



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Lethbridge

Monday, April 26, 2010
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-18

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
Deputy Chief Electoral Officer

Brian Fjeldheim
Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

R. Shawn Patience, Mayor, Town of Fort Macleod

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

9 a.m.

Monday, April 26, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. 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: Dr. Keith Archer of Banff on my far right, next to him Peter Dobbie of Vegreville, then to my left Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton, and next to her Brian Evans of Calgary.

As you are aware, the five of us have spent the last seven months reviewing the electoral boundaries of our province, and I can tell you that we have examined every square inch of the map of Alberta. I know I speak for all of us 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 have read close to 500 submissions and are looking forward to additional feedback during this hearing. Once we have considered this feedback, the commission will issue its final report by July of this year.

With that, I am pleased to touch on a few of our findings and recommendations setting out the boundaries, areas, and names of the 87 electoral divisions we propose for Alberta together with our reasons for the proposals as outlined in the interim report you have hopefully all had a chance to read. I can tell you that the foundation for our decisions has been effective representation for all Albertans.

In undertaking its work, the commission has been guided by the requirements of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, relevant decisions of the courts, advice received during the first round of public hearings and in written submissions as well as the census information available to us.

When I speak of the census information, I'm referring to the 2009 municipal census data for Alberta's cities, which shows that 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 considered by the commission is 3,556,583. Given the 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. This would ensure effective representation across the province.

Now, the commission is required by law to divide the existing Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo division. Its population is more than 88 per cent higher than the quotient, and the law prohibits the commission from recommending a division which has a population more than 25 per cent above the quotient.

How did we make these recommendations outlined in the interim report? In our efforts to respect 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

of the average population per division. The average population per electoral division from the quotient is from plus 4.3 per cent in Calgary, 0.7 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 and 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 the extensive written legal descriptions previously used.

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

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

Now that I have briefly reviewed our recommendations, we want to hear your views. We believe that what we hear from you, the people who will be affected by these boundary changes, is critical to recommending a new electoral map that will ensure fair and effective representation for all Albertans. I will now call upon our staff to announce the first speaker. Each speaker will have 10 minutes to present and then 10 minutes for questions and answers with the commission.

The commission's public meetings are being recorded by *Alberta Hansard*, and the audio recording will be posted to the commission website; transcripts of these proceedings will also be available online.

If you have registered as a presenter or choose to participate in the meeting, we ask that you identify yourself for the record prior to starting your presentation.

At this point, to give the staff and the presenters a little time to organize, we're going to take a short adjournment.

[The hearing adjourned from 9:08 a.m. to 9:56 a.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our first presenter is Mayor Shawn Patience with Fort Macleod.

The Chair: Mr. Mayor, welcome. Since we're being recorded by *Hansard*, would you be so kind as to give your name and position so it can be on record?

Mr. Patience: My name is Shawn Patience, and I am the mayor of the town of Fort Macleod.

The Chair: Thank you. Please proceed.

**R. Shawn Patience, Mayor
Town of Fort Macleod**

Mr. Patience: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity. I've been in municipal politics for a very long time, and I think this is the fourth time I've presented in front of one of these boundary hearings. I hope this one is more successful than the previous ones, by the way. I realize this is a tough position for you individuals to be in, and I hope you keep an open mind as you go through this process. I'm sure you will.

You have in front of you the hard copy of a letter that was prepared on our behalf. Yes? I'm not going to read it verbatim. I don't like it when people do that when I'm sitting there. You can read that, certainly, afterwards. I'm going to just quickly run through the crux of our presentation.

We understand that with population shifts and with the growth that the province has seen, there's a requirement to look at existing electoral boundaries and to certainly try to make allowances for the extreme growth that the larger centres have seen in Alberta. That said, though, myself and my council are not of the belief that the constant juggling of rural constituencies is the way to approach this. In a nutshell, we'd far prefer to see additional constituencies added to those urban areas without a lot of shifts to rural constituencies. I say that having been very much a part of politics in Livingstone-Macleod and the previous Pincher Creek-Macleod and the Macleod constituencies. I know how relationships are forged amongst communities.

The proposal that we see before us in terms of the proposed High River-Crowsnest constituency makes a couple of adjustments that are fairly significant. The main one is the addition of the town of High River on the north end of this constituency. I'm certainly here to say that we have no issue with the people of High River – good and well and true, all of them – but, certainly, the inclusion of High River in this constituency brings into the fold another set of challenges that we currently don't necessarily face. I believe it's a challenge that any MLA is going to have to work with should this proposal be approved. The town of High River has seen tremendous growth issues and has very much become a satellite community of commuters to the city of Calgary, a different mindset and certainly a different set of economic issues than the rest of this constituency currently contains.

That said, we have spent a long time in our area trying to forge bonds through regional economic development alliances. We sit currently with almost every municipal council on a regular basis, or at least members of those councils, through Alberta southwest, have forged very strong bonds, and that relationship has worked well because we have very similar interests and very similar challenges.

That said, I would suggest and it's our council's suggestion that

if an adjustment needs to be made to Livingstone-Macleod, this panel and the province ultimately should be considering the addition of Mountain View, Cardston on the south end as opposed to High River on the north end. The similarities are certainly there in our communities. We currently have a lot in common. We meet regularly. Our MLA is certainly aware of all the issues in that area because they're the same issues we deal with in our constituency.

We feel that if you look at the map before you – and I understand the commission's desire to use physical boundaries, existing ones that may make for ease of adjustment – you'll notice that the western boundary of the Blood reserve has a very small sliver of land that slices up into it, which was done to accommodate the Cardston-Taber-Warner constituency in one of the last adjustments. Those communities are our neighbours, and they certainly share everything that we share. They have the same interests. They have the same goals. They have the same challenges.

I would suggest and we would suggest that if there needs to be an addition to our constituency to accommodate population and/or area values that the commission look very strongly at using that Blood reserve western and southern border as the boundary for this constituency adjustment. It would make it not only easier for our MLA, who already has significant challenges in this very large and very diverse constituency; it would continue natural ties that we already have. I think that's very important from an MLA's perspective. This is not an urban riding, where you have one parade, for instance, or one Remembrance Day ceremony. They are many and varied, and it's already very huge and very much a challenge for an MLA to deal with, not just in terms of challenges of those communities or goals but in terms of the raw physical area and the size that has to be dealt with.

We're here to suggest that if adjustments need to be made, we would certainly prefer them to be in the urban areas to make more ridings in Calgary and Edmonton, and make little adjustment to the rural constituencies. If it needs to be done, maybe let's use a common-sense approach and use that Blood reserve boundary to bring some communities into the Livingstone-Macleod fold that already have very similar characteristics.

That said, the third point I want to make – and being the mayor of the town of Fort Macleod, this probably will not come as a surprise – is that we are taking some slight bit of offence to the proposal to remove the name "Macleod" from the constituency. We're a very proud community that very much embellishes and embodies the history of not only our community but the province of Alberta. The name Macleod has been synonymous with that constituency since the advent of this province in 1905. Even through the adjustments in 1993 and 2004 the name Macleod remained with the constituency. We believe that as the oldest town in this province and, really, one of the founding communities that made this province grow and got it off the ground in the very early years, it would be very much – how do I put this in polite terms? – a bit of a slap in the face to the history of our province to remove Macleod from the constituency moniker.

I bring to you those three points for consideration. I would ask you to keep an open mind as you go through your deliberations. I'm certainly here to answer any questions that the panel may have of me.

The Chair: Certainly. Thank you very much. We appreciate your input, particularly on the name, because we had the privilege of hearing from Mr. Coutts, who gave us the history and again reinforced in our minds how central to the history of Alberta Macleod is.

Mr. Patience: I appreciate that.

The Chair: We're certainly going to be taking that into account. Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks very much, Mr. Patience, and thanks for the compliment about the work that we've done thus far. We're going to continue fine-tuning as we have this opportunity for the second round of public hearings.

I was going to make a comment, as the chairman did, about your former MLA, Dave Coutts, and the very positive presentation he made about the history of Colonel Macleod and the importance to this area. So we've heard that message loud and clear.

The second matter I guess some people would think is a little more like arithmetic, but the reason that the Blood reserve is now in Cardston-Taber-Warner is because of the population issues down in this part of the province. That's the same, quite frankly, for High River, incorporating the town of High River. For one thing, putting High River into Highwood would put its population quite substantially over the provincial average in an area that you recognized yourself is a very growing area and, you know, lots of people commuting all the way from High River into Calgary. Even though it's a robust agricultural area as well, there are quite a few people commuting, and that will continue to happen in the future.

10:05

In terms of the Blood reserve would it be your position that the residents of the reserve would have more comfort continuing to be in what we're calling High River-Crowsnest in our interim report as opposed to any connection with Cardston-Taber-Warner?

Mr. Patience: Obviously, we're just throwing out some options and suggestions, and we realize there's a formula to be dealt with here. I could debate the formula as well, but I'm choosing to stick to our constituency and its issues. I'm not suggesting bringing the Blood reserve into that constituency. I'm just simply suggesting that we utilize the western and southern boundaries as a physical border for a new proposed redrawing.

Mr. Evans: Okay. So you'd like to move that area along the Belly River to the current boundary back over right to the east to the Blood reserve?

Mr. Patience: Correct. I just think it makes sense because I know the commission is looking for reasonable options that would include obvious physical boundaries. Certainly, highway 2 would provide an eastern boundary for that proposed redraw as well.

We haven't pitched this to the town or the people of Cardston or Mountain View or anything along those lines. Looking at it in real terms, we understand the issues that High River has. I can say this: I've been involved in municipal politics since 1989; I have never had the opportunity or requirement to meet with the town council of the town of High River, to give you an example, where in the town of Cardston, for instance, we probably meet with representatives from Cardston 10 or 12 times a year.

It just shows you already the affiliation that's in place, and that affiliation is derived out of necessity because we do share a lot of similar interests and similar values to those people. Again, we have a regional economic development alliance that encompasses those communities. It does not encompass High River. Having to deal with various boundaries – whether it be school divisions, MDs, constituencies, federal electoral districts – becomes very confusing. The constant shift of constituencies is very confusing for many

people to deal with and certainly confusing for MLAs.

This constituency is very much a challenge. I have been strongly affiliated with provincial politics within the areas of this constituency, and I know the issues that are being dealt with there. It just seems to me and it seems to our council that High River's issues and challenges and strengths and goals are far better associated with those encompassing communities around the city of Calgary than they certainly are with the town of Lundbreck, for instance.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you very much. Those are my questions.

Mr. Patience: My pleasure.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms. Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mayor Patience, for coming. I'm sort of going to continue on the same theme. The challenge we have is that voter parity is not an absolute, but it is very, very important, and we are very challenged by the plateauing or declining population in some of the communities in the south. It's not just a matter of adding urban seats. It's a matter of relative voter parity, and we hear an awful lot about that as well.

Just, you know, as an explanation. My concern is that if we take that sliver away from Cardston-Taber-Warner – Cardston-Taber-Warner as proposed is already 9 per cent below the provincial average.

Mr. Patience: I understand that.

Ms. Jeffs: Do you have any sense as to where we might pick up some other population? It was a bit of a conundrum for us.

Mr. Patience: Well, actually, I don't know that it's my place and I'm certain that the leaders in those communities wouldn't think it my place to propose adjustments to Cardston-Taber-Warner except as it may affect our particular constituency.

I recognize the challenge, and I recognize the formula that's in place. As I said, I could probably strongly debate the formula and the intents behind it, but I understand that that combination of land mass and population certainly needs to be taken into consideration and the ability of an MLA to properly represent a constituency.

Now, we already have a very large constituency. By throwing in another very diverse set of challenges by the addition of a satellite community off Calgary, I honestly think that the quality of representation is certainly going to suffer regardless of the sitting MLA, and I think we need to understand that as we move forward. The role of government is to properly represent the people that have elected them. In the city of Calgary you might have a 16- or 20- or 40-square-block area that encompasses an entire constituency. Where I realize that there are population issues that need to be dealt with, I honestly think that we need to look at this in the clear light of day as well and to suggest that it's still a matter of providing proper representation.

You know, I don't want to stand here and suggest where the committee could make adjustments to Cardston-Taber-Warner. I truly don't. All I can suggest is that when we looked at this map, there seemed to be an obvious missing link on the south end, communities that we're already currently dealing with, where it seemed like a very workable and plausible option and it seemed to provide the physical boundaries the commission was looking for in terms of splitting that up and making the addition.

Ms Jeffs: Do you know what the population is in that little sliver that you've suggested?

Mr. Patience: I honestly don't. I mean, I know the community's population makeup, but I'm not certain of the rural makeup. I would guess it's in that 5,000 people mark probably, but it would be strictly a guess.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Yeah. I'm not sure that would be a trade-off with respect to High River.

I realize that, you know, there are certainly concerns about community of interest, but it is on the main road running north-south. I don't know if it would be any comfort that if you have a growing area like High River in the constituency, the boundaries might be more stable the next time out because the constituency conceivably would not be losing ground vis-à-vis the provincial average population. I mean, would that be at all a reasonable trade-off?

Mr. Patience: I'm not sure I would consider it a reasonable trade-off. I guess the issue would be that you would be deflecting the centre of power in terms of population to the far north end of a rural constituency. Should that ratio continue, I don't think that you're doing any favours to Alberta's rural development strategy by including larger power centres in rural constituencies.

I know there are a lot of people that have worked long and hard to sort of try and protect that urban representation in the province, and I recognize it's a challenge, especially with our urban growth. These kind of things, these decisions that your group are going to make, certainly go a long way to having a positive or negative impact on that, and I would hope you keep that in mind.

Ms Jeffs: Well, I certainly appreciate hearing from you.

I don't have any other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Patience: Thank you, Allyson.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mayor Patience, it is great to have you here today, particularly because of your tenure in municipal politics.

When we're looking at section 15 of our act that we're bound by, it requires us to take a number of things into consideration. You've spoken to some of those today: sparsity and density of population, natural boundaries. We hear sometimes from people who don't live outside of a large city that it really doesn't matter who your MLA is because the intermunicipal relationships are independent of that. You'll still have a relationship with the adjacent communities whether or not the boundary runs in between them.

You've given us some information today on the problems that you see for effective representation. I just want to go into that a little bit further with you, if I can. One of the points, as I understand it, that you've made is that if you add a town like High River to this existing constituency, they're bringing another set of issues to the table which will deflect, I think was the term you used, the MLA away from the existing issues. I take it that means that his ability to serve the existing communities will be diluted. There simply won't be as much time. Is that correct?

Mr. Patience: Certainly.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, we understand the natural relationships that

exist, but we don't often hear about how changing the boundaries negatively affects representation. I wanted to get into that a little more if I can. Apart from the time spent, if you have two different MLAs involved covering an area, some might argue that that's actually of some assistance because you would have two people aware of the issues. Do you see that as a positive or a negative?

10:15

Mr. Patience: I think that regardless of where the boundary is, you're going to have MLAs working together. I mean, issues aren't going to change across highway 2, for instance. I guess we have to understand our MLA's ability to cover this quadrant.

When the addition of Pincher Creek, Crowsnest was brought into the constituency, it brought an entire new fold of challenges for our MLA, and that wasn't very long ago. To now include an urban sort of set of characteristics – and again, I have certainly nothing against the town of High River or the people; that's certainly not the issue – certainly does change the balance of population in this constituency dramatically. It brings a far more urban flavour into what is basically a rural constituency. That impact alone is going to make it more challenging for an MLA to properly represent those people. You're going to be dealing now with urban challenges as well as rural challenges.

Because I have obviously had a close relationship with Members of the Legislative Assembly, I can tell you that it is already a very taxing position physically, just going from one community to the other. All I can tell you is that it seems to me that this certainly will not enhance our MLA's ability to represent; in fact, I do believe that it will have a significantly negative impact on it.

I guess I'll just leave it at that. I don't want to go further on here.

Mr. Dobbie: Sure. Adding Crowsnest Pass, you said, created additional challenges. Could you enumerate a couple of those? Again, we're trying to build a bit of a record so we have something that gives some specifics. What type of specific new challenges were added to the constituency when those communities came in?

Mr. Patience: Well, it brought in a different economic set in terms of resource development that we only had on a limited scale throughout the rest of the constituency, and I speak specifically of mining. A lot of the population of the Crowsnest Pass that is supported by that particular industry either works in Alberta or in British Columbia and commutes back and forth. That alone, I know, through times of strike in that industry, et cetera, became a very large challenge for our MLA to deal with. That was something we didn't previously have, and it obviously brought a different urban population set into the constituency as well. I wouldn't say that it has been detrimental, but it certainly has added to the requirement of that MLA to spread himself even further and thinner, and this would certainly increase that, I believe, manyfold.

Again, it's one thing to deal with another small town or an addition of two or three small towns that share similar interests. The addition of a very large community with a varied set of interests certainly adjusts the mix considerably, I guess, is the best way I can put it. You're going to be dealing with the same issues that MLAs within the city of Calgary are going to be dealing with in addition to that multitude of rural issues that they are already dealing with. Those can go from land, water, resources, all over the board, issues that, you know, a city MLA wouldn't specifically spend a lot of time on.

Mr. Dobbie: It just becomes too many balls to juggle.

Mr. Patience: It's very challenging. You know, I have to tip my hat to standing MLAs both in northern and southern Alberta that have those huge, wide areas to deal with. It's very hard to give everybody their proper due, and the more we deplete and add to rural constituencies, the more that's going to become very prevalent.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. Thank you. We could probably have this conversation for quite a while.

Mr. Patience: Yeah, I'm sure we could.

Mr. Dobbie: I'll stop there and let Dr. Archer ask a question.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks, Mayor Patience. I was given some data on the size of High River and some of the communities that you had mentioned. Let me just read those numbers out to give you a sense of the challenge that the commission is facing. The population that we have for High River is 11,346. For Cardston it's 3,578. Then in Glenwood and Hill Spring we have at 280 and 192 respectively.

The first challenge, I think, if one was to think about putting High River outside of this constituency, is: where does High River go? What are the options? The options seem to be either the Highwood constituency immediately to the north or, alternatively, the Little Bow constituency immediately to the east. These are the three ridings that High River either abuts against or are included in our initial proposal.

The population in the Highwood riding at the moment is 41,595. If we were to add 11,346 people to that, that would actually put us over the limit that the law prohibits us from going over. We can't create any riding that's more than 25 per cent above the average, and that would exceed the 25 per cent, so we actually couldn't put them there. The riding of Little Bow is currently 39,955, so that would be probably very close to the plus 25 per cent as well. I suspect we'd probably hear similar arguments from that constituency because it tends to be one of the geographically larger ones in the south and stretches out quite a bit to the southeast. So the challenge, quite frankly, for us is living within the legislation that we're provided with. Given a town the size of High River, there are just limited options as to what constituency it can be placed in.

The data for us was kind of compelling that by putting it in this constituency, it has the impact of bringing the numbers in line. In fact, it was just a little bit above the provincial average. Putting a higher growth community within the constituency, as one of the commissioners was saying, may have the effect in the long term of providing a greater level of stability within this constituency. Inevitably, I think, whenever you're looking at a place that's right at the boundary between a couple of ridings, there's always going to be an argument as to whether it fits more naturally in one or the other, and simply because of the numbers themselves, we just have few choices here.

One could also make the case, though, that if you take the communities that are farther north – Nanton, for example, and Longview – they probably have stronger connections with High River than they would with Cardston, for example. Although the Cardston connection is probably more compelling from Fort Macleod for other parts of the constituency, High River probably seems a better fit.

Anyway, I just wanted to offer that as some of the concrete challenges that we're facing in resolving an issue dealing with a community as large as High River.

Mr. Patience: I understand that. I also understand that it's currently in Highwood, so you've obviously made an adjustment somewhere

in that constituency to make that allowance to lose High River from there. I guess if you want my quick and short response, I would say that whatever changes you're making to the other side, don't make them. That having been said, the town of Nanton, in fact, was just included in this constituency, one of the recent adjustments that was not one of the traditional communities within those boundaries as well. This constituency has seen some tremendous changes over the course of only the last 17 years. I understand this was Macleod all the way till 1993 from 1905, so in 17 short years four major shifts to this constituency.

But my fear and our fear at this point is really that even with the previous additions of Nanton and Crowsnest Pass you're still talking about rural-urban municipalities in real terms. This definitely changes it. This is almost like putting a piece of the city of Calgary into this constituency, and I really honestly think it will have a detrimental effect on our MLA and his ability to represent our area. In the long term if we're going to start hooking rural municipalities with pieces of suburban centres or commuter centres, I believe that it's going to very much change the landscape politically in this province for a very long time. I honestly do believe in the province's effort to try and curb rural depopulation. I don't think this helps it at all. In fact, I think it may well hinder that effort.

10:25

I guess, you know, there's not much more I can say. I realize that you're making adjustments elsewhere and that one leads to the other, leads to the other, leads to the other. I recognize the challenge that this group has, and I certainly am not saying that there is any easy or quick solutions to it, but I did really feel that we needed to bring forward some of what we saw as possibilities. Maybe in your eyes it's the perfect option, but I am saying that certainly from the perspective of somebody that has dealt with all of these communities and community councils for a very long time, you're proposing a very significant change, not a minor change. It's not adding in Nanton or Carmangay or a small community. It's very significant. As you said, the population level of High River is twice that of any community in that constituency currently, and that's Crowsnest Pass. Now, as far as the rest of them go, it's three to four times the size.

So you're really putting a bit of a gorilla into the room in real terms, and I say that with utmost respect for those people. That's certainly not our issue. I think that in real terms we just have not shared a lot of similar interests, or I wouldn't stand here and say that we don't. Our issues are very much different, very specific to our area. I would think that it would behoove the commission to maybe look at an alternate option.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I also wanted to raise with you the question of the name of the constituency.

Mr. Patience: Please.

Dr. Archer: Both your presentation and a previous presentation that we had highlighted the importance of retaining the name Macleod. We haven't heard as much about retaining the name Livingstone. I guess the Livingstone reference would be both to a historical figure and to the mountain range within the riding. Do you have a view on the Livingstone part of the name within this constituency?

Mr. Patience: Well, as I said, the name Macleod has been associated with the constituency since 1905. The name Livingstone-Macleod has only been in place since, I believe, '97. So there hasn't become a close, heartfelt attachment, I suppose, to that. It really

does seem tertiary to the real discussion in terms of the boundary. At the same time, I think we need to maintain that bit of respect for where this province came from, and certainly the town of Fort Macleod has been an anchor in the development of this province. We've had Premiers from there. It was one of the founding municipalities and certainly brought law and order to Alberta and allowed it to develop. I just think it would be nice to retain the name Macleod as a representation of the history of this province and how far we've come in a very short time.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. I have no further questions.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. We've certainly heard what you have to say. I think you're very knowledgeable, and you can certainly understand the problem we're facing

and how we within the law make this work. Without presentations such as yours we wouldn't get the full picture, so thank you very much. We'll consider this, and we'll let you know in our final report. Thank you again.

Mr. Patience: My pleasure. I appreciate the opportunity and wish you well.

The Chair: Thank you.

We are going adjourn unless there is another presenter at this point. We'll adjourn, then, until the first presenter this afternoon. We'll reconvene here at 1:30.

[The hearing adjourned at 10:29 a.m.]

