



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission  
Public Hearings

Red Deer

Wednesday, April 14, 2010  
1:38 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-8

## **Legislative Assembly of Alberta**

### **Electoral Boundaries Commission**

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

Dr. Keith Archer  
Peter Dobbie, QC  
Brian Evans, QC  
Allyson Jeffs

### **Office of the Chief Electoral Officer**

Chief Electoral Officer	Brian Fjeldheim
Deputy Chief Electoral Officer	Lori McKee-Jeske

### **Participants**

Pat Alexander, Reeve, Clearwater County  
Richard Marz, MLA, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills  
Gail Parks and Buck Buchanan, Councillors, City of Red Deer

### **Support Staff**

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil
Clerk Assistant and Director of House Services	Louise J. Kamuchik
Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Robert H. Reynolds, QC
	Shannon Dean
Administrator	Karen Sawchuk
Communications Consultant	Melanie Friesacher
Consultant	Tom Forgrave
Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

1:38 p.m.

Wednesday, April 14, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good afternoon. My name is Ernie Walter, and I am the chair of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce you to the other members of the commission here with me today: on my far right Dr. Keith Archer of Banff, next to him Peter Dobbie of Vegreville, on my immediate left Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton.

As you are aware, we have spent the last seven months reviewing the electoral boundaries of our province, and I can tell you that we've examined every square inch of the map. I know I speak for all of the committee when I say that the commission has found it both very interesting and challenging to weigh the concerns and relevant factors put before it during the preparation of the interim report. I would like to note that we are very pleased with the large amount of public feedback received. We've received over 470 written submissions and are looking forward to receiving additional feedback during this hearing. Once we've considered this feedback, the commission will issue its final report by July of this year.

With that, I'm pleased to touch on a few of our findings and recommendations setting out the areas, boundaries, and names of the 87 electoral divisions we propose for Alberta together with our reasons for the proposals as outlined in the interim report. I can tell you that the foundation of our decisions has been effective representation for all Albertans. In undertaking the work, the commission has been guided by the requirements of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, relevant decisions of the courts, advice received at the first round of public hearings, and in written submissions as well as the latest census information available to us.

When I speak of census information, the 2009 municipal census data for Alberta's cities shows there has been a consistent pattern of growth since the 2001 census. Fifty-two per cent of Albertans currently reside in Edmonton and Calgary. Using the 2009 official population list, the total population being considered by the commission is 3,556,583. Given this pattern of growth this means the quotient, or provincial average population, has grown by 10,100 since the 1995-1996 commission and is now at 40,880. So, essentially, the act directs the commission to divide the province into 87 electoral divisions with a population within 25 per cent of this provincial average in a way that will ensure effective representation for Albertans.

Taking into account available population information and factors affecting effective representation, the majority of the commission concluded that the redistribution of the 87 divisions should allow for the following increases: Calgary by two additional divisions, bringing it to 25; Edmonton by one, bringing it to 19; and the rest of Alberta by one, providing it with 43 divisions.

Now, in coming to our recommendations as outlined in our interim report, we have respected the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The primary principles and factors which have guided the commission's recommendations are:

**Population.** The commission has attempted to limit the variations in the average population per division. The average population per electoral division from the quotient is from plus 4.3 per cent in Calgary, .7 per cent in Edmonton, and minus 2.8 per cent in the rest of Alberta.

**Scarcity of population.** The commission recognizes scarcity of population in the two proposed special divisions of Dunvegan-Central Peace and Lesser Slave Lake. Dunvegan-Central

Peace meets all five criteria for a special division, and Lesser Slave Lake meets four of the five criteria.

**Community interests.** The commission has taken into consideration community interests of which it is aware.

**Community boundaries.** The commission has attempted, as requested by the municipalities, to respect community boundaries in Calgary, Edmonton, and other areas.

**Municipal boundaries.** The commission has made every attempt to respect municipal boundaries. This has not been possible in all cases, but the commission has attempted to reduce the fragmentation of municipal boundaries resulting from the existing divisions.

**Geographical features.** The commission has considered geographical features, including roads, which provide natural barriers between communities of interest.

**Understandable and clear boundaries.** The commission has attempted to recommend boundaries which are clear and easy to understand for the residents of the areas. In addition, the commission is using digital mapping technology to describe the boundaries rather than extensive written legal descriptions.

**Distance and area.** This is primarily an issue in the rest of Alberta. In recommending those boundaries, the commission has considered the area of the proposed electoral divisions and the travel distances involved both within the division and between the division and the Legislature. In addition, MLAs have to maintain relations with more than one school board, more than one municipal council, and several community and business organizations.

**Inner-city urban issues.** The commission acknowledges the submissions stressing that the inner-city urban ridings generally have their own challenges such as large numbers of linguistic and cultural communities, a disproportionate number of people dependent on social programs, increasing numbers of new immigrants and aboriginal peoples, and other issues.

1:45

**Other Calgary and Edmonton issues.** The commission acknowledges there may be only one council and one school authority or two school authorities, but maintaining relations with a number of community leagues or associations, business revitalization zones, and other identifiable organizations places time demands on the MLA.

Now that I have briefly reviewed our recommendations, we will want to hear your views. We believe that what we hear from you, the people here today, will help us in terms of how we strike the boundaries and any changes that are necessary or critical in recommending a new electoral map that will ensure fair and effective representation for all Albertans. We certainly have heard in the hearings here in Red Deer that people do want some changes to the proposals in the interim report, and we will certainly take that into account in making our final recommendations.

Now, I will call on our staff to call the first speakers. Each speaker will have 10 minutes to present and then 10 minutes for questions and answers with the commission.

The speakers should know that *Alberta Hansard* is recording these proceedings, and the audio recordings will be posted to the commission website; transcripts of these proceedings will also be available online.

We would ask the presenters who choose to participate this afternoon that you identify yourself for the record prior to starting your presentation.

**Ms Friesacher:** Our first speakers are Mrs. Gail Parks and Mr. Buck Buchanan, councillors with the city of Red Deer.

**Gail Parks and Buck Buchanan, Councillors  
City of Red Deer**

**Mrs. Parks:** Good afternoon, commission members and Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for being here. I think I'm not quite as prepared as I'd like to be, but, believe me, I am speaking from the heart. My name is Gail Parks. I registered as a private citizen, but I think it's important for you to know that I am a city councillor.

**Mr. Buchanan:** My name is Samuel Buchanan. They call me Buck. I'm also a citizen but also a city councillor, sir.

**Mrs. Parks:** I've looked at the new riding that would be formed that would include a portion of Red Deer. I appreciate the consideration for a third riding that would involve the city of Red Deer. When I look at our newest city map, that shows our annexed lands. I went to the city to get that because I wasn't sure that what I had was reflecting the addition of those lands. They're not all under development, but they will be under development.

Before the next commission, in seven years or whatever, we will see an addition of at least 10,000 people. I have no doubt about that whatsoever. We do have a small piece on the west side that has received approval along Taylor Drive, that is new to the city, and that development is going forward as well as the development along 30th Avenue that has broken ground and so on. Currently with these new additions I believe there are 530 people, I think, something in that nature, 500 and change anyway, and that is only going to grow. So I know that a third riding will become very important to good representation, effective representation within the city of Red Deer. I don't believe that it's effective if you take a chunk of the city and marry it to something so far south that we don't go there.

As I was thinking about what I might tell you that would be different from anyone else that has presented from the city, both Buck and I have sat on the FCSS board. We have those municipalities that we're closely involved with as a city, and we have a common interest in that.

In addition to that, I sit on CAEP. We have 41-member municipalities. We have a lot of MLAs that are involved, but our involvement here is the two MLAs that serve our municipality. We work very, very closely with them on the things that are of interest to the citizens that we represent within our city. We'll lose that if you take that southern chunk and send it off someplace like Drumheller. There's an unfairness in that, if you'll forgive me for using that word, but it certainly is something that is not going to sit well with the residents in the city of Red Deer. It certainly is not going to sit well with the people who live in Drumheller. We have nothing in common with them, except we live in the same province and love it.

Politically speaking, we just can't expect that we'll have value in that boundary. I'm quite sure for this next go-around that to leave the city with two MLAs will work. If the boundary is moved somewhat to the south, perhaps, I think – my ideas might be different than somebody else's, but I looked at 39th Street and said: it's a natural boundary. It isn't a street that doesn't exist, like Molly Banister. That isn't there; it's just a field.

In neighbourhoods – and this city is all about neighbourhoods – we share conversations about our political choices, so we have that in common as well in our neighbourhood. Whatever makes sense: to take some population from the south and add it to the north. But I'll tell you that when you look at the newly annexed area, there's going to be tremendous growth in the north, and we will see that third riding will be intact in the city of Red Deer, I'll bet you, in seven years.

**Mr. Buchanan:** I'm somewhat unprepared, too, sir. I just came back from Las Vegas and started hearing about this on the radio, and as Gail said, we kind of tagged into it. We were at a meeting this morning. We just signed an agreement called common ground, which is to try and bring some of the communities for pilots in Alberta and dealing with the urban aboriginal. I think we're making headway in that.

I think, as Gail has said, that to restructure the boundaries as you're restructuring and rejigging them – I see the intent, like you said, the effective representation, which was mentioned earlier on, and your Madam Justice McLachlin from Saskatchewan, not equality in voting power per se but effective representation. I think the effective representation, as Gail is saying, is virtually the way that we have it. I think the thing is that to rejig the map as you've rejigged it, we're going to have – I don't know – a bit of an anomaly.

I mean, continuously in Red Deer we talk about being the third-biggest city in Alberta. Looking at the census results that you have here, you're about 10,000 people short right now, so we're over 90,000. We've got 78,000 in the two ridings the way it's listed. I think that, as Gail has said, with the annexation there is an awful lot of movement to the north and to the northwest, and I think that in the not-too-distant future, obviously, that other area is going to be there.

I'm looking at option 1, option 2, option 3, very quickly, that you've come up with, with the two and the one and the one or the three and the one and none in the rest of Alberta. You know, I think that in Red Deer's best interests the way that we have it is very good and very productive. As Gail has said, we work very closely with what we have.

You know, I noticed there was a comment here from somebody from St. Albert suggesting that highway 2 from Edmonton to Calgary could be the Lac La Biche constituency, somewhere in there. I was an RCMP member for 30 years, and I spent 10 years of that north of the 60th parallel, so I can understand the remote areas that you're dealing with. With the urban that we are, we're kind of the distant cousin to the Edmonton-Calgary crowd, so we kind of like to cry a little bit. But, as I said, the boundaries the way they are facilitate generally effective representation by the people that we deal with and, I think, also the people that the people from the province deal with.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

1:55

**Dr. Archer:** Well, thanks, Mrs. Parks, Mr. Buchanan. I appreciate those comments. They're consistent with some of the other comments that we've heard since we've been to Red Deer, beginning with yesterday evening's session.

Just to put it into perspective as to why the commission went the way we did with our recommendation, I think we started with the premise that Red Deer, in fact, has been growing faster than the provincial average and, as you suggest, likely will continue to do so. So our concern was that if we started today with constituencies that are well above the average, one or two elections out they'll be dramatically above the average. Trying to avoid that scenario, we took the decision to try to keep the two constituencies pretty close to the average. The effect of that was to require us to hive off a part of the city and to place it within a broader urban-rural riding.

I'm not sure if that approach was wrong or if our identification of the right part to hive off was wrong, but certainly the message that we've been getting loud and clear from the community is that in this go-around we probably should just keep with two constituencies within Red Deer, fully urban, with none of them spilling over into a rural community. The impact will likely be that both constituencies

are somewhere 12 to 15 per cent above average from day one, and their variation will just continue to grow from there. But, you know, if that's what people in the community would prefer – I mean, we certainly haven't made that decision yet – that's one of the things that will be very much central to our discussion following our meetings.

I wonder if you could give us some guidance for the eventuality of a situation in which there's a population that doesn't fit all that neatly into the electoral formula. If an electoral formula provides us with a quotient of 40,000 people per riding and Red Deer does grow by 10,000, the next time it'll be 100,000. That doesn't quite make three ridings that easily fit within that formula either, so a future commission might need to look at taking a part of the city and putting it in with a rural area. Would it be right to say that people should be looking at that northwest part of the city and possibly a connection with Sylvan Lake as opposed to the southern part of the city? I know I'm kind of putting you on the spot with that question, but someone has to deal with that at some point, so we might as well start talking about it now.

**Mrs. Parks:** Dr. Archer, you're not putting me on the spot, actually. When you look at the southern portion of the riding, we have very little growth there. By that, I mean that we're limited to the amount of growth we can have because we've set our boundary with the county. There are two quarter sections that I think will develop as well as a small piece on the west side, abutting Taylor Drive.

The majority of this growth will be to the east and north. So where we may annex land in the foreseeable future very likely will be to the north and maybe some to the west. You may have it right about Sylvan Lake. I wouldn't like to speak to that today. But just so that you understand, we're limited to where we can grow in the south because of the joint planning that we've done with the county. I don't think they'll have a problem if we go east or north or west as long as we're not touching their growth area, their financial base in Gasoline Alley in the south end. So it does limit the city of Red Deer from going south. We can go west and we can go north and we can go east. Those will be growth areas, and we're already seeing that development today.

**Dr. Archer:** Great. Thanks.

**Mr. Buchanan:** Further to your question there, Dr. Archer, I noted – and I just can't put my finger on it here. For the two inner-city ridings of Edmonton and Calgary both of the people that presented suggested – they are over populationwise, too – that it was better to keep their riding as a whole versus breaking it up, you know, strictly on a population basis. When we go back to that effective representation, I think that, ultimately, the primary is that with the little jag that you've got there, you know, are those people going to be effectively represented?

**Dr. Archer:** Thanks very much. That's all I have.

**The Chair:** Peter.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Councillors, for taking the time to be here today. In my view, it's very helpful to have representatives from the city of Red Deer here. My first question is: has the city council itself taken a position on the interim report? Are you here in your capacity representing the council or as two individual councillors?

**Mrs. Parks:** No. We're two individual councillors, Mr. Dobbie, and it's why I registered as a private citizen. I think that because of our interests and some of our shared workload that we do at council, it was important for you to know that we are city councillors.

**Mr. Dobbie:** My second question. We received a submission from the two MLAs that currently represent Red Deer which very much mirrors the comments you've made today, and it forms part of what is submission 285 on our website. It proposes that the dividing line between Red Deer-North and Red Deer-South would be Ross Street.

**Mrs. Parks:** It currently is Ross Street but not all of it.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Right. The proposal was to carve out the centre neighbourhoods.

I would invite you – since you've presented today, we're welcoming further written feedback as part of your discussion today – to take a look at that proposal and advise, if you're interested, whether you concur or not with that proposal. I've heard you suggest that 39th Street would be a good boundary. I don't know, but it sounds like you may not have had a chance to look at the population breakdown. If we are going to have Red Deer as two larger constituencies populationwise, we'd be interested in getting as much input into where the appropriate dividing line is. It may not be one street, but it would be very helpful to us. If we could get that feedback within the next 13 days – I guess we said 14 days yesterday – we would be able to consider it in our deliberations.

**Mrs. Parks:** Mr. Dobbie, I do know what was proposed from both MLAs, and that was to take Eastview and Eastview Estates, I believe, and that is for nine polls. I looked at that. I happen to live just on the north side of Ross Street. We're in the eastern corner of Minister Jablonski's riding. The reason I suggested something different – and I do not want to be in trouble with either one of them – is that the growth that Mr. Dallas will have in the south, because there isn't space for it, will be considerably less than the opportunity for growth either to the east or the north that Minister Jablonski will have.

2:05

**Mr. Dobbie:** I understand that. Again, if you could canvass your council colleagues, and if we got some direction from city council as a whole, it would be of assistance because this is your city, and you know it better than we do. So the more precise you can be with your suggestions, the easier it is for us to make better decisions.

My third question is if you can tell from the maps in our appendix E, pages 121 and 122 – I don't know whether the annexed land or the proposed annexed land is currently covered by the Red Deer-North constituency that we had proposed. If not, I would like, again, to invite you to provide that information to us either now or in writing so that we can again look at an appropriate boundary. I see that you're providing us with a document. Something in relation to that: is that annexation being done with the consent of the adjacent county?

**Mrs. Parks:** Oh, it's done.

**Mr. Dobbie:** It's completed?

**Mrs. Parks:** It's completed. Yes, it was done with full co-operation in partnership with the county. That's why I said to you that our growth is limited in the south because that was the deal. We will not be asking for anything that they have in the south.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you. Again, your input today is very valuable to us because you know the city better than we do. We want on the record to have a couple of city councillors encouraging us to have two constituencies in Red Deer just so we're clear that we're actually not guessing on what you might think but simply responding to what you're suggesting.

Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Parks:** It's our pleasure, and we will speak to both the mayor and the city manager as well as council on Monday, and we will provide you with comments from that.

**The Chair:** Thank you. I take it we may keep this.

**Mrs. Parks:** You may.

**The Chair:** All right. Allyson.

**Ms. Jeffs:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much for coming this afternoon. I don't actually have any questions. You've been very clear. I do look forward to seeing the additional information that Peter Dobbie has asked for. In particular, if you can canvass council, it would just add strength if this is the position of council. Or if council as a whole has something else to say, then we would certainly welcome hearing that as well. We have heard this submission from others as well.

On the issue of the annexed land I think somebody told us last night that it is in our proposal, but we'll confirm that so that the boundary makes as much sense as we can.

**Mrs. Parks:** It may be.

**Ms. Jeffs:** I think it might be.

**The Chair:** It's not.

**Mrs. Parks:** No. No, actually, the land on the east isn't on there.

**Ms. Jeffs:** It's a completed annexation?

**Mrs. Parks:** Yes, it is.

**Ms. Jeffs:** Okay. Well, that helps us. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Brian.

**Mr. Evans:** Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. My apologies for missing the presentations. Because I haven't heard your presentation, I won't ask any questions now; however, I will take a look at what you've done in the transcript, and if I do have any questions, I'll get in touch with you.

**Mrs. Parks:** That would be fine.

**Mr. Evans:** Thank you very much. I apologize for not being here during your presentation.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you both. That was very helpful, and we'll certainly be taking that into account. If you could provide us with that other information, we'd be most appreciative.

**Mr. Buchanan:** We will do that, sir.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Parks:** We will ask to be on the agenda for Monday, and you will hear from the city clerk's department.

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

**Mr. Buchanan:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Parks:** Thank you very much for the opportunity.

**Ms. Friesacher:** The next presenter is Mr. Pat Alexander, reeve of Clearwater county.

**Mr. Alexander:** Good afternoon.

**The Chair:** For the record we have to have you . . .

**Mr. Alexander:** Pat Alexander, reeve of Clearwater county.

**The Chair:** Please proceed.

**Pat Alexander, Reeve  
County of Clearwater**

**Mr. Alexander:** On behalf of Clearwater county I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to present today to your committee. I understand the complexity of the task that you've taken on and certainly respect the work you have done.

At our March 23 meeting Clearwater county council discussed the Electoral Boundaries Commission's proposed boundary change and passed a motion supporting an alternative change in the constituency boundaries, outlined in green on the map that's attached to your handout. The red is your proposed boundary, and the green would be our proposed boundary. As you can see, we believe in including Rimbey, Eckville, and Bentley in the Rocky Mountain House-Olds constituency. Also, the Rocky Mountain House-Olds constituency makes more sense to us in the fact that it helps with our east-west travel. We have the main corridors going through in our area: our highways 53, 12, 11, and 54. Sundre would also remain as part of the Rocky Mountain House-Olds constituency because currently we have quite a bit in common with Sundre and the other towns that I mentioned: Rimbey, Eckville, and Bentley.

With respect to economic and business issues we have ranching, farming, timber, oil and gas, schools, RCMP, and emergency response all common to this area of central Alberta. For example, we have students from Clearwater county attending school in Rimbey, the RCMP patrol part of our area, and the ambulance from Rimbey comes to our area also. Of course, much of our northeast farming community also uses the Rimbey area. Eckville always has been part of the Rocky Mountain House constituency and also Bentley.

Council believes that the Electoral Boundaries Commission's proposed boundaries will create a certain amount of division within the constituency due to the lack of commonality whereas our proposed amended boundaries will build on regional relationships. We do a fair amount of work with our partners to the east in the county of Lacombe, the town of Eckville, and the town of Bentley. Even in the counties of Ponoka and Red Deer we do a fair amount of regional partnerships. I believe also that if you're looking at the green and red sections of the map, the population numbers are very similar. I think that they run in the 39,000 to 40,000 area.

With the changes that we have here, I think it helps our MLA, our representative, to centralize and helps with the travel. It's a very

large constituency. You'll see that it goes west pretty much to the boundary. We have an increasing population also in Nordegg, so it will take more time in the future. It certainly is a large area for the MLA to travel. Clearwater county council's concerns lie within the alignment of communities which share little in common in terms of regional interests, commerce, industry, trade, and travel corridors as well as interaction.

On behalf of Clearwater county and the residents I respectfully request that the commission reconsider their initial proposal and positively support our proposed amendments to the constituency boundaries. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you.  
Brian.

**Mr. Evans:** Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, Reeve Alexander. Looking at your green and our red, as you said, there aren't a huge number of differences there. I'd be curious, though, about the boundaries of Clearwater county. Did they reflect the green area, or are you leaving out some areas of the county? Are you adding in other areas that are not part of the county?

2:15

**Mr. Alexander:** Yeah, we're adding in. If you look at the north, the west, and the south, basically that's the Clearwater county boundary. When you get to the east side, we move in and take in Rimbey and about six miles east of Rimbey and then run south along Gull Lake. It takes in part of the county of Ponoka, and when you're into Gull Lake, it takes in the county of Lacombe. Eckville is in the county of Lacombe.

**Mr. Evans:** Have you had any discussions with either of those counties relative to your proposal?

**Mr. Alexander:** Yes, we have. I met with the mayor of Rimbey and discussed with him what I would be proposing here today. He was not opposed. You know, from that perspective I'll let him pass on his thoughts on it.

**Mr. Evans:** Certainly. I'm curious why on the southwest you've indicated that the boundary would end before Saskatchewan River Crossing and the Jasper-Banff highway because there's virtually no population other than at Saskatchewan River Crossing.

**Mr. Alexander:** I can't give you a good answer on why that is. There is no population out there, you're right. It's basically the boundary . . .

**Mr. Evans:** It's the provincial boundary.

**Mr. Alexander:** The park boundary, yeah.

**Mr. Evans:** Yeah, at Saskatchewan River Crossing. It would seem to me that that would make sense as we thought it did when we constructed that provincial boundary.

**Mr. Alexander:** Yeah, that's fine. I think they just went to the park boundary, but it would be fine.

**Mr. Evans:** Just to the park boundary. Okay. Thank you very much. Those are my questions. I appreciate that.

**Mr. Alexander:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Allyson?

**Ms Jeffs:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much, Reeve Alexander, for coming. I'm shuffling a few papers here because I'm looking at a proposal that we had from Ty Lund this morning looking at a similar configuration. It looks like, if it's not the same, it's very, very close. Do you know if this is the same?

**Mr. Alexander:** It should be the same.

**Ms Jeffs:** It should be the same. All right. So this is in support of that as well?

**Mr. Alexander:** Yes, ma'am.

**Ms Jeffs:** It's a mutual agreement as far as that goes. All right. We went over it in quite some detail this morning. I don't have any other questions, but thank you for that. I wanted to make sure we weren't missing a line or dotting a T.

Thank you.

**Mr. Alexander:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Peter.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Reeve Alexander, we heard this morning from a presenter who lives in the Gull Lake area, and I'd like to ask you for your comments on some suggestions we heard. The suggestion we heard from the presenter this morning asked us to think about the lakes to ensure that they fall entirely within one constituency or another. Our understanding is that the proposal that you're presenting would have the eastern boundary of the new Rocky Mountain House-Olds constituency be along the eastern shore of Gull Lake. There appear to be some developments, though, along that shore. Would you be opposed to having the boundary moved far enough east to make sure those developments were included?

**Mr. Alexander:** I think that would be fine. I know the developments you're referring to. I think it would be fine. I think they chose the lake just as a marker. The fifth meridian is also very close, but then that goes basically through the lake.

**Mr. Dobbie:** So, again, there isn't a compelling reason you're aware of to not include any development along the eastern shore of the lake within the proposed Rocky Mountain House-Olds constituency?

**Mr. Alexander:** From my perspective and Clearwater county's perspective I would not see a problem with that.

**Mr. Dobbie:** My next question relates to Sylvan Lake. This proposal divides it up. I understand that the county boundaries actually run through the lake. Is that correct?

**Mr. Alexander:** Yeah.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Is that the basis for this proposed alignment?

**Mr. Alexander:** I think that in consultation with some of the other communities that seemed to be the preferred routing, what is there on the green now. I think it does go through the centre of the lake. My eyes aren't as good as they should be.

**Mr. Dobbie:** I can hand you a copy, sir, of the map we received from Mr. Lund this morning that may make it easier for you to see where the boundary runs.

**Mr. Alexander:** Maybe that will make it a little bit easier. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Dobbie:** If your proposal mirrors that of Mr. Lund, my next question to you. If we adopt the suggestion that we should keep a lake within a constituency so that we don't have MLAs with a split opinion over what should happen at a lake, one recommendation would be to have the boundary of your constituency moved far enough west to ensure that all of Sylvan Lake was included in the Sylvan Lake constituency. You may not have considered that, but today do you have an opinion as to whether that would create a problem for you?

**Mr. Alexander:** No, I don't believe it would. I think that including Sylvan Lake, like if we had gone straight south there – they have a fast growing population; it's 11,000 people – it would have put the numbers of this constituency fairly high at that point.

**Mr. Dobbie:** But moving the boundary further west to exclude the entire lake is not problematic from your perspective?

**Mr. Alexander:** No.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, sir. The only other comment I would make is that I have to take what you say very seriously because my sons are named Patrick and Alexander. So I take your comments very seriously. Thank you.

**Mr. Alexander:** Thank you.

**Dr. Archer:** Thanks, Reeve Alexander. As others have said, your proposal is consistent with others we've reviewed in the last day or so. So I think we've gone through most of the major issues, and really we're at that point of tweaking and making sure that we understand what the key items are to include on one side of a line or another.

If I can just follow up on some of Peter's comments, then. What I take your comment to be with respect to Gull Lake is to include all of Gull Lake and its surrounding developments within the constituency of Rocky Mountain House – the net result may well be to push it a little bit farther east than the line as we see it because the line looks like it uses the waterline as the demarcation, so to find a roadway that is a little bit east of the development in the community would make sense – and that the community of Bentley should remain within Rocky Mountain House. Consequently, that would suggest that we shouldn't use the boundary between Lacombe county and Ponoka county as a divider. I take that from both of the maps that are provided.

Then with Sylvan Lake – and that's the one that's a little bit problematic now – to include all of the lake and its surrounding developments outside of the Rocky Mountain House constituency. So rather than having the boundary go through the lake, find a way that we're able to include, on the one hand, Bentley but not exclude areas on the northern reaches of Sylvan Lake. From the maps that we have, it doesn't appear that there's an obvious road or other natural boundary there, but it may be that if we had a more detailed map of that area, we'd be able to find a demarcation point that made sense.

**Mr. Alexander:** I know on the north side of Sylvan Lake there's Rainy Creek Road, which is a paved highway. They call it Rainy Creek. I can't tell you the number on it.

**Dr. Archer:** Okay. That may be a useful boundary.

**Mr. Alexander:** Yeah. It goes right on the north side of Sylvan, and it joins with highway 766, which goes into Eckville.

**Dr. Archer:** Okay. Well, great. That's very helpful. Then you were saying that if these changes were adopted, the constituency would be somewhere between 39,000 and 40,000 people?

**Mr. Alexander:** Yes. Now, if you changed the boundaries at the lake, I don't think the population is that great along the east shore, but I know there is development all along the shore there and that, actually, right on the east side of the lake is what they call the Lincoln road, which is another paved highway that goes from highway 12 north to highway 53. It's a highway that goes straight through, north and south.

**Dr. Archer:** Right. Okay. That's all the comments that I have. Thank you.

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

Reeve Alexander, thank you so much for coming and for your input. It's a pleasure seeing you here.

**Mr. Alexander:** Thank you. I enjoyed it. Good to see you again.

**The Chair:** All right. Our next speaker is not here. We're running a little ahead of time, so we'll take a short adjournment and proceed when our speaker gets here.

[The hearing adjourned from 2:25 p.m. to 3:37 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Welcome.

**Mr. Marz:** Well, thank you. I guess I'm a little bit early, but that's a habit of mine.

**The Chair:** We're running a little early. If you would just, before you start speaking, identify yourself for our record there, and then we can move on and hear what you have to say.

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

**Mr. Marz:** Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Richard Marz. I'm from Three Hills, Alberta, and I'm the MLA for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. It's a pleasure to be here this afternoon. I appreciate the work that this committee is doing. I can understand that it's not easy redrawing all the boundaries every eight years and making everyone happy with it, but I guess that's why we're here.

You all have a copy of my presentation? That's good. I did consult with a number of the municipalities in the constituency of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. I also consulted with my colleagues in the central Alberta region. There seems to be some general concern about the initial proposal in the first draft. One of the things, going through the book, was to keep trading patterns and communities kind of together, so we were a bit surprised when we saw the boundary split the communities that are on highway 2 like Crossfield, Carstairs, Didsbury, and Olds. It's been my experience as an MLA



that people are creatures of habit, and if they've voted in the same community – not only in the same community; I've found that people voted in the same town at the Legion for 15 years – and suddenly are told they have to go two blocks down to the church on the other side of the street, it has actually caused some people to go home and not vote at all.

I think what we want to do is make it easy for people to vote, and we want them to get out to vote and not have to go to a community that they don't normally go to. Splitting communities on a major connector road like highway 2A is not a natural boundary; it's a natural connector road that connects communities together. In the situation of Olds, Didsbury, Carstairs, and even Crossfield, which is not currently in the area of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, they have regional waterlines and are looking at regional waste-water lines. Also, in the more eastern part Acme and Carbon and Linden are kind of linked to the areas of Beiseker and Irricana with the regional waterline as well.

We recognize in meeting with the municipalities that there have to be some changes to increase the size of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills because the numbers are lower. I recognize in meeting with my colleague Dr. Morton that he also needs to increase his size. With Airdrie-Chestermere, when I initially consulted with Rob Anderson from Airdrie-Chestermere, his area was much larger and needed to be reduced. His initial suggestion to me back when we made our first submissions – I think that if you look back at that, his submission and mine were quite similar in reducing the size of Airdrie-Chestermere in the rural part to the east and north of Airdrie to go in with Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills because there are linkages between communities, not just waterlines but also recreational facilities between Beiseker, Acme. One has got a pool; one has got an arena. The communities of Linden to Irricana actually share those types of things. So it's easy when they want to get their MLA together. Those communities know each other and are more apt to show up to meetings that are common to all of them.

As constituencies grow, we're going to find, too, that it's much more difficult to get MLAs together just because of the time constraints. I'm not sure if you've heard that it's much easier to be an MLA today because of the electronic era that we live in. Well, I will argue that actually the electronic media has made it much more difficult to be an MLA because people don't just contact their MLA for things that they would normally contact them for. It's so easy, because a lot of people live on those computers, that they contact them with everything that goes through their minds. I've found that the amount of contacts I have, or hits, has increased exponentially in the last five years as more and more people of my vintage, who are tending to retire and wanting to be part of the process, get a computer and start talking to our MLA through that computer.

It's a little different talking to an MLA face to face than it is over a computer because if you happen to hit your thumb with a hammer just before getting on the computer, your mood isn't exactly that pleasant. So an MLA has to be a little more tactful in dealing with some of these things. There is a barrage of them, and I can tell you that it's a lot more difficult in the last five years than it was in the previous, I guess, eight that I was there so far. I've really noticed that.

We are growing. We're getting more people, and I recognize that we need to meet this population criteria.

In meeting with some of the municipalities – I sent an invitation to all of them; they didn't all show up. The ones more in Rocky View and Mountain View showed up. There wasn't unanimous agreement on this, but there was a general consensus. Some people feel: well, I like this MLA better than that MLA, so that's the way

I want the boundaries drawn. But this isn't about MLAs. It's about, whoever the MLA, being able to provide the best service to the people in the area, and it's also providing some ease for people in that area to contact their MLA and to vote and be part of the process.

What I came up with after consultation with those municipalities you see on the maps before you. Everyone has the map I sent? It reduces the geographic size of Airdrie quite a bit, but in consultation with the reeve of Rocky View, that area 7 is an area that they are looking to grow to, and Airdrie is a very fast growing community. They feel that even if their numbers with this reduction are slightly down, it will fill up within the next eight years and probably be, again, over the numbers of the average.

3:45

Now, we're not expecting this to be written in stone. There was some discussion in areas in the green diagonal from bottom to top, right to left, which would be Foothills-Rocky View, that perhaps that line could be drawn straight across polling area 4 and include the north part of areas 1, 2, and 3. It probably wouldn't increase the numbers that much, but it would kind of square off the area.

Even at this, this would be adding three new municipalities to deal with and one more school board, and it may still keep the area of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills slightly under the 41,000. The numbers we got from Beiseker and Irricana were roughly about 2,000 people, maybe slightly over, and whatever Crossfield was. I just forget at the moment, but I think it was around maybe 2,500 or something like that. You're looking at adding roughly 4,000 or 5,000 to 34,500, so you're up around the 39,000 but under 10 per cent variance. Looking at it just from a geographic standpoint to serve, there are quite a few more. That would be three more into the 10 or 11 that already are in that riding, so you're looking at quite a few more communities to serve.

One thing I wanted to point out, too, in Drumheller. That is an area that I have a boundary butting right up against. Drumheller is not in the riding of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, but the boundary is close, and it is the service area for that southeast corner of the riding. I do get invited to a lot of events in Drumheller because that's where the people are that I serve. We had a real difficult time last time because they traditionally vote in Drumheller, but they weren't allowed to this last time because the Chief Electoral Officer wasn't initially allowing it, and it took a lot of negotiation for that to happen. When we see that same type of thing happening in Innisfail, in Olds, in Didsbury, in Carstairs, in Crossfield, this could be quite an onerous thing to happen, dividing communities like that, and that seemed to be quite a shock.

The other thing you'll probably find interesting. The calls I got after your initial report came out were asking why I am doing this. I pointed out to them, looking at the book, that I appeared to be the only one from the riding that actually made a presentation, and it wasn't an MLA consultation; it was a public consultation. That isn't understood clearly, and I don't know how much communication you could possibly do to ever make it clearly understood. We don't do this this often or often enough for it to be clearly understood. It's just not something people pay a lot of attention to, so it does fall on people, I suppose, like myself and people like yourself, that work with it more often. Municipal people tend to get a little more involved in it because they deal with people like myself on an ongoing basis.

With that, I'll stop talking for a while and let you ask some questions. Maybe we can get down to some of your concerns more about my presentation. I'm sure you've read it all and looked at the map.

**The Chair:** We have, and we are certainly getting a pretty clear message that the people liked the east-west alignment. We're getting a pretty clear message on these points.

**Dr. Archer:** Thanks, Mr. Marz. I appreciate your submission and your appearance before us today.

I'm just looking at the map as it currently exists, not our proposal but the map for the current riding. The starting point for us: in the household that we mailed out back it must have been sometime in August, I think we had a population in this riding of 34,517, which put it at about 16 per cent below. Now, we haven't adjusted those numbers based upon the current riding to know whether the growth patterns have changed those for now. But with our current electoral quotient of 40,880 that put it 16 per cent below, which for us was certainly towards the high end of things.

Given its relatively small size for a largely rural constituency, you know, there seemed to be an argument in favour of adding some population. The proposal that you've provided, as I understand it, is to add population largely in the area just north and east of Airdrie. You indicated that that would bring in somewhere between 4,000 and 5,000 people, probably bring it up to about 39,000 or so. That would certainly be very consistent with the kinds of targets that we would have in mind, I think, for a riding of this kind.

Do you know if that would have a significant impact on the Rocky View populations? It may be a hard question to answer because once we create a constituency to respond to the dramatic growth in Airdrie and make a largely urban constituency there, that has such a big impact on all of the surrounding constituencies. But given your understanding of the demographics in this area, particularly in the proposal that you've brought forward, do you have a sense as to how Foothills-Rocky View would turn out as well?

**Mr. Marz:** We would be adding part of the Airdrie-Chestermere area to Foothills-Rocky View. It would probably put that riding at 41,000 to slightly above that. They might be slightly above that. But if you also look at the riding, they have fewer municipalities within it. First of all, they'd be dealing with one rural municipality. Turner Valley and Black Diamond would no longer be dealing with Crossfield. They may have a few more numbers but a few less entities to deal with and only one school board. We felt that there should be a consideration given to that in the variance.

Also, in the variance legally you have 25 per cent plus/minus. Now, I recognize that you're also looking at eight years. You don't want the numbers that you come up with to be out of whack, above that 25 per cent plus/minus variance, in the eight years. You know, as we're looking at the growth, many people in Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills felt that the 16 per cent, without touching it at all, would be within that 25 per cent eight years down the road, especially the way the corridor is growing in those towns of Carstairs, Crossfield, Didsbury, and Olds, but it would create a bigger population burden for Foothills-Rocky View.

We felt that by moving into Foothills-Rocky View, once the Chestermere part of Airdrie-Chestermere was taken out and added, it basically fell to the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills riding and Foothills-Rocky View riding to take the bulk of the Airdrie-Chestermere riding. We felt that between those three ridings we could come up with satisfying the variance numbers.

3:55

All the colleagues that met with their municipal people around us felt they had solutions for you that I'm sure they'll be presenting either verbally or in written form or both. If we just left them alone, they could come up with some solutions that would help you out.

Leaving this to these three ridings here, we could solve the problem within the three and still keep communities, voting patterns and recreational patterns and shopping patterns and business patterns, commerce patterns, municipal patterns relatively intact.

**Dr. Archer:** Great. Thanks very much. The proposal that you're bringing forward is certainly consistent with a number of the other proposals we've heard over the last couple of days. Thank you.

**Mr. Marz:** Good. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Peter.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Marz, for coming down and seeing us. We met with Reeve Habberfield from Rocky View county on Monday morning in Calgary, and I understand from discussing matters with her that there is an annexation that essentially is by consent from Rocky View county into Airdrie. Her proposal to us is that the northern boundary of the Foothills-Rocky View constituency would be basically a quarter section south of township road 274. Just so I'm clear on the record, is that the southern boundary that you're proposing for us? Those are congruent?

**Mr. Marz:** My initial proposal before I met with Lois and the other municipal people was a little different than what you see here. This adjustment was made based on the advice she gave me to take in that concern of hers. I also assured her that the constituency boundaries don't really affect annexations or anything of that nature; they are two unrelated issues. She seemed to be comfortable with that, but this basically reflects what she told me. I adjusted my maps after meeting with her to meet those concerns. I left her, actually, copies, so I think hers should be relatively the same unless she changed her mind since we talked.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you. Again, I just wanted to put to you that the quarter section south of 274, certainly, is identifiable to me if I was driving by, and it's what you understand.

**Mr. Marz:** This map actually geographically connects the proposed constituency we have before us here of Foothills-Rocky View without driving through the city of Calgary, but there are a number of connector roads that the MLA for Foothills-Rocky View could access through the city of Calgary with relative ease to serve both sides of that. Calgary is the big centre of Foothills-Rocky View. Rocky View's municipal building is in the city of Calgary, so the MLA for that region, whether he lives in the region or not – and currently the MLA for Foothills-Rocky View, which is Dr. Morton, lives in Calgary. Many of the things that he would be dealing with probably would take place in the city relative to that proposed constituency.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you. You started out your presentation by talking about the challenge in having constituents understand the process for electoral boundary reform, and I wanted to clarify for you our understanding of the flexibility we have with respect to the variance from the quotient of 40,880. Certainly, by law the legislation permits us up to 25 per cent, but the Supreme Court was quite clear that there needs to be an analysis and a clear basis for any material deviation. It may be that you understand this, but I want it on the record that MLAs need to be aware that we simply cannot accept a variation without coming up with a reason for a significant variation. Those include a number of factors that are listed in the

act, which essentially is our statutory incorporation of the direction from the Supreme Court. We are directed by the court to make a very principled basis for change.

Dr. Archer earlier today had done a really good summary explaining how we got to the interim report in the central Alberta area. Again, for your background information, one consideration we had is that since the growth is along the highway 2 corridor, by moving boundaries towards it, we're able to not create large constituencies along the very western and eastern boundaries of the province. What seems to have happened is that that approach does work with the numbers but at the cost of really interfering with existing voting patterns, trading relationships, so the benefits obtained are outweighed by the costs incurred.

It's been very helpful to get as much feedback as we have received. It does appear that throughout this area enough changes are being recommended that it does give us flexibility. If we only had one problem, we would have a real challenge fixing it, but by creating seven or eight, we've got more room to work with. Thank you for the clear input you've given us.

**Mr. Marz:** If I may comment. Yes, I'm familiar with the Supreme Court ruling, and I understand the challenges, and hopefully we did address the issues that were raised through the Supreme Court ruling in justifying the new proposal that we have here.

The other thing I'd say on the initial draft in the book is that it would make a riding of roughly 40,000 people, with a quarter of it in the north part of Red Deer. One of the issues I find in talking to people, like in the current riding of Airdrie-Chestermere, is that a lot of the demands on an MLA's time lie within that huge urban area, and it becomes difficult to give – I was going to say equitable – a fair amount of time to the other regions.

Even with a community like Olds, which has a college in it, there's a disproportionate amount of demand on an MLA's time in areas that have postsecondary institutions in them. I have also a private one in Three Hills, the Prairie Bible Institute, although it doesn't seem to demand as much time. But it does make you really conscious of how you're going to get out to the areas like Carbon and Acme and those types of areas. They deserve a portion of your time, too. So you're always looking for those days that you might want to take off: well, I'd better take a tour and just talk to people in those areas.

That's why I brought it up. It's adding another rural municipality, Foothills, to Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. It's not much of it – it's a small part – but it's adding three urban centres: Crossfield, Beiseker, and Irricana. They do things together, but they each have a council that wants to see their MLA. It also adds another school board. In Foothills-Rocky View it's a different school division. They tend to not demand a lot of your time if you have just a little bit, but they do expect you to meet with them from time to time.

I know that from my municipal years, when Nigel Pengelly had a little bit of Kneehill. It was only a few miles, but he still had that area. There were no towns in it, but we felt as a council that he was obligated, because he was our MLA, to hear our concerns, too. So we made sure he got an invitation, and through a sense of duty he made sure he showed up. That's just the way it is.

But it's a good point. We hope we've addressed those concerns that you raised.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Allyson.

**Ms Jeffs:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you very much, Mr. Marz, for coming. I have trouble reading this map, that I think was sent in, but this is essentially the same thing. This is the map from what's been identified to us as the government caucus proposal for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. It does look like it's Crossfield-Beiseker-Irricana coming in. I want to make sure we don't have competing maps here.

**Mr. Marz:** We might have because some of these change with every meeting. I actually have colour copies here.

**Ms Jeffs:** That would be even more helpful.

**Mr. Marz:** Basically, that's it. I'll give you each a copy of this in colour. There's a little legend I have, actually, as well. For *Hansard's* benefit, I'm distributing colour copies of my proposal.

4:05

**Ms Jeffs:** Thank you very much for that.

**Mr. Marz:** It's a throwback to my artistic days in grade school. I just liked to doodle.

**Ms Jeffs:** Colouring is very relaxing.

Thank you very much for that because – I'll only speak for myself – I find it hard to conceptualize in terms of the electoral polls, but this sort of identifies the communities and what you're adding. I just wanted to make sure that the maps are essentially the same.

You had mentioned that you had had an opportunity to seek commentary from some of the municipalities. Can you tell us which are on page or were able to give you feedback on this? I think you mentioned that some could and some couldn't.

**Mr. Marz:** Yes. The meeting we had was in the county office of Mountain View. Representatives from Irricana and Beiseker, the Foothills municipality, Mountain View were there, and we had some previous input from some of the towns. I believe the mayor of Didsbury was there, and someone from Carstairs was there as well.

**Ms Jeffs:** This is their preferred option as well for this proposal?

**Mr. Marz:** Well, Carstairs didn't have a problem with the existing one. They indicated that they could support this, too, but that they'd have to take it back to their council. It was pointed out, too, at the meeting that if everybody sends in a different proposal, it's not a whole lot of help to you people. We didn't expect unanimity, but we felt that if we could get a consensus – I don't think you'll ever expect unanimity either. It is something I believe they could work with, and they understood the issues.

**Ms Jeffs:** That sounds great. Did you hear from Crossfield on this one way or another?

**Mr. Marz:** You mean, where I live?

**Ms Jeffs:** I think you mentioned you heard from Beiseker and Irricana, but I didn't know if we'd heard from Crossfield on this as they're one of the communities.

**Mr. Marz:** I don't have the minutes of the meeting with me. They weren't distributed to me beforehand. I think somebody from Crossfield was there, but I can't remember for sure.

**Ms Jeffs:** It doesn't sound like they voiced opposition to this.

**Mr. Marz:** Certainly, Foothills was there.

**Ms Jeffs:** Okay. That's very helpful.

Just an issue following up a little bit on some of the other comments on the plus or minus 25 per cent. In addition to sort of having the court decisions to deal with, we've increasingly been hearing from Albertans who, you know, while recognizing that that is the outside of the envelope, would really like us to try and not treat that as a goal but actually have a goal of coming much closer to the average, and that's a little bit about what we've been trying to achieve. Certainly, we've had this consistent message about the east-west connections. It causes us a little bit of a problem on the east and west outside edges of the province because some of those ridings, you know, have very few people: lots of territory and very few people out that way. So one of the thoughts was that if we could divide closer to the highway 2 corridor, then we could try and balance that off, but I know that hasn't gone over well with people.

**Mr. Marz:** I don't want it to sound like I'm just an advocate for rural Alberta, but in talking to my colleagues for years, there is quite a difference between how an MLA works in rural Alberta and how they do in the major cities. For one thing, the obvious thing is that there is much more travelling time. It takes time to travel. But everybody knows you. As a result of everybody knowing you, even though it's a much broader area with many more communities, your dance card is full, I guess, whereas some of my colleagues that I think are well known say that they could go to a coffee shop in the middle of their riding and that nobody would recognize them unless they're a minister. I even had colleagues that were ministers who said that when they walk down the street, people walk past and don't even know who they are unless they're political animals.

In rural Alberta it takes a lot of time to get from point A to point B. People stop you on the street and talk about their issues whenever they see you. It's just the way it is. I think it's a good thing myself, but it is a time-consuming thing.

**Ms Jeffs:** I agree that that's probably a little more rare in the cities although I believe that former councillor Michael Phair used to have that problem quite a bit, but he'd been at it for a while.

Those are all my questions. Thanks again very much for coming today.

**Mr. Marz:** I think city officials are different than provincial ones.

**Ms Jeffs:** That's true.

**The Chair:** Brian.

**Mr. Evans:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks very much, MLA Marz, for your presentation. You've obviously put a lot of time and effort into making sure that your view was a view that had been discussed, and as has already been mentioned by my colleagues here at the front of the room, we've had a lot of positive comment about what you've been proposing here. You know, we received your map in colour from Lois Habberfield, for example, with very positive comments about what you were proposing.

In terms of just Mountain View county I'm curious about how much of it is within your proposed alignment and how much would be out. Even if it's just percentagewise, if you could give us some indication.

**Mr. Marz:** The amount of Mountain View that is in the current proposal is the same that is existing now. Basically, I have all of Mountain View county with the exception of the Sundre area, that's basically split off down highway 22. At highway 27 it jogs over to the Eagle Hill Road and goes up to Eagle Hill. It goes down highway 22 to what we call the Westcott Road. The Westcott Road stops there, but the line, if it went straight, would go west. All that area you see at the bottom part in sections 10 and 9 and 7 is the Water Valley-Cremona area. Then the part that's excluded is Sundre out there. Ideally, I would have liked to have just added that area to the riding, and that probably would have satisfied the numbers, too, but that throws everybody else out of whack in the Rocky Mountain House area. My colleague Ty and I have known each other probably as long as I've known you, and people deal back and forth with both of us.

It's currently a situation that works well for constituents because it's closer for them to go into Olds, so they do. Instead of sending them back to Rocky Mountain House, we just deal with their issue and advise Ty, and I'm sure he does the same with neighbouring things. But that doesn't say that that dynamic is going to be there after any election because elections change things. People change, and parties change. I mean, ridings can be held by different parties. You might not have that dynamic.

Basically, the riding is quite simple the way it currently exists. It's all of Kneehill county and almost all of Mountain View county with the exception of the Sundre area. Of course, that was my first thing: oh, we may as well just add the rest of Rocky View, and it would make life easy for whomever happens to be the MLA after the next election. But life is never simple.

4:15

**Mr. Evans:** Just to be clear, you have met with MLA Morton as well in terms of this configuration, which really gives MLA Morton a horseshoe? I recall my conversation with Reeve Habberfield about accessing from the south of that constituency through to the east side. Her comment was: well, you know, with the southeast ring road now getting closer to commencement of construction, it's going to make it even easier, but you could also bypass Calgary at the south. I presume that you've had robust conversations and that this is an alignment that works as well for Dr. Morton.

**Mr. Marz:** A good description. We've had many robust conversations. Actually, he was invited also to the meeting at Mountain View county. He agreed that this or something close to this would be suitable to him, but he had to go down to visit his mother, who had had some health issues when that meeting was on. He gave it his blessing, and he said that he wouldn't be putting forth an oral presentation himself.

**Mr. Evans:** Okay. Those are all my questions. Thanks very much.

**Mr. Marz:** Thank you.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Just one quick follow-up if I could.

**The Chair:** Is it necessary?

**Mr. Dobbie:** I think it will be helpful for Mr. Marz to know.

**The Chair:** All right.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Marz, we did hear from Jim Allison and Martin Bumstead this afternoon. Just so you

know, Mr. Allison may be giving us information as to his suggestions as a former returning officer about carving out part of that southeast corner of your constituency. If you know him, you may want to just converse with him and have some input into those suggestions because we've invited him to do that.

**Mr. Marz:** Yeah. I know him well.

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

**The Chair:** I'm glad you asked that.

**Mr. Marz:** He's in my constituency. I know him well.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you very much. That was very helpful. We appreciate that. We have a lot of reviewing to do with what we've received here.

**Mr. Marz:** I have a much larger copy in colour, and it bends when I put it in my briefcase, so I'll leave it with you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** That would be great because we can get a colour copier, and we'll get that copied. Thank you so much.

**Mr. Marz:** Thank you, and all the best in your deliberations.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

All right. Melanie, do we have further presenters before 6?

**Ms Friesacher:** No.

**The Chair:** All right. We'll, then, adjourn till 6 o'clock.

[The hearing adjourned at 4:18 p.m.]





