All right.

**Mr. LePoudre:** The outside west boundary would be range road 4. That's what they're asking for.

**Mr. Murray:** Allan LePoudre, president of our association.

**Mr. LePoudre:** They feel we're splitting up their community by going over to Lockend instead of range road 4.

**Mr. Murray:** They're probably about as vocal as the folks in Crossfield were about their community being split, and sometimes boundaries don't really make a big difference. They made a difference to the folks in the last election down in Janis Tarchuk's riding, Banff-Cochrane, and Airdrie-Rocky View, highway 1A being the dividing line. North is Airdrie, Rocky View south, but even the Liberal candidates at that time didn't know which riding they were posting their signs in because they overlapped each other's. A lot of folks threw their hands up in the air and didn't come out and vote. They weren't sure who they were voting for.

**The Chair:** Well, we'll certainly have a very serious look at it. I understand the problem in Crossfield. I was at a funeral there two weeks ago, and I got the benefit of their judgment.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, I do distinctly recall your MLA making a statement to us that she was concerned about having to go quite a lot of the way around Calgary. Now what you're suggesting is to go back almost to where you were before, so I just kind of wonder here because I can distinctly remember her coming to the hearing and saying: look, please don't have me kind of surround Calgary.

**Mr. Murray:** Okay. One of the reasons for that, if I may, is that in this area here that's bound by this, it's fairly flat land and the roads crisscross. You can move around through here. You probably know very well yourself that you can move around very well here. Once you get past that into that Bearspaw area and what is her riding now and where I am up here up off the Horse Creek Road, you know, you've got those darn hills and little valleys, and it costs too much money to build roads through all that. You do have to travel, and I know that for folks up here, way up on the Grand Valley Road, in order to vote for Carol in that election, they had to travel probably half an hour, 45 minutes south and east and back north to get to a polling station to cast their vote. There weren't enough people over here in their areas to put a person to have another polling station. The same thing happens down there. You know, once you get into that terrain, that's where you run into the problem. Eventually, maybe, there'll be roads there, but right now there are not.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, if I might, I'd just like to say: would you pass the message on to your federal civil servant that there was a reason for doing that finger? It was to take in the boundaries of the town of Cochrane so we'd have population in Banff-Cochrane.

**Mr. Murray:** We explained that to him very well.

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

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

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

**The Chair:** I had expected that there would be a presentation dealing with this issue because I know that it was not the most appealing situation to everyone.

**Mr. Murray:** Again, have a Merry Christmas from us at Airdrie-Rocky View.

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

**Mr. Olthof:** Marlene Graham and Darril Stephenson, Calgary-Lougheed.

**Mr. Clegg:** Marlene, will you sit in Moe's place? I'd rather look at you than Moe.

**Ms Graham:** I see you haven't changed, Glen.

**The Chair:** I don't think there's much hope.

**Ms Graham:** And that's a good thing. That is a good thing.

**The Chair:** Welcome, Marlene.

**Ms Graham:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We look forward to your presentation.

**Ms Graham:** Members of the commission, I have with me this afternoon Mr. Darril Stephenson. Darril is a longtime resident of Woodlands and has been on the board of Calgary-Lougheed and its predecessor riding association of Calgary-Shaw from the very beginning. He's very knowledgeable about the area and is more of the technical person on this. You have in front of you copies of the summary submission, the one pager that pretty well says it all, as well as copies of my submission in response to the interim report; the two affected community associations, that of Cedarbrae and Canyon Meadows; the two affected riding associations, Calgary-Lougheed, Calgary-Glenmore; and also another community association, the South Fish Creek Transportation Action Committee.

All of these organizations support the two proposed changes that we are requesting. Our riding of Calgary-Lougheed will change fairly dramatically by the recommendations in your report, but we're requesting just two fairly minor changes that we think are quite positive. They respect your guidelines in terms of keeping communities intact, respecting natural boundaries, and also work with your numbers. The net effect of our requested changes would add roughly between 1,500 and 1,600 people to the total, which we calculate to be within the 4 percent or 5 percent variation that you are trying to keep within in the city of Calgary.

The first change is to consolidate the community of Cedarbrae into Calgary-Glenmore. Under your report you would see that split, and that is being suggested to be consolidated in Calgary-Glenmore. The MLA, Ron Stevens, his riding association, and the community itself support that. If you did that, the north boundary, then, of Calgary-Lougheed would be the major thoroughfare of Anderson Road, which is going to become an even larger thoroughfare once these major changes on the west edge of Calgary take place, the 37th Street widening of the bridge and the extension of 37th Street to Sarcee. That's part and parcel of that, so we think that that has a lot of merit to it.

**The Chair:** And it has the support of the other neighbouring constituencies?

**Ms Graham:** It does. Calgary-Glenmore is likely not to ever have any capacity for growth, so, if anything, probably the numbers would go down over time. We think that makes sense to bolster them, and I believe that – Darril, I think you could confirm – the addition of the balance of Cedarbrae to Calgary-Glenmore keeps it within the 4 percent as well.

4:05

**Mr. Stephenson:** If it does not, I know that Calgary-Glenmore did send a written submission November 12 suggesting exactly the same thing in terms of bringing in Cedarbrae. However, they had

indicated that the community of Kingsland could stay with Calgary-Egmont as an offset to that population.

**The Chair:** Okay. And they've talked to Mr. Graham about this?

**Mr. Graham:** Yes, they have.

**Ms Graham:** I think everyone's happy with that one.

So the other requested change from your report is to keep the community of Canyon Meadows intact. Now, you would have that split between Calgary-Lougheed, where it has always been, and Calgary-Fish Creek. There's the major thoroughfare of Macleod Trail splitting Calgary-Fish Creek and Calgary-Lougheed now. There are railway tracks. There are LRT tracks. There's really very little community of interest. One riding is in the southeast; ours is in the southwest. So we feel quite strongly, as does the MLA for Calgary-Fish Creek, Heather Forsyth, that all of Canyon Meadows should remain within Calgary-Lougheed, where it has always been. Calgary-Fish Creek is not very interested in taking on that portion of Canyon Meadows, and, as I say, the net effect of these two changes would add, well, I think it's, to be exact, 1,566 more people to our number, which would bring us to 39,839, keeping us within the 4 percent.

**The Chair:** It seems on the surface from what you've told us very, very reasonable.

**Mr. Graham:** Marlene, thank you very much. I want you to know that all of these matters have been considered, will be considered. I think it might be appropriate to tell you our approach to this thing. The law, as you may be aware, requires effective representation. The starting point of effective representation is population. When you're in a situation such as the city of Calgary, where the situation is reasonably similar across the city, the conditions are the same, the predominant factor is population.

We are aware of the importance of keeping communities together. We have tried to do that where at all possible; believe me. As a matter of fact, I've been working with Mr. Fjeldheim for a number of days. He can attest that the first draft that we did of the city of Calgary, not the draft that you see in front of you and not the draft that you will see in front of you, provided that every community be kept intact. I can tell you that it's impossible. It is impossible to keep every community within the city of Calgary intact and provide an appropriate number of ridings and effectively make everybody happy. It can't happen. We will try to do that, and we will try our best to do it, but there are going to be some communities split. There's no doubt about it. Whether this one is split or not, I can't tell you yet because we haven't, you know, done a final draft, but be assured that it's not that we're ignoring the community boundaries. Despite what you might believe, we're trying to pay attention to them, but it is not possible in all instances to do so.

So I don't know how this will shake out. We certainly got your presentation. We'll certainly do our best to try to accommodate you, but I can tell you that there will be communities within the city of Calgary that are split when all the dust settles.

**Ms Graham:** Well, I appreciate that, Doug, and I suppose some of those split communities make more sense than others do, and I really do feel that the division of Canyon Meadows would be quite unsupportable. I've heard what you said, but I don't think it's one of those ones that really would make more sense than another does. We aren't aware of a request by any other adjacent or a neighbouring riding that would adversely affect what we are requesting. We heard the submission today from what is now

Calgary-Shaw, and we don't believe that that would prevent you from doing what we're asking here today.

**Mr. Graham:** It may not, and I can't tell you exactly how things will shake out.

**Mr. Stephenson:** As a past president of the Woodlands Community Association, which is one of the communities still in Calgary-Shaw, having to deal with one MLA was enough. This was Marlene's predecessor, the shy and retiring Jim Dinning. I think very strongly that communities do not need to be torn apart any more than absolutely possible, and I do know that there is some fairly significant animosity over some municipal issues between the communities east and west of Macleod Trail. I don't think that people in Canyon Meadows, being a small enclave in a predominantly southeast constituency, will get adequate representation.

**Mr. Graham:** I couldn't agree with you more.

**The Chair:** We have spent this morning and certainly all day hearing the importance of keeping municipal boundaries intact and, as Doug has aptly put, how difficult it is to do within the city and the communities. But when you get into municipalities – and we had one municipality where their view was that we hacked them up into four different constituencies. So we're facing the same challenge in rural Alberta, but I can assure you that we'll take very much to heart what you've asked us to do.

**Ms Graham:** Well, thank you for that. That's the best we can expect, and we wish you well with your final deliberations.

**The Chair:** So do we.

**Ms Graham:** And a good holiday season to all.

**Mr. Clegg:** We are taking off to Siberia.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Marlene. Thanks, Darril.

**Mr. Olthof:** Marg Loewen, Foothills-Little Bow Municipal Association.

**The Chair:** Could we take a five-minute break before Marg gives us the word? Okay. Thank you.

[The hearing adjourned from 4:12 p.m. to 4:23 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Marg, I do believe that you met us previously. I think we certainly listened then, and we want to do the same thing here for you. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Yes. You listened to me in Lethbridge, and I'm here again on behalf of the Foothills-Little Bow Municipal Association, which I think you realize represents all the rural municipalities in southern Alberta basically from Calgary south to the border and the B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan borders, with the exception of the county of Wheatland.

**The Chair:** You haven't got them convinced yet?

**Mrs. Loewen:** Well, they go with central. I mean, some of our boundaries are not as good as they should be either.

I feel like I may be in less than friendly territory presenting this

here on behalf of rural Alberta because I'm here to essentially maybe give a different viewpoint, if not opposite. In rural Alberta we see our representation being eroded and eroded significantly over the last several years. I'm not here to make any specific boundary changes. I believe that my good friends from the MD of Foothills will be doing that for me. I'm not going to go through my whole presentation – you have it to read – but I think it's safe to say that we believe that effective representation has to be the key to electoral boundaries.

Rural Alberta plays such an important role in the province's economic, environmental, and social development. It's especially true when dealing with the economy as productivity from agriculture, oil and gas, forestry, and all the other natural resources. These all take place almost totally in rural Alberta. Ninety-three percent of the land base in Alberta is rural and is represented by far less than, I would think, 50 percent of our MLAs.

We thought you did an excellent job in addressing the importance and the need for effective representation in your interim report. You established that very complex matrix to measure the degree of difficulty in representing all constituencies. Then we felt that you didn't follow through and do anything with it. You ignored it. That's our perspective.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, get this woman under control.

**Mrs. Loewen:** You're going to make me lose where I'm at here.

I recognize that this is a very simplistic viewpoint, but essentially if you look at it from a rural Alberta perspective, we see for instance the city of Calgary, where all you had to do was redistribute the boundaries and, you know, you fell within your population parameters. I recognize that it's not that simple and that you have communities within Calgary just as we have communities in rural Alberta. Theirs seem to be split; ours seem to get more and more and more lumped together as you go through the process.

The distance in the rural ridings for an MLA to represent are just incredible. They make it incredibly difficult to give effective representation, particularly when you get into the very southern part of the province or the very northern part of the province, where you have several hours traveling time to even get to Edmonton, let alone spend time in your constituencies.

**The Chair:** When we were in Peace River for the hearing there, a group dealing with one of the health authorities drove six hours to get to Peace River.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Yeah, and that's not uncommon.

**The Chair:** And that would be it to go back.

Please remember that the geographic centre of Alberta is Athabasca. So when you're in Edmonton, Edmonton is still in the southern part of the province.

**Mrs. Loewen:** It takes me five hours to get to Edmonton.

**The Chair:** Now, that isn't the centre of population, but that's the geographical centre of the province. So it's a challenge.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Oh, I know. I live halfway between Medicine Hat and Calgary, and it takes me five hours to drive to Edmonton. I have no good plane service. If I drive to Lethbridge or Calgary to fly, I might as well drive.

The MLAs also face in rural areas – I mean, they have multiple school jurisdictions, municipal councils, towns, villages, municipal districts and counties, health regions in some cases. In southern Alberta they've got irrigation districts as well. Then you've got all

your other groups and people that want and need some of their time. They're extremely difficult to represent. Coupling towns and villages and smaller cities with the rural areas isn't the answer to effective representation, at least not in our view.

Urban MLAs deal with constituent issues, social issues including policing, children's services, education, and health. Rural MLAs deal with that. As well, they need to know the agricultural industry, all about agricultural products, about mining, oil, gas, timber, towns' water treatment programs, why a school's modernization project is being held up, the road issues in a municipality and probably the road issues in several municipalities. I mean, it's just incredibly difficult to wade your way through all of that.

To summarize: in essence we would like you to please consider the geographical size of the constituency, the distance from the Legislature, the number of local governments including school boards, et cetera, the regional diversities within some of those ridings, the distance of the community from other major centres – and, please, don't just add the sparse areas to the closest urban centre; I don't think you're doing anybody any favours – traditional trading and transportation patterns, the job details of the rural MLAs, and the communities of interest. I guess what I would say, then, is – we have a couple of things, and I think you've probably heard these before – that if a more effective distribution of seats is not recommended than what is currently in the interim report, we would then ask that you recommend a second House or that another workable solution be established to ensure that all Albertans have meaningful representation in the government.

Another suggestion is in section 15(2) of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. That section allows for special consideration for a maximum of four electoral boundaries where those boundaries may be as much as 50 percent below the population. We're suggesting that another special consideration be added where you could have 50 percent more, which would address some of the issues in the large urban centres, you know, given certain criteria. Those we would assume would have to be discussed and worked out, but it could be the 50 percent over the population as a special consideration as well.

4:30

**The Chair:** Certainly we have a distinguished member of the legal fraternity on the panel, but suffice it for me to say: that's easier said than done, because whatever we recommend to the House and the House ends up passing then can go to a judicial review or to the courts. I would remind people – and correct me on my dates here somewhat, but it seemed to me that during the 1993 provincial election campaign the town of Lac La Biche and a couple of municipal associations took the boundaries to court and asked to have that election thrown out. My understanding is that a divided decision of the court opted in favour of not throwing the boundaries out but in fact suggesting that the Legislative Assembly pass new legislation that dealt with the principles as set out in the Bill of Rights for Canada and decisions of the Supreme Court and also decisions in other provinces, and then they said that the basis is effective representation. That's why you had another redistribution very soon after the '93 election, and that's really why we're in kind of rapid redistributions here, because we had two: one before and one right after. Okay? We've had a lot of people say to us: "There are just so many changes. We can't keep up." I have a lot of sympathy for that.

All I'm saying, Marg, is that – I'm a rural Albertan – it's easy to say that Calgary-Lougheed could have 50 percent more than Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, if we use that, but anyone in that place can take the decision to the court, and the court may very well end up throwing out certain seats or, in fact, the whole redistribution.

You've got to do it over again because there's that constitutional guarantee.

Doug, I hope I'm not being too, too . . .

**Mr. Graham:** No. That's about it.

**The Chair:** So that's why we've tried to keep things within, you know, 15 percent or less. I think we had one at 19 percent in Fort McMurray, which is over. I know that your suggestion is serious, and we take it very seriously, but it's just that kind of a problem.

We had it suggested to us in Red Deer today that we should have every urban riding 20 percent over, 20 percent above the 36,000, and every rural riding 20 percent below. We didn't get involved in an argument. We just simply had to say: "No. That won't fly. We'll be in court quicker than I can be home to Carstairs," or someone will be in court.

Sorry. I'm not trying to shoot you down.

**Mrs. Loewen:** No. I understand.

**The Chair:** I'm just trying to share with you the practical problem that we have as a commission.

**Mr. Clegg:** You said in your opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, that I like to comment, and I do, so don't cut me off for a second here.

Marg, you know, these have been three very interesting days. We started in Athabasca, and we had many presentations yesterday. We got into Edmonton, and they were totally reversed. I'm going to agree with you to an extent. I do not want to ever get into the argument that a person's work as a rural MLA or an urban MLA – I'm going to call it equal. But when you consider – and you said it – that when, in fact, I represented Dunvegan for 15 years, it didn't matter what I did. I lost eight hours of time that I had no choice but to spend on the road. From Dunvegan, where I lived, you can go another 350 miles north to get to the northern border of Alberta.

Now, when our dear chairman here said that Athabasca is the centre of the province, I saw a few people here shaking their heads. But you were right, Mr. Chairman, for a change.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you, Glen.

**Mr. Clegg:** He was exactly right.

If you want to take a trip, just go up north from Barrhead and go up towards Swan Hills, and there's a monument there at the centre of the province: east and west and north and south. But what I'm really saying is that that time to get to the Legislature is an absolute factor, and certainly as MLAs there's a real factor in getting around the constituency.

So I sympathize with you a lot, but I don't want to get in that there's more work, because there is a different kind of work. It's just a matter of, you know, the time spent to get from one job to the other. Many days – and it's no worse than this, Mr. Chairman – I spent from 5 in the morning til 11 at night and even later getting home, and if you were in the city, you would see the same amount of people as I did in, say, two hours, in which I spent 16 to 18 hours.

So when we use the matrix system or whatever you call it, you know, in my mind that's why the Supreme Court made the decision on fair representation. I certainly appreciate what you've said on the amount of work, but I'm sure that I don't want to get into an argument on the amount of work. It's just that you haven't got the time or ability to do the same work as they do in an urban riding.

One more thing. I wish that half the people in Calgary would have been in Red Deer and half the people in Edmonton would have

been in Athabasca and half the people in Athabasca would have been in Edmonton, because people don't understand. It's like when I was chairman of the irrigation district. There was one guy who got up and said: everybody has got to have a licence. The other guy got up and said: nobody is going to have a licence. The guy in the middle jumped up, and he said, "And you'd better do as we say," which was totally opposite to each other. This is kind of the way we are here too. You can rely on us five to do the very best we can do.

Sorry for the speech.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Well, then, maybe I helped bring some rural perspective to the city of Calgary.

**The Chair:** You certainly did.

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, I'd just like to make a few observations. The majority of our presentations that focus on one single issue say that there should only be 56 MLAs, believe it or not.

Now, the second thing is: I have been suggesting the idea of the second House, because that came to the fore when we were down in southern Alberta. Yet when I ask that question to some of the presenters, guess what they say? No more government. Less government. So we find that.

The only other point I would like to make – and I realize the problem because I drive to Edmonton quite often myself – is that you say you represent 93 percent of the land base. The only thing I would point out is: land doesn't vote; people vote. We can't go back to the rotten borough system that was in England in the 1800s where some landlord owned a huge mass of land with two people living on it yet he got to sit in the House of Commons. So, you know, it's a tough, tough thing. It's very, very tough.

Thank you.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Don't get me wrong. I wasn't suggesting that we go back to that system. Just remember that that's where the economic prosperity for this province comes from.

**The Chair:** Marg, thank you very, very much.

**Mrs. Loewen:** Thank you for your time, and have a good holiday.

**Mr. Olthof:** J.B. Isaacs and Valerie Chatten from the Calgary-Fish Creek PC Constituency Association.

**The Chair:** Good afternoon, folks.

**Mr. Isaacs:** Good afternoon.

**Ms Chatten:** Good afternoon.

**The Chair:** Thank you for taking your time and coming to give us the benefit of your views. We appreciate that very much. I think you were here earlier when I indicated that our work will be finished by the 1st of March, and it goes to the Speaker then, and then it'll be up to the Legislature to see what they choose to do with our report. Thank you very much for your help. We need it.

**Ms Chatten:** We understand. Thank you.

4:40

**Mr. Isaacs:** We'd like to thank and commend the commission for their work on this very important, complicated task. We do however

respectfully request that members take a second look to ensure that all electoral boundaries provide Albertans with effective representation.

Effective representation as we see it consists of two fundamental parts, the first being parity of numbers to ensure that each member of the electorate has an equal voice, the second being the effectiveness of that voice. To have their voices heard, voters must have reasonable, equal access to their representative. The increasing complexity of today's society requires the modern MLA to be a more significant part of the fabric of the communities they represent than ever before. Changes in health care, education, and social programs have made their representative role as an ombudsman equally as important as their legislative role. We say this because the ability of the voter to effectively raise their concerns, their grievances and issues to their elected representative is fundamentally enshrined in our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which, Mr. Chairman, I know you referred to, and we were very pleased with that.

The 1999 poll by Environics west, which you included in your interim report, indicated that one of the most important ways MLAs can make themselves available to their constituents is by attending community events. So we kind of go on the logic that it's logical that one of the most important ways a voter can bring their concerns, grievances, and issues to the MLA is through their ability to attend community events. We suggest to you that the ability is marginalized when communities are divided, as their ability to present impactful collective positions – impactful collective positions – is diminished. The reality of dividing the minority from a community is to isolate the minority. Events are advertised for the most part in community newsletters, bulletins, and the like and are delivered within the boundaries of the community. As a consequence, the minority outside that community is unlikely to have the same opportunity to access their MLA. This says nothing of the impact on the voter's motivation. Today it's a complex world, and people are inundated with all of this information in their mailboxes and everything, so the motivation is really something that needs to be looked at. If a person has to participate in two communities to have representation, we suggest to you, again, that they're very marginalized.

Electoral boundaries splitting communities and their legislative functions may not in the actual conduct at the polls risk diminishing representation, but we most strongly suggest that in access to and assistance from his or her representative it certainly does. It makes a disenfranchised island of voters who in matters of community are disempowered by such demarcation. The result is uneven and unfair representation.

Relative parity may prove undesirable if it has the effect of detracting from having a voice in the deliberations of government as well as the idea of the right to bring one's grievances and concerns to the attention of one's government representatives. When access to and assistance from the elected representative is disadvantaged, then the representation afforded the voter is diluted and we suggest offends the ombudsman role.

The community of Bonavista feels very strongly about this issue of dividing their community as evidenced by their October 10, 2002, letter, which we have attached. We're not suggesting that the commission ignored this factor but perhaps in the light of the absence of hard data did not appreciate its potential impact. We know the commission understands and appreciates that factors like community history, community interest, and geography are available to them when considering voter parity. We're strongly guided by the Supreme Court of Canada when they said that

only those deviations should be admitted which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populace

as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the populace and geographic factors within the territory governed.

The disadvantage to the voter of electoral boundaries dividing a community ought to be sufficient justification for the commission to give greater weight to it than the need for numerical parity. The anecdotal evidence being placed before this commission by the community association, constituencies, and individuals supports this, and we're confident that research into this relatively new phenomenon will also. We'd suggest that subsections (c), (d), and (h) of section 14 of the act also provide for the commission to make such a judgment.

We appreciate that the commission was guided by the underlying pragmatism of establishing a target of variations not to exceed a plus or minus 15 percent but do question that this should outweigh the philosophical idea of effective representation. We suggest that such a low standard deviation does not take into account the realistic growth of communities surrounding Calgary-Fish Creek and unduly restricts proper representation of the fabric of these communities. We'd ask the commission to take into account the growth projections depicted in your interim report for Calgary-Hays, Calgary-Shaw, and Calgary-Lougheed and, also, that projected population changes within the period that the boundaries will govern for may justify a deviation from the strict equality at the time the boundaries are drawn, given that boundaries will govern for a number of years, which is the case here.

The growth factors of Calgary-Fish Creek. We are not one of the fastest growing communities. In your interim report table 1 showed the percentage change from 1991 to 2001 to be a minus 7 percent, and no doubt the commission was trying to address this lack of growth with the interim report boundaries. However, in our opinion these boundaries offend equal representation. They divide the communities of Canyon Meadows, Bonavista, and Midnapore. In addition, these boundaries do not provide for the possibility of natural expansion in future revisions, a proposition that we fully appreciate and understand is not in the scope of this commission. We would suggest that a preferred approach would be not to divide these communities. We understand that the ramifications of this have been or are going to be dealt with in detail by other presenters so will not take up the commission's time by repeating this information

We would like to suggest an alternative, however. We believe that the commission has the opportunity to maintain parity of vote and effective representation for the voters of Calgary-Fish Creek. What we'd like to see happen is that the commission consider including the community of Douglasdale Estates in Calgary-Fish Creek. Douglasdale Estates is an established stand-alone community to the east of Calgary-Fish Creek and is in the interim report boundaries of the proposed Calgary-Shaw. The changes to the boundaries were outlined to the commission in our letter of November 15, 2002, which is attached. The demographics of the population of this community are similar to the present Calgary-Fish Creek communities of Bonavista, Diamond Cove, Parkland, and Deer Run. The addition of this community to the present Calgary-Fish Creek would result in a population of 42,075, which is within the plus/minus 25 percent provincial average allowable range. We'd suggest to the commission that the arguments we've presented would justify this population. However, in the event the commission does not accept this argument, we would ask that they consider taking the approach that does the least amount of harm, that being to divide as few communities as are necessary. We feel that this could be accomplished by dividing the community of Douglasdale Estates so as to include as much of it in the population of Calgary-Fish Creek as the commission will allow.

We thank the commission for their time and their attention and

really do appreciate the opportunity to address you.

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

Would you care to add anything, Valerie?

**Ms Chatten:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess the only thing that I would like to say in reference to Mr. Isaacs' last proposal is that in terms of the other communities that are included within Calgary-Fish Creek – that is, Parkland, Bonavista, Diamond Cove, and Deer Run – they are what we sometimes refer to as long-standing communities. They have a real community history of cohesion, and it would be, I think, more disastrous to split them up. Likewise, if, for example, Canyon Meadows were to be included – Canyon Meadows has a history with Calgary-Lougheed – we think that that would be unfortunate. We think that with Douglasdale being a newer community, it perhaps hasn't had the long-standing history and cohesion which these other communities have had, and there would be less of an impact with dividing that community than there would with the others.

4:50

**The Chair:** And that's always a delicate situation – isn't it? – to mention one as opposed to another?

**Ms Chatten:** Yes, it is.

**The Chair:** I appreciate the delicacy.

Any questions or comments?

**Mr. Patterson:** I'm a little concerned about your suggestion of 42,000 people because if rural people had heard this – we've caught a lot of hell over giving Calgary two extra seats. Now what I'm worrying about is that you're kind of playing right into the hands of the people who said that Calgary shouldn't have two extra seats, because if your constituency justifies 42,000 people, maybe we shouldn't have given Calgary two extra seats. That would trouble me, so I'm kind of worried about that.

**Mr. Isaacs:** I wouldn't undermine the worry, Mr. Patterson, but I would suggest to you that possibly it's not as grave a worry as you're pointing out. We need to take a look at these things as to what is best for the communities. I realize that the commission is struck to do everything that's right for all Albertans, but I would suggest to the commission that in doing that, they also have to remember the individual voter and what is best for them.

Rural Alberta – and my roots are in rural Alberta – certainly has its challenges, but urban Alberta, for proper representation, is having great challenges too. The social demographics that we are collecting on things now are just beginning to surface. Some of the things are showing that a lot of people in urban Alberta do not have good, effective representation because they're unable to access some of the collective. Individually, no argument. But how do you make a collective voice heard if you're not part of a community?

**Mr. Patterson:** If I might, Mr. Chair, the argument that we heard in Red Deer this morning is that a constituency should be made much smaller in rural Alberta so that the community could remain intact.

**Mr. Isaacs:** You're damned if you do; you're damned if you don't, sir. I fully appreciate that, and I wouldn't argue that point. I just give you our thought that we certainly appreciate your thoughts, but how grave it is . . .

**Mr. Graham:** Well, we appreciate your thoughts and thank you

very much for them. Believe me, I can tell you that we have laboured for days and days and days to try to preserve all the communities, and also believe me when I tell you that it's impossible to do it in all cases. We've done it in all the cases that we can.

I take it that you're not suggesting that Calgary stay with its present number of seats, because Mayor Bronconnier wouldn't accept that.

**Mr. Isaacs:** No, Mr. Graham. That's not our presentation at all.

**Mr. Graham:** Just let me finish. If that's the case, you're quite right. We did try to balance all these communities by population in the south. The number is about 38,000 per constituency. What you're suggesting is that Calgary-Fish Creek would go to 42,000. That's going to mean, by my math – and it's very simple math – that there's a constituency next to you with 34,000 people. I'm sorry; that won't fly. You cannot have two constituencies in the city of Calgary where one has 34,000 and the one right next door to it has 42,000.

**Mr. Isaacs:** Again, there we're looking at a growth factor, which I understand is not in the scope, but it is realistic to think that that is not going to be a long-term situation. Again, not to be argumentative with you, Mr. Graham.

**Mr. Graham:** No. I know.

**Ms Chatten:** Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond, too, to Mr. Graham's point. I guess that's why we did propose an alternative too. The preference would be to include the whole of Douglasdale, but that brings the number up to 42,000. If that is not palatable, I guess that's why we are proposing the alternative of splitting Douglasdale in some manner.

**Mr. Isaacs:** Split one community rather than three.

**Mr. Graham:** Believe me, we've tried it. We've tried it all. What happens is it starts to ricochet up to the north and the east, and the train wreck occurs up there instead.

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

**Mr. Isaacs:** Thank you.

**Ms Chatten:** Thank you.

**Mr. Olthof:** Mark Ross, Whitehorn Community Association.

**Mr. Ross:** Well, good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. I'm the president of the dangling participle.

**The Chair:** By the way you started off, I don't think you'll dangle for long.

**Mr. Ross:** Well, first off, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon about the realignment of riding boundaries.

As you're aware, the current proposal is calling for the community of Whitehorn to be moved from Calgary-McCall to Calgary-East. On first glance this seems like a reasonable proposal. However, when the facts are examined, it's our contention that this move will be unduly disruptive and very confusing to the general public. I was just thinking that when one of the other groups was making a comment, they were saying that they didn't want to deal with two

MLAs. Well, try dealing with three, because in our four-square-mile area we now have three MLAs.

In the previous written submissions to the commission you were referred to the number of residents in the various communities making up Calgary-McCall, Calgary-Cross, Calgary-Montrose, and Calgary-East, and quite frankly I really don't want to dwell on those numbers any further. I'm going to ask this commission to take two things into consideration: one, the location of Whitehorn versus Calgary-East, and the idea of community and community involvement. As you're aware, Whitehorn is located in the very northwest corner in what is commonly referred to as The Properties. The groups of communities known as The Properties are roughly the same age, have almost identical demographics, and over the years have worked together to establish many of the cultural and recreational opportunities that exist in our area of the city. These communities, Whitehorn, Temple, Pineridge, and Rundle, have all contributed to the social well-being of the northeast. To my mind and that of many other property residents this is the perfect opportunity to create what should've been in place all along, and that is a provincial riding that incorporates the four original communities known as The Properties. The communities are mature, the chance of significant growth is minimal, and as I stated previously, the communities have a long history of working together to achieve common goals. To date this has been done without the benefit of common provincially-elected representation. It can only improve if the properties were united provincially as well.

To do this would take considerable courage from this commission, because to do so would mean that this commission would have to decide that the arbitrary numbers arrived at that suggest that a riding should contain 36,000 to 37,000 people plus or minus an agreed-upon percentage are a guideline to be adhered to where possible but only taken into consideration when it makes sense to do something else. To take one of the most northerly communities of The Properties and place it in a riding that is predominantly in southeast Calgary would be similar to taking the town of Carstairs and having it represented by the MLA for Calgary-McCall, Shiraz Shariff. He'd do a great job; it just doesn't make sense.

**The Chair:** Did you pick Carstairs for any particular reason?

**Mr. Ross:** Yeah, I did, as a matter of fact. I'm a longtime fan of Bob Clark. I'm from Innisfail originally.

**The Chair:** You've got poor judgment.

**Mr. Ross:** The connecting lands between Calgary-East and Whitehorn are light industrial and commercial properties with automobile dealerships and shopping centres as their occupants. Not one voter lives in the areas that are being used to connect Whitehorn to Calgary-East. In fact, to get to Whitehorn, the MLA would have to drive over a kilometre through Calgary-Cross either on 52nd Street or 32nd Street.

The second point I wanted to make is with regard to community and community involvement. The four original communities of The Properties worked together on a number of issues. Our most recent collaboration is the heart of the Northeast Community Solutions Resource Centre. This organization came together through the co-operation of the four communities along with Monterey. Our communities are also responsible for the creation of The Properties Sports Association. PSA was formed to meet the recreational needs of our communities in a way that individual community associations were not able to. All four communities continue to be supportive of PSA even though they have now formed their own associations.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, I'd

like to refer to two points made in May to this commission by Mrs. Teed of Temple, who is here again today, and Mrs. Milnes of Abbeydale. Mrs. Teed focused on the historical and social ties of the communities in Calgary-Cross, and although I don't disagree with her, I would suggest that the ties between Temple, Pineridge, Rundle, and Whitehorn are longer and deeper than those with Monterey, Monterey/Aurora, and Parkridge Estates. When I first moved to Whitehorn back in the mid-80s, Monterey was a sales trailer in an open field, and the four communities of The Properties were well established and working co-operatively.

Mrs. Milnes made a very important point with regard to the actual boundaries. She said – and I take it the commission agreed with her by the questions and statements made following her presentation and again what I've heard today – that it is important to keep whole communities together. In many ways The Properties is one community, and this commission could help bolster that community by uniting it.

Thank you very much for your time.

5:00

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

Any questions or comments?

**Mr. Graham:** Well, I think this is similar to the other presentations that have been given earlier. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** We'll do our best to prevent much more dangling.

**Mr. Ross:** Thank you.

**Mr. Olthof:** Kim Linkletter, Calgary-Currie PC Association.

**Ms Linkletter:** No difficulty here. As a former board member of the dangling participle, I'd have to agree with that. Of course, my house right now sits on the edge of Strathmore-Brooks and Airdrie-Rocky View, so I don't even know where I live.

**The Chair:** I think he's left already.

**Ms Linkletter:** Still dangling.

First of all, I'd like to thank you for the work you've done and particularly for the mention of constituency office funding. As a person who has worked in constituency offices for 10 years, I appreciate that greatly.

**The Chair:** Good.

**Ms Linkletter:** Calgary-Currie is very understanding of the difficulties that the boundary commission has had to go through, and we're not looking at changing a great amount of population. We had a very, very small submission. Basically, it's just to keep CFB East and West together because it was a block of land that came from the Forces and is considered as one in the redevelopment. Currently on one half of it I think there are about 200 and some odd folks who are living in low-income housing, and that's essentially what's in CFB West. In order to accomplish that, you would also bring back I think it's about 40 houses in the Richmond community that were cut off in the early '80s by the expansion of Crowchild Trail, but they still belong to the Richmond community, so you could cut down 29th. It's not a large population difference, and that would also bring Mount Royal College back within Calgary-Currie. I can remember back to the 1982 election when Mount Royal College was in Calgary-Currie, and the MLA there has always worked with that particular educational institution.

We've talked to people in Calgary-Elbow and Calgary-West, and

there really is not any argument with this request from Calgary-Currie. And as I said, it doesn't make much of a population change, under a thousand people, certainly. So that's it.

**The Chair:** Okay. Very succinct and to the point. Any questions of Kim or any comments?

**Mr. Graham:** We've spoken, Kim, and we fully understand your concern. You want to keep Calgary-Currie and you want to keep Richmond and you want to keep CFB together. I'm not saying which way we're going to come down on it, but one of the considerations that we have to consider very strongly is understandable defined boundaries, and of course what you've got running down the middle of both CFB and Richmond is Crowchild Trail. That's a pretty definite and understandable boundary. So I'm not saying which way we're going to come down on it, but you have to understand that there are countervailing things which we also have to consider.

**Ms Linkletter:** I understand Crowchild Trail, but I also understand that a large part of our constituency is to the west of Crowchild Trail: Killarney, Glengarry, Glendale. We're not arguing the addition of more communities on the west of Crowchild. We're just saying that if we're going to spread farther to the west of Crowchild, don't sort of crawl over something that we've had and then go farther west again realizing that, yes, Crowchild is going to cut down the centre of our constituency, and that's understood.

**Mr. Graham:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Olthof:** Ron Laycraft, MD of Foothills.

**The Chair:** Gentlemen, thank you very much for joining us. I noticed you sitting back there patiently, and I appreciate you taking the time to come and give us the benefit of your judgment.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been thinking about what I was going to say here for two or three days. I was lying in bed this morning when Mr. Patterson came on the radio and said that you were meeting here today and you were looking for specifics. So, of course, I've changed my whole speech all over again.

Anyway, we had written you a letter, which I presume you have, and we have some serious concerns with the proposed new Foothills-Rocky View riding, and we passed out a map. I guess to get to specifics, in our letter we indicated, of course, that in Foothills and the Highwood riding our orientation has always been to the east and to the south, and our ambulances and health care and what not is all oriented that way. If we look at the new riding, we find and we feel that our area is going to work in isolation. You start out with the city of Calgary boundary and you hit the Tsuu T'ina boundary, and that takes you almost to the west end of our MD. It leaves you about a four-mile corridor to connect us with the rest of the new riding. That, we feel, is a serious concern.

The other concern we feel is that if we take your projected population – we know basically how many people we would be contributing – we would be a minority. So we would be an isolated minority, and we don't think this is a good situation.

One other specific. I'm not sure, but I believe that there are four MLAs around the city of Calgary at this time. This new thing would reduce us to three, and I think, as this board is aware of, MDs around burgeoning cities such as Calgary and Edmonton and Red Deer do face some different and some serious problems. Quite frankly, we

need all the help we can get up there in the Legislature to help us with these types of things.

I guess looking into the future I wonder about another thing here. The MD of Rocky View and the MD of Foothills are rapidly expanding populations, and they're going to continue to be rapidly expanding populations. If you change this now, you should change it again the election after, because the population is going to grow that much again and how are you going to change it?

Our population in Highwood now is about 46,000 people, which puts us about – what? – 22 or 23 percent over what you would like to see. We don't feel that this is a problem because it is a fairly condensed riding. You know, there are not a whole great, huge amount of miles in it; nevertheless, that's the way it is. I understand your arguments on the legal implications. We run into these in our areas, too, of course, but what we were thinking was that if you do have to cut down, we would rather see the south and the east parts of our MD go into the two other ridings than take us up into the north riding. The south and the east parts of our MDs have been in these other ridings previously. If they were taken in there, they would not be isolated, and I believe they would be more homogeneous than our group going with the north people.

**The Chair:** So you're suggesting that they go into Little Bow and Strathmore-Brooks?

**Mr. Laycraft:** No. Little Bow and Livingstone-Macleod.

**Mr. Patterson:** If I might, Mr. Chair. Livingstone-Macleod now is taking part of the Highwood riding that comes up to your boundary, and what you're suggesting maybe is that – I'm trying to remember it, but it doesn't show on this map – the area of Blackie is one of the areas that could go into Little Bow. I don't think it is in there now.

5:10

**Mr. Laycraft:** No, it's not in there.

**Mr. Patterson:** So that's one area that could go in.

Now, the area that you're referring to which is of concern when I look at the map here is northwest. I'm looking at Okotoks as a point on the map we've got in here. Then there's a little sliver that kind of goes up on the northwest side. That's what you're talking about as your main concern.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Well, the two towns. The town of Turner Valley, the town of Black Diamond, and that northwest corner of the MD are what is proposed to go in the new riding. If I remember correctly, I think you're coming out Sheep Creek until you hit highway 7. You go down highway 7 until you hit the fifth meridian, and then you shoot north up the fifth meridian to the boundary of the city of Calgary. All of that northwest area would go with the new Foothills-Rocky View riding.

**Mr. Patterson:** Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Let me pull this out and see what you think of this. If we were to take the area east of highway 2 in Highwood and put that towards Little Bow, is that going too far west?

**Mr. Laycraft:** Well, I would think you might take too many people that way, but you would have to really look at it, because we do have a very dense population along Dunbow Road there and Heritage Pointe. There is a lot of heavy subdivision in there, but I don't think you'd have to go to that extent.

**Mr. Patterson:** No. In other words, it might be the area south of

the Sheep River and east of highway 2, somewhere in that area towards Blackie, down in that area.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Your pitch really would be, if I could put it that way, that Black Diamond and Turner Valley somehow stay in the Highwood riding. Is that right?

**Mr. Laycraft:** Well, my pitch is that that whole area stay in the Highwood riding.

**The Chair:** Yes, but when I say those towns, it's the areas surrounding them. Really, if there was going to be a new riding – there's a reservation there, and it would take in from there north.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Yes. You know, that area has municipally been handled all together anyhow. That's all part of Rocky View, and they're I think probably under the same MLA at this time anyway, but I'm not sure about that.

**The Chair:** I think they're in Banff-Cochrane now, aren't they? That whole Priddis area and so on are in Banff-Cochrane.

We'll certainly seriously consider that, Ron, because we've said on numerous occasions that what we're proposing on the west side there is a very difficult riding. It isn't something we've just said today; it's something we've talked about all along.

**Mr. Patterson:** You're right also, Ron, in that I can remember very well when that Blackie area was all in Little Bow. That's kind of jumped back and forth.

**The Chair:** We'll certainly keep that in mind.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Thank you. I appreciate it.

**The Chair:** Anything else?

**Mr. Laycraft:** Nope. That's it.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate it very much.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Thank you.

**Mr. Patterson:** I hope I didn't lead you astray. When the reporter asked me where the commission was meeting today, I told him, and he said, "What advice would you give to people if they were to come?"

**Mr. Laycraft:** I thought it was great.

**Mr. Patterson:** Thank you.

**Mr. Clegg:** Now, don't blow him up.

**Mr. Laycraft:** Well, okay; I thought it was pretty good then. How's that?

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

**Mr. Olthof:** Al Brissette, Calgary-Egmont Progressive Conservative Constituency Association.

**The Chair:** Hello, Al.

**Mr. Brissette:** Hi, there.

**The Chair:** How are you today?

**Mr. Brissette:** Just great, thank you. I'm sure you're pleased to see the room slowly emptying and me being one of the last presenters.

**The Chair:** Well, I wouldn't put it quite that way, but we're not crying. Thank you, Al.

**Mr. Brissette:** Our main concern today is concerning community association issues. I walked in to hear my friend J.B. from Fish express his concerns as we've been discussing, so this may be a bit redundant, but we'll bring forward our concerns.

We'd first like to say that we understand some of the difficulties you had in coming up with the revisions. As you probably know, six or more of the southern Calgary constituencies came together on two occasions attempting to submit a unified solution to our problems, and we could not do so. It's a tough job, and we now better understand your problems.

The changes that you proposed dramatically change our riding boundaries. I've supplied you today with copies of our November 24 letter to the commission outlining our concerns along with letters from the Riverbend and Lake Bonavista community associations expressing their objections to the splitting of their communities.

I'd like you to refer to the two maps that I have provided. The first one is the current Egmont boundary, and outlined in pink on the left-hand side is the Kingsland area, which will be moved over. We have no problem with Kingsland, because it's a community association unto itself. Riverbend, as you'll note, we're splitting virtually in half along 18th Street, with the western segment staying in our area and the eastern segment going over to Shaw.

The next map that I have I would call our working map, and as you can see, we've grown dramatically to the north and have a large-area constituency now. The issues here are the Haysboro group on the left-hand side, in green. There's about 520 people there, but they're in a high-rise condominium, and I'm sure that's not going to disturb them as far as their community situation goes. Going north, all of that area has been added onto us. There's very little from Fairmount, which is at the northern end of our area, over to 58th Avenue. There are 244 people living in Manchester, which is a little area where the Macleod Trail is, and then up to 26th Avenue, where Inglewood starts and Ramsay and Alyth.

Now, we feel that those people, their concerns, being near the downtown core, would be different than ours. However, as they're all coming as complete communities, we may not like having that, but we certainly accept that side of it.

We're very pleased that you left the core of our community together. That's Fairmount, Acadia, Willow Park, and Maple Ridge. We're very thankful that you did that.

The problems occur with Riverbend. They've objected strongly to this situation where we virtually split them in half, and then over to the Fish area, where we split the Bonavista riding, taking 3,900 people. I think that leaves around 9,000 in there. As I said, I just came in and heard you say to J.B. that that 3,900 that we want to give them back is not very acceptable because that's going to put them up around 42,000, I think.

Our recommendation, which is on the last sheet I gave you, is as follows. If by working within the guidelines that your commission has set up, you would allow the four high-growth areas of southern Calgary to be accorded a lesser total at this time, again within the

guidelines, their growth by the next election would address the discrepancy. By returning the east segment of Riverbend to us, we take back the 4,425 from Shaw. Shaw, as we know, is one of the high-growth areas just referred to. By returning Lake Bonavista to Fish, we lose 3,910. Fish has made the proposal as to dealing with that 3,910, which has not met with a lot of favour. The net difference is 515 people, a plus for us, which is, again, well within your guidelines. I've outlined the differential on the right-hand side in the proposed total on the map, which with the movement of those two community associations would bring us from 37,438 to 37,953.

Our motivation in this exercise is to keep the community associations whole. As we all know, there is a great strength and pride in our community associations, and we would like to be supporting them with that position.

We'd certainly appreciate your thoughtful consideration, and I thank you for having us here.

**The Chair:** Al, I can assure you that we'll go back and have another look at it. We've already done some of that since the report was issued. A number of organizations, including your own, got presentations to us earlier, so there's been some looking at that already.

**Mr. Brisette:** That's great.

**The Chair:** We'll try and do the very best we can.

**Mr. Brisette:** Well, we'd love some consideration on that because we really feel strongly about the community associations. I mean, they're a big deal in all communities, and as they expressed earlier, it creates a problem with having two guys. It's not the end of the world, but it'd be better to keep us together.

**Mr. Graham:** Al, we will take a look at it again. I can assure you that we've looked at it probably about – I don't know – five, six, seven, eight, nine times. Ten, I hear.

But just so we know the full ramifications of what you're suggesting, my calculation is roughly that this would put Calgary-Fish Creek to roughly 42,000. Calgary-Shaw, which would be directly adjacent to it to the east, would be at 31,500. So there would be a difference of 10,000 people between those ridings, which would be separated by the river. I understand what you're saying about growth, but that's an awfully tough sell.

**Mr. Brisette:** It's going to get there; that's the problem. You know that it's going to get there, and it's not going to be a long way away before it's there.

5:20

**Mr. Graham:** Well, it's hard to predict the economy. I can tell you that when I bought my house in 1982, we were told – and I hate to be a gloomy Gus – that the subdivision would be built out in two or three years. We were the only house in the subdivision for three years. So we don't have crystal balls. We have to deal with what we have, you know, fundamentally. We have tried to take into consideration, somewhat, future growth. You probably noticed that when you looked.

**Mr. Brisette:** Indeed.

**Mr. Graham:** But to 10,000? That's an awfully tough sell, Al.

**Mr. Brisette:** And now we have Kyoto; right?

**The Chair:** Yes, we do, Al.

**Mr. Brisette:** Well, thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Al, and I appreciate your comment saying that the four constituencies got together and tried to resolve the matter, and you experienced some of our challenge.

**Mr. Brisette:** Oh, without question.

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

**Mr. Olthof:** Rebecca Aizenman.

**The Chair:** Rebecca.

**Ms Aizenman:** Good afternoon.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for coming. I notice that you've been here for some time this afternoon. You've heard all our stories, and you know what we're up to.

**Ms Aizenman:** I came with the intent to listen to the presentations and to avail myself of the opportunity to request information on two technical aspects. As the hearings progressed, I became very involved mentally, and I thought: I see some concerns here.

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to present in a formal way. I compliment you on the work that you've done on the preliminary report. I came away from the last meeting quite excited because, as I said to myself, the process works; the commissioners are listening. In a day and age when it's difficult to get the individual voice across on many, many concerns of a diverse nature, I was elated by the fact that there is the opportunity for input.

My original submission dealt with the boundaries of Calgary-Elbow. I made suggestions which were acted upon, and I thank you for that. At my constituency meeting the other night, someone said, "Oh, well, Eagle Ridge has been added." I said: "So what? We've been able to change the boundary so that it's much more consolidated at the south end of the constituency." This was the intent of my presentation, and I can live with it.

I do have some concerns. I do not have a formal, written presentation for you because I wasn't prepared to do that. In 1993 the area of Kingsland was part of Calgary-Elbow. I notice that in the prepared maps at the present time you have taken it out of Egmont and placed it into Calgary-Glenmore. Kingsland is to the immediate east of Calgary-Elbow. It could be accommodated in Calgary-Elbow, and I don't think the numbers would change that much. I would agree with the previous speaker that Kingsland doesn't have much in common with Egmont because it's a self-contained community between Elbow Drive and Macleod Trail from roughly 68th Avenue to 75th Avenue to Heritage Drive. I would not recommend that Kingsland go to Egmont. If you can move it into Elbow, it would meet the historical background where it had been in 1993.

In my written submission, which reached your office on the earlier deadline – I believe it was the end of June – I neglected to outline the need for poll maps to be prepared on a disk. I had brought it to your attention verbally, but I just forgot to include it, so I'm going to make the request again that when the constituency maps are prepared, some sort of technology be employed so that the poll maps can be produced on a disk and computer technology can take over. If there's a charge for such, let it be. After all, this is Alberta, where we do believe in user fees, and I'll take responsibility for that statement.

**The Chair:** The gentleman to speak to is right over there.

**Ms Aizenman:** You heard me, sir, but don't make it too expensive. Having been involved in more elections than I can count, it takes a tremendous amount of time to prepare those poll maps. It's highly intensive labour, it's very, very demanding, and you have to be absolutely correct.

As the afternoon progressed, my real concerns dealt with some of the names that appear on this map. I'm a native Calgarian. I grew up here. My background is such that I have to be very, very demanding when it comes to historical detail because I do have a background in history and a little bit of local history. For the record there is a community called Haysboro, which was actually named after land that Harry Hays owned in the Calgary-Glenmore area. There are huge tracts of land there that were his, and that community is a reflection of that. So I thought: what's Calgary-Hays doing down at the south end? I thought, "Oh, well." Similarly with Lougheed. Mr. Lougheed's family mansion is actually in the dead centre of Calgary-*Buffalo*.

5:30

I realize that you can't make those kinds of changes, but I do have concerns with the Calgary-Fort name as it appears on this map and the inclusion of Inglewood and Ramsay in Calgary-Egmont. That just blows me away because Fort Calgary as such, historically speaking, is at the junction of the Elbow and Bow rivers just east of our zoo location. If I lived in Inglewood or Ramsay, with which I'm very familiar, I will have gone through at least three constituency changes. At one point I would have been in Calgary-*Buffalo*. Then I was in Calgary-East. The last time round I was in Calgary-Fort, and I don't think those two communities should be so expendable.

I would respectfully suggest that Inglewood and Ramsay be relocated to Calgary-*Buffalo* because this is an inner-city community. The movement of population is to the west. I could also argue that shoppingwise it is to the east over on 17th Avenue. But geographically and historically it has more affinity with Calgary-*Buffalo* than it does with something called Calgary-Egmont. The natural dividing line is 17th Avenue, and it is a man-made physical barrier. There's a lot of park space to the south of that river. If you have to juggle numbers with your computer, I think the numbers could be balanced if the west boundary of Calgary-*Buffalo* was straight down the line on 37th Street. I think that would give you some leeway with your numbers.

I would suggest to you that the north boundary of Calgary-Egmont be 17th Avenue. I think it starts with the Cushing bridge, and it goes over into Forest Lawn. I want to borrow a name from the federal electoral act, where the expression "community of interest" is used, particularly historically. I think Inglewood-Ramsay is a community of interest; they go together. Inglewood was the home of many famous historical personalities in Calgary, but more recently Inglewood-Ramsay was the prototype model of inner-city urban redevelopment, and that was a credit to Jack Long, who is no longer with us. I'm even thinking that maybe Calgary-Long should be a constituency, or it should be acknowledged. But Inglewood-Ramsay is an entity unto itself, and it should not be lost in Calgary-Egmont, because what you're doing, ladies and gentlemen, is you're confusing the voter. The voter doesn't know: "Where do I live now? For whom do I vote?" And I believe that everything possible should be done to improve voter turnout, not discourage it, because as I said earlier, I think this is the third name change that people in that constituency have had to endure.

My next comment deals with your labeling of Calgary-Fort as shown on your map included in the interim document. You have moved Calgary-Fort from where it was in '97 out to where it is on this map. Again, if I use a historical background, please, Calgary-Fort does not match that name that you see on the map from Glenmore Trail southeast to 17th Avenue. As I sat here this

afternoon without reference material, I tried to think of a few names that would be far more appropriate, and I tried to envision what is in that area. To the north of Glenmore Trail you have a huge industrial park, a huge distribution centre. The south end of Calgary-Fort is industrial, distributory. It has facilities that represent distribution services in Calgary. It's quite a trip to go through there and see what has been located there. As has been said earlier, the northern part of Calgary-Fort is residential. I would respectfully suggest that you change the name of Calgary-Fort to Calgary-Deerfoot. The Deerfoot Trail is a significant landmark, a significant man-made boundary that reflects the Deerfoot being used as a distribution road or as the main access into Calgary-Fort. I'm going to leave that with you. I thought of other names, but on the spur of the moment – it would have taken a little bit more research.

You've moved Calgary-Fort from where it was, roughly from 1st Street East, which is just west of city hall, all the way across old Victoria Park, Inglewood-Ramsay. You've taken it away from there completely, and you've moved it into a combination of long-time residential areas like Southview, Erin Woods, Dover, I think, and the industrial park. I would respectfully request that that name be looked at again. It has only been on the map since '97. I don't think that if you took it away, people would miss it.

**The Chair:** Okay. Are you moving right along?

**Ms Aizenman:** Yes, sir.

**The Chair:** Good.

**Ms Aizenman:** My last comment endorses one of your comments in the interim report that many submissions were received where we should have less representation than what is proposed, and I'm not going to get into the urban/rural split.

The issue of a second House was mentioned to acknowledge more effective representation within or outside the boundaries of the terms of the commission. Something has to be done in the process of democratic democracy whereby we start looking at proportional representation as the solution to the inequities of representation. It may be one person, one vote, but that is not reflected when final results come in, particularly in the province of Alberta. However it is done, proportional representation has to be looked at to effect a greater degree of democratic democracy or representative democracy.

Thank you for giving me time for this verbal submission.

**The Chair:** Okay. Great. Thank you. You obviously know Calgary very well, Rebecca.

**Ms Aizenman:** I wish I knew parts of it better. It grows before I get a chance to find out where it is.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, just one quick question to Rebecca. When you were talking about Calgary-Fort, you mentioned Calgary-Deerfoot. What about Calgary-Dover?

**Ms Aizenman:** In honour of Mrs. Mary Dover? Why not?

**Mr. Patterson:** There is a subdivision in that area that's Dover, also. As you were talking, you mentioned Dover. She did make quite a mark in the city of Calgary.

**Ms Aizenman:** Yes, she did. I didn't have a map in front of me.

**Mr. Patterson:** I think that might fit better than Calgary-Deerfoot.

**Ms Aizenman:** I only came up with that because that was all I could think of while I was sitting here without any reference to maps in front of me.

**Mr. Patterson:** And it would honour a woman.

**Ms Aizenman:** It would honour a wonderful, wonderful contributor and person.

**The Chair:** She was an alderman in the city – wasn't she? – for a number of years.

**Ms Aizenman:** Very well respected in the city.

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

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you, and a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year to all of you. Don't work next week or the week after.

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

**Mr. Patterson:** I don't think the chairman would agree with you.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Olthof:** Sandy Wilson, Calgary-Fort constituency.

**The Chair:** Ms Wilson, you're the last person here, so we look forward to your presentation.

**Ms Wilson:** And you hope it's brief so you can go.

**The Chair:** Well, that's right too. What can I say other than thank you for coming, and give us your advice, please.

**Ms Wilson:** Okay. Wayne sends his apologies. He was going to attend, but he has been detained at the last moment.

Firstly, we've made two other presentations, one written and one verbal, before to your committee. We'd like to emphasize, consistent with our previous submissions, that we agree that no additional increases to the number of constituencies should be made to Alberta as a whole, and Wayne wanted to emphasize that he agrees with you there. We would prefer that no increases be made to the constituencies in Calgary simply because of the negative feedback that we've received regarding that, but being the case, if there are, we would prefer that multiple boundary changes not be made but that changes be made only to the south and the north areas of the city to accommodate the new growth.

Please, don't make radical changes to all constituency boundaries for the sake of a few thousand constituents one way or another. Swapping communities between several constituencies to make the populations closer in size down to the last 1,000 people incurs a lot of inconvenience for no apparent benefit. The allowances for differences in constituencies is there for a purpose and, where possible, should be used to accommodate and anticipate a future change in growth rate.

We'd also like to suggest that several high-needs communities not be placed together in one constituency if at all possible, which is what has happened in the interim report.

**The Chair:** Where in the interim report? Which riding?

**Ms Wilson:** In Calgary-Fort. In that interim report you've placed

Dover and Millican-Ogden, which are two high-needs constituencies, and you've added Forest Lawn, which is also high needs. We're talking the bottom 10 in high needs out of 167 communities in Calgary.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms Wilson:** Now, I can tell you a little bit about what happens with that. With high SFI rates, high AISH rates, high WCB rates it puts a lot of demand on the office. Also, in the office both Wayne and I are already involved with many communities in the area doing preventative measures and helping to build communities in those areas. So besides the office work, we're also out at meetings. There's the Inner City Community Life council and there's the Sunrise Community Link, that are both arranging community resource centres with the Alberta government, and then several small resource centres.

**The Chair:** I understand the point.

**Ms Wilson:** Okay. At a meeting held on December 16 in our constituency with the communities presently in Calgary-Fort, the overall issues were discussed, and the following priorities were agreed on by all present. They wanted to keep communities whole, not to break communities up. They wanted to maintain contiguous areas where communities have natural affinities; like, when two or three communities are working together, are basically located together and have a lot in common, they prefer not to be broken up, if possible. You just had the example of Ramsay-Inglewood and Downtown East, and those communities told us that they would prefer to stay together in a constituency, if possible. They wanted to make as little change as possible to constituencies' existing boundaries to keep constituencies connected to the Alberta government representatives so that they know who is their representative. Again, you just had the example where it has changed four times in four changes, and those communities were voicing that opinion to us.

Individual communities expressed their concerns also. Victoria Park would like to be reunited east with west because they have been split between two constituencies. They agree that they would like to be put in Buffalo, which you've done in the new report. They work together with Beltline, Mission, and Connaught in a very close relationship now, and they're looking at doing one joint community association, so they really like your idea of putting them together.

**The Chair:** One of the few letters that we got from a member of the Legislature saying the same thing. That's two now.

5:40

**Ms Wilson:** They are very, very happy to have that, and they've requested that since we were formed. East Village would like to remain in the same constituency as Inglewood and Ramsay because of their close ties. They've got similar concerns, they work closely together, and they work through the Alexandra health centre with several different community development projects in the communities. If you look at the map, they're very closely related, and then they're in an isolated area around them so that they're sort of a little island. Although it looks like – and I have a map here if you'd like to see better – you're close to Victoria Park, because of the railway track there's no way to pass the railway to Victoria Park, so there's actually quite an isolated little corner there all to themselves in the city. I don't know if anybody wants to see, but I can show you if you'd like to look.

**The Chair:** East Village has been the source of a certain amount

of things in the newspaper anyway recently; hasn't it?

**Ms Wilson:** Yes, it has, and they're working with the city on that problem.

Ramsay community concurs with this also, that they would like to stay together with that triarea group, and Millican-Ogden definitely does not want the community divided in the future between two constituencies. It would like to see the area of South Hill reunited with the community. South Hill is a small area south of Glenmore Trail that has a hundred-year history of being part of Ogden. They're cut off by Glenmore Trail, so when people look on the map, they cut it off. But they have no other way. They are not connected to Riverbend in any way by road. They cannot get there by road. They go directly across Glenmore Trail into Ogden, and they've historically been part of Ogden for years. Both the federal and the city redoing of the maps have included them with Ogden in the future. Again, Millican-Ogden would like to remain with Calgary-Fort, if at all possible. I can show you on the map, if you'd like.

**The Chair:** The gentlemen are rushing to help you there.

**Ms Wilson:** Okay. Now, the area of South Hill that we're talking about is just this little corner down here. Although it looks like it's part of Riverbend, there are no through traffic roads this way. They only go across into Ogden Road. It's just a little anomaly, and it's been there for a hundred years.

**The Chair:** How many people there?

**Ms Wilson:** There are 24 homes and two mobile home parks in the area.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms Wilson:** Then the other area that we were talking about. The railway line that divides Victoria Park – actually, downtown east is very highly affiliated with those two areas of Inglewood and Ramsay.

**Mr. Graham:** So if you could go back, Sandy. What is that little tip called?

**Ms Wilson:** South Hill.

**Mr. Graham:** And how many people are in there?

**Ms Wilson:** Twenty-four homes and two mobile home parks that take about 30 people each. So there are probably a hundred people there.

**Mr. Graham:** So is it a hundred people in there that we've got presently in Calgary-Egmont?

**Ms Wilson:** Yes.

**Mr. Graham:** But it's connected by road to Calgary-Fort?

**Ms Wilson:** Yes, but not to Egmont.

**Mr. Graham:** But not to Egmont. Okay.

**Ms Wilson:** And they have no intention of ever developing that road through that way for quite a while because there's a big problem with where they wanted to build the road.

**Mr. Graham:** All right. Now, Sandy, I understand from your previous letters and submissions that your priorities in order are, number 1, keeping Ogden together. Number 2 is keeping the Dover community; right? And number 3 is keeping the Erin Woods community. Is that right? Do I have those three priorities in order?

**Ms Wilson:** Yes. If possible.

**Mr. Graham:** And then this little tip you've pointed out, South Hill.

**Ms Wilson:** Yeah. And the other area of concern was to get too many high-needs communities in one.

**Mr. Graham:** I understand all the concerns. I wanted your priorities.

**Ms Wilson:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clegg.

**Mr. Clegg:** Thank you. Sandy, I think you just came in when Rebecca was making her presentation, but I know you got in on the discussion on name change. It's maybe not a fair question. What do you think? What does Wayne think? Or did you ever discuss a name change whatsoever with Wayne?

**Ms Wilson:** We've never discussed it, but I know that calling it after one community in the area would probably be upsetting to the rest of the communities, and I would suggest more something like Calgary-Foothills if you're going to change it from Calgary-Fort.

**Mr. Clegg:** The suggestion was Dover.

**Ms Wilson:** Yeah. That's one community.

**The Chair:** Dover is a community.

**Mr. Clegg:** Oh, that's a community.

**Ms Wilson:** Dover is a community that's one of six that we have now.

**Mr. Graham:** The problem that I see with that is that although it's laudable, a lot of people aren't going to understand it. They're going to see it as naming the whole constituency after one of the subdivisions within it.

**The Chair:** Or one of the communities.

**Ms Wilson:** Yeah. And the whole area is surrounded by Calgary Foothills, the industrial development park, if you were looking at a name.

**The Chair:** There's already a Calgary-Foothills.

**Ms Wilson:** Yeah. There are all sorts of other names that I would call it, but I wouldn't pick one community's name.

**The Chair:** What if you go home and talk to Rebecca and see if you and she can come up with an idea and get back to us?

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, you know, I just suggested Dover because of the area of Dover, but I can see the problem there, then,

because a lot of people have probably never heard of Mary Dover.

**Ms Wilson:** I'm not putting down Mary Dover. I think it would be wonderful to honour her that way, but I think the communities would find it confusing.

**Mr. Patterson:** Right. On the other hand, I think there's a problem keeping on calling this Calgary-Fort, because it's getting farther and farther away from it.

**Ms Wilson:** Unless you . . .

**Mr. Patterson:** Go back.

**Ms Wilson:** . . . go back to the other area.

**Mr. Clegg:** Some of us younger ones on the committee don't remember Dover, the name or what she did. Just the elderly members of the committee remember that stuff.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Chair, you can't help people from northern Alberta. They know nothing about the south.

**The Chair:** On that very positive note, Sandy, thank you very much. We appreciate your making the effort to come out. Thank you.

**Ms Wilson:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Olthof, who's next?

**Mr. Olthof:** I hate to disappoint you, but we have no further speakers this evening.

**The Chair:** Well, then, at 10 minutes to 6 on this Wednesday afternoon I declare the public deliberations of this commission concluded. I want to thank those of you who stuck with us this afternoon.

I want to thank the *Hansard* people and the sound people. Thanks for the job that you've done for us all across the province on about four or five different occasions, almost a week at a time. Thank you very, very much, and have a good Christmas.

To Mr. Forgrave's staff, to Brian and his staff, and to Bill Sage: thank you very much for your help. Your work has just begun. Mr. Forgrave, you're that way too.

And to Douglas: Doug, in two days you leave us to go back to Simon Fraser University to – what should we say? – the soft-thinking area in British Columbia. We know that'll firm up your brain and your good thinking so that you're an even better man in the future.

So might I say this portion is concluded. Thank you very much.

[The hearing adjourned at 5:49 p.m.]

