



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission  
Public Hearings

Calgary

Tuesday, February 21, 2017  
9:02 a.m.

Transcript No. 15

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta**

**Electoral Boundaries Commission**

Justice Myra Bielby, Chair

Gwen Day  
Laurie Livingstone  
W. Bruce McLeod  
D. Jean Munn

**Support Staff**

Robert H. Reynolds, QC  
Shannon Dean  
Aaron Roth  
Shannon Parke  
Tracey Sales  
Janet Schwegel

Clerk  
Law Clerk and Director of House Services  
Administrator  
Communications Officer  
Communications Consultant  
Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

## **Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings – Calgary**

### **Public Participants**

Derek Fildebrandt, MLA, Strathmore-Brooks

Wendy Fulton

John Kenneth Wayne Jackson

Ric McIver, MLA, Calgary-Hays

Jordan Pinkster, President, Calgary-South East PC Association

Michelle Robinson



9:02 a.m.

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning. Thanks, everyone, for coming out.

I'm Justice Myra Bielby of the Alberta Court of Appeal, and at the moment I'm chairing the provincial Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce the other members of the commission. At my far left is Jean Munn of Calgary. Then we have Laurie Livingstone of Calgary. At my far right from Carstairs is Gwen Day, and then we have Bruce McLeod from Acme.

The room looks a little sparse, but based on our last two weeks of having hearings, it tends to fill up as people's speaking time comes along. So I'm optimistic that we'll have a full morning here of people who have things that they'd like to share with us.

Before we start, I'm going to give a little bit of an explanation about the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission and what our goal is. Since this was set up, a number of people have asked me: "What's it all about? Why are you doing it? Why are you doing it now?" In summary, the Electoral Boundaries Commission was created to research and make recommendations to the Legislature as to where and how our provincial constituency boundaries should be changed to ensure effective, proper representation by our MLAs in future provincial elections. Of course, we all remember from school that representation by population is a fundamental democratic principle.

The commission's work is particularly needed at this time because Alberta has experienced a huge increase in population since the time the last Electoral Boundaries Commission looked at our boundaries, in 2009-2010. Our population has increased net by more than 14 per cent since 2010 notwithstanding the recent economic climate. Perhaps some of you, like me, looked at the press we had around the February 8 release of the Statistics Canada census information and took some pride to see that our province remained the fastest growing in Canada by a long shot and that the populations of both Edmonton and Calgary had increased by more than 14 per cent. The next following city was Vancouver at 6.9 per cent, so we're still a big jump ahead of other places in Canada in terms of population growth.

There's our picture, and we'll start with the idea that Alberta has 87 provincial constituencies. This commission has no power to increase or decrease that number. We're obliged to make recommendations as to how the province should be divided up into 87 areas. Some of you may remember the last time the Electoral Boundaries Commission did some work. The province at that time created four new constituencies, so the number went from 83 to 87, and some of the population increase at that time could be absorbed into those four new constituencies. That hasn't happened on this occasion. If it was going to happen, it would have had to have been the result of an act that the Legislature passed prior to the time this commission was set up on October 31, 2016, and that didn't happen, so we're left with looking at 87 areas.

What you see there on the slide are the outlines of the current 87 constituencies. On the wall we have maps kind of making that more readable. The big map in the middle shows the 87 constituencies as well; the one on the right, the 25 current Calgary constituencies; and the ones to the left of that, the constituencies surrounding the city of Calgary because we anticipated that some people who would come to speak would not be speaking about Calgary specifically but about surrounding constituencies.

Of course, each constituency elects one MLA. The voters in each constituency choose one MLA, and we have 87 MLAs in the provincial Legislature in Edmonton. The thought is that we should look at how many people vote for each of those MLAs and attempt

to ensure effective representation. One of the considerations in effective representation is making those sizes of voter populations relatively equivalent.

As I said, our population has increased by more than 14 per cent in the last eight years. The average population figure for Alberta is 46,697 people, and that's the result of dividing 87 into the province's current population of 4,062,609 people. It's important because our current constituencies, the ones on the wall map over there, were based on an average population size of 40,880, which was the number in 2009-2010. You can see that some of the constituencies at that time were very close to the provincial average of 40,000, roughly. If you go up to the map later and look closely, the blue numbers are the numbers on which the current constituencies were designed, the ones that are in place right at this moment. The red numbers are the increase in population in some of those constituencies. Some of the constituencies have experienced virtually no population growth, and as we see in Calgary-South East, which wins the prize for Alberta, it's almost doubled in population in the last eight years. All of this information is based on the February 8 release of the Statistics Canada population figures. Those are the figures that we're going to be using in our work, that we're obliged to use in our work.

The idea, or the problem, I guess, if you think there is a problem, is that this enormous growth of more than 600,000 people moving into Alberta or being born in Alberta in the last eight years hasn't occurred equally in each of the 87 constituencies. While eight years ago the population variance from average was relatively small in the province – half of the constituencies were within 5 per cent of the provincial average of 40,800 people, and 85 per cent were within 10 per cent of the provincial average – now we have a huge swing because the newcomers haven't moved equally into each of the 87 constituencies. Today the populations range from 17,129 people in our most lightly populated constituency to 93,248 people in Calgary-South East, which is our largest constituency by population. As I've said, the variation has arisen in large part not because people are moving in from the country within Alberta but are moving into Alberta from other places in Canada, and they've chosen not to move in equal numbers into each constituency.

Our job in the Electoral Boundaries Commission is to make recommendations to the Legislature as to where and how constituency boundaries should be moved to ensure that each Albertan continues to have effective representation by their MLA. Relevant to these, our work is not simply the math. If it was just the math, we could have not had these public hearings at all, stayed in our offices, taken out a ruler and a calculator, and simply divided the province up into 87 squares, each of which had 46,000 some-odd people. But the legislation directs us to not simply consider relative population but also common community interests and organizations, including those of First Nation reserves and Métis settlements, and existing community and neighbourhood boundaries.

9:10

Our goal in Calgary is not to divide up a neighbourhood if we can avoid it by putting a constituency boundary at the edge of the neighbourhood rather than through the neighbourhood. We're to respect, if we can, existing municipal boundaries in places outside of Edmonton and Calgary, so we're to try to avoid dividing up – by mistake, I'm sure, the last time Tofield got a constituency line right down the middle of it. Hopefully, we're going to be able to fix some of those things and avoid doing that this time. Of course, it's great to see you out today because you can help us avoid making those mistakes if we hear from you precise suggestions about constituency boundaries.

We're also to try to use geographical features that suggest natural boundaries: major highways, rivers, mountain ranges, railway yards. Those sorts of things make logical boundaries for one side of a constituency if they exist.

The legislation says that we have to consider all of these things, but really it's wide open as to other suggestions, other ideas that might be relevant to what's necessary to allow our MLAs to effectively represent us here in Alberta. We're inviting public input on each of these enumerated factors and any other factors that you think should be taken into account. Our goal is to work to create clear and understandable boundaries throughout the province.

Now, we've been holding these public hearings. This is our third week of public hearings. Thanks very much again to those who have registered. Anybody who has registered will be called on to speak, and if we have available time, for anybody else who is here who would like to speak, we'll turn to you as well.

In addition to the public hearings, we've invited written submissions as to where constituency boundaries should be set through our website, [www.abebc.ca](http://www.abebc.ca), and we've invited those submissions to be made by e-mail, social media, and regular post. Perhaps that was too good an idea because we've now gotten 749 written submissions by the deadline. The last time they did this, they had 500 in a year. We had 749 in six weeks, so there has been a level of interest that's been very gratifying. While the deadline for written submissions has now passed, we will be holding a second round of public hearings in the summer and inviting further written submissions at that time. So if you missed the date for written submissions and you want to make a written submission, you'll have a second opportunity.

Our goal at the moment is to complete these public hearings, consider the comments made at the hearings along with the comments that were made in the submissions, and then come up with 87 recommendations, one for each of the constituencies. In addition to making recommendations in regard to constituency boundaries, we can, if necessary or if it's our inclination, make recommendations about names for the constituencies as well, if there should be name changes or what have you.

We have to file a written report containing these recommendations with the Legislature no later than May 31 of this year. Then that report will be put up on our website and also available, I'm sure, through the Legislature's website. The public will then be invited to make submissions a second time, looking at the actual recommendations that would affect individual constituencies. Our hope is that once people see what might actually happen in relation to their constituency, they will perhaps have more to say about our boundary recommendations.

We're holding a second round of these public hearings in late July and early August, and we'll consider representations made at that second round of hearings as well as any further written submissions, see whether we want to modify any of our 87 recommendations, and file a final report with the Legislature by October 31. The Legislature may then enact legislation to change boundaries and the names of our constituencies so as to be ready for the next provincial election.

Now, why we're doing this is that the Legislature is compelled by law to set up this process every eight to 10 years by something called the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. I'm told that a version of this act has been in place since the province was founded over a hundred years ago, but the most recent version of this act was passed in 1990. It sets out the timetable for setting up an Electoral Boundaries Commission, requires it to be held every eight to 10 years, says that this particular commission had to be appointed by October 31, 2016, which it was, and then sets the composition of the commission, who's to chair it. A judge or somebody equivalent

is to chair it. I'm a judge. I'm the chair. Then we have two representatives from rural Alberta, two representatives from the cities. We have two representatives appointed by the government. We have two representatives appointed by the Official Opposition in consultation with other opposition parties. We work together to make these recommendations that I've gone through.

Now, in looking at our task, we have to keep in mind the law in relation to constituency boundary distribution in Canada. As I said before, it's not simply a numbers game. Equality or parity of population isn't our only consideration. While our courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have interpreted our legislation as meaning that each of us has the right not to have the political strength or value of our vote unduly diluted, the legislation permits variances from the average of up to 25 per cent above or below average and, for a maximum of four constituencies, up to 50 per cent below average.

Now, we currently have two constituencies that fall within this latter group, this special category where it can be up to 50 per cent under. They are on the upper left-hand side of the map there, in the very northwest: Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, which is, in fact, at 51 per cent below the provincial average right now; and Lesser Slave Lake, which I think is about 40 per cent below average right now.

Why the Legislature in its wisdom decided to create this special category I don't know, but it's easy to speculate. I had some fun last week when the StatsCan figures came out. I talked to Elections Alberta and found out that Lesser Slave Lake is two and a half times the size of the Netherlands – my daughter lives in the Netherlands, so I picked that – and that Peace River, which is above it, is two and a half times the size of Belgium, so we have substantial areas in the far north with relatively small, very small, populations. That's something that we can consider and decide whether it's still the case that we should allow them to have this extra low population density in those special constituencies or not.

So we're here to get your input. It's critical that we know what you think. It's critical to avoid us making silly mistakes. I'm not really being critical of the last commission; they did a great job, in my view. But I'm going to go back to Tofield. We want to avoid Tofield. You know, we want to avoid cutting off a tiny bit of the Battle River constituency so that an MLA has two counties to represent in one constituency. We want to make thoughtful decisions on boundaries, and sometimes it takes somebody who actually lives in the area to say: this would make sense, but that doesn't make sense. I am certainly going to invite you to do that. If you can help us that way, that would be terrific.

Once we have all this information, the task of the commission is this. We take it constituency by constituency. We look at the actual population of the constituency, the red number. We compare that to the provincial average number of 46,697 and then decide if there's any acceptable reason not to change the size of the constituency by moving the boundaries either in or out to get closer to that average number.

Be aware that *Hansard* staff are present and that they're recording all the proceedings. Everything that's said today will be posted on our website, [www.abebc.ca](http://www.abebc.ca), in audio form and by written transcript within the next few days. All of the written submissions, the 749 written submissions we've received, will be published on our website in the next couple of weeks.

So there's the city of Calgary. In the event that you find it to be of assistance, if you're making a recommendation that we move a particular boundary in a certain direction, I might invite you to go up to the maps that we have there. Our clerk will give you a marker to draw the boundary on where you think it should be, and then he'll take a photo of that so that we have those photos in our actual

deliberations and so that we can keep in mind exactly what you're suggesting. You don't have to do that, but if you're willing to do that, I'm sure that will be a big help to us.

9:20

With all that in mind, I'm going to invite our first speaker up. We've allotted 10 minutes for each speaker and five minutes for questioning, but to date in this process that's not been a hard timeline. Sometimes our questions go longer than the five minutes, so we'll just make it work and feel our way along today.

Our first speaker is an MLA. Welcome, Derek Fildebrandt. If you wouldn't mind coming up and sitting at the microphone.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you very much. Thank you for having me here today and for all the work you're doing. My father-in-law actually served on the commission at one point, and he says that it's very poorly paid work for a lot of work, but he had a lot of fun doing it.

I do understand what you mean by these massive constituencies. My sister lives in the Netherlands, in Groningen, and she talks about how small the country is. Well, it's about the size of my constituency, almost.

You've touched on, I think very well, that in a democracy as much as possible we have to have representation by population, that every vote should as much as possible count as much as another vote in another constituency and that we shouldn't water that down, but at the same time we have to balance that with effective representation, recognizing that there is a fundamental difference between small, urban, compact constituencies and large, diffuse, rural constituencies.

To drive from one end of my constituency to another – and I'm fortunate in that I have the Trans-Canada, that makes it very easy to do that in Strathmore-Brooks – it's a long drive. The communities within it are often very different from one another and have extremely different needs. I have in Strathmore-Brooks two counties, one city, one large town the size of a city, one small town, five villages, and dozens of hamlets and locales. I can't keep up with – and then many school boards. In terms of trustees and municipal politicians it's effectively a Legislature's worth of elected officials of one level or another within my constituency. Strathmore-Brooks has a Legislature's worth of elected officials.

It's extremely difficult to keep track of all of them and balance them out whereas a Calgary city councillor will have one, possibly two city councillors overlapping from a municipal ward and one, possibly two federal MPs. The requirements of a rural MLA are very, very different. Some of it is to our advantage; some of it is to our disadvantage. One of the advantages, you know, is that in a rural area your constituents know who the MLA is. They're more likely to know who you are. You're able to build a better connection. On the other side, it's incredibly more work. I've got no less than five rodeos alone to attend. Now, that's probably the funnest part of my job, going to rodeos, but that's indicative of the kind of extra work that comes with being a rural MLA.

I can't even keep up with the village councils. I have to really largely focus on Strathmore and Brooks and sometimes Bassano. Keeping up with all of the villages is virtually impossible. I check in with them, and I listen to them, go to local events, stay in tune. You know, if you're a Calgary MLA, you might go to a couple of local community association events. Otherwise, there's not that much that's expected whereas a rural MLA is expected to go to so much more. They're expected to know so much more and be so much more involved. The expectations and the demands on our offices are so much higher.

None of that should be mistaken as a complaint – it makes the job much more enjoyable – but it does place greater demands on our time. I rack up at least 40,000 to 50,000 kilometres a year in my job, not all of it just in the constituency but most of it. My truck is a mobile office. Travel really is one of the most time-consuming parts of my job. I want that to be considered, as you have said you will.

I just want to reiterate the importance of our ability as rural MLAs to effectively represent our constituents. The demands on our time are absolutely great. We have just massive areas with people and communities who never interact with each other in many cases. In many cases people in Brooks interact with people in Strathmore because Strathmore is en route to Calgary, but most people in Strathmore don't know many people in Brooks. They don't interact with each other, necessarily. They're completely different communities, and each community expects me to be an MLA for that community – and they don't necessarily know the work I'm doing in the other community – whereas if you represented most Calgary communities, you'd have a couple of neighbourhoods. You'd have, you know, Tuscan and Scenic Heights. They're all more or less similar, and people in those communities will interact with each other. But the work I do in Standard the people in Hussar don't know about, and the work I do in Gleichen the people in Bassano don't know about. You have to be several MLAs to do these jobs.

The constituency of Strathmore-Brooks itself is, I think, fairly well designed. I think it's well named, Strathmore-Brooks. If you're going to give it a different name, it would probably be just Trans-Canada because it's pretty much the Trans-Canada between Chestermere and Medicine Hat. It makes it easy to traverse. The Trans-Canada acts as, effectively, the spine of the constituency. It makes it relatively easy to get from one end to another compared to many rural constituencies. The two towns are roughly equal in size.

Strathmore is growing at a fairly significant pace, which is one reason we're one of the only large rural constituencies in southern Alberta that is above the population average right now. Strathmore continues to grow and will continue to grow, I think. Despite the economic downturn it is continuing to grow at quite a significant pace. I expect that it will continue to pick up even more. It's affordable, nice houses for families, so as things become more expensive in Calgary, I expect that people will continue to settle in Strathmore.

Brooks will continue to grow as well, I think, but not at the same pace. The downturn has particularly hit Brooks hard as an oil and gas based town. As that recovers, Brooks will continue to grow but just not at quite the same pace as Strathmore.

Plus, we have several hamlets in Wheatland county buttressing Rocky View county. Speargrass near Carseland doesn't even appear on the maps. It's such a new community that it doesn't even really appear on the maps. Speargrass is a fairly significantly sized community now.

**The Chair:** About how large?

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Well, I can only say roughly. I've walked it and knocked on the doors in it, but I don't know any census on it because it doesn't really even appear on the maps in many cases.

Also, right beside Lyalta is Lakes of Muirfield. It's almost the same kind of thing. Lyalta is the older prairie community. Right beside it is a new development of houses, Lakes of Muirfield – we still call it Lyalta, largely – again, exploding with very well-priced single-family dwelling homes, mostly people who work in Calgary but want to find that cheap land. Land comes pretty cheap there, so they can build a house at a pretty good price.

Those are two growing areas that aren't really recognized yet. If there are differences within the riding, it's primarily Strathmore itself. It's half traditional old prairie town and half Calgary's bedroom community whereas Brooks is very much a community in and of itself. It's not really influenced by other media markets as much. It's very much its own identity. Strathmore is its own identity, but at least half of it largely considers itself in the orbit of the greater Calgary region whereas Brooks is Brooks. With the new communities popping up on the border of our constituency, as I said, the Lyalta and Carseland areas, they don't actually identify with either Strathmore or Chestermere or any of those things. They largely just consider themselves bedroom communities of their own but within the greater Calgary ecosystem. Yeah, those would be the primary differences between them.

On a clear day you can see Calgary from Strathmore; you can't see Calgary from Brooks. That's probably the biggest difference. A large portion of Strathmore commutes into Calgary. Otherwise, the two communities are pretty similar. They tend to vote relatively similarly to one another. They have, again, relatively similar demographics and levels of income. The biggest difference is that a large portion of Strathmore is a commuter population.

9:30

I would strongly recommend against changes to the constituency. Despite how massive it is and how hard it is to balance, it's now a relatively long-established constituency that has a pretty good working relationship within it. We work well as a unit. If the commission does decide to shave off part of the constituency to go to some of the other neighbouring constituencies that are lower in population – I heard you were going to ask about this – I suppose it depends on how much you do. If you took off a small section and brought us down just right to the average, then so be it.

I would strongly caution against cutting up our small urbans. If you're going to cut, I would just cut a county. That tends to be less disruptive, I think. If you do make a larger cut, if there is a larger change to the constituency and we have to grow somewhere else, on the Strathmore side we're probably most similar to the eastern section of Rocky View county, not Chestermere itself but the area of Rocky View county going up to Chestermere. People between east of Chestermere in that Rocky View county up into Wheatland are very much the same kind of people. Some of them live and work where they are, some of them commute into Calgary, relatively similar levels of income, relatively similar voting patterns, just similar kinds of people.

Langdon is right on the border of the constituencies, between Chestermere-Rocky View and Strathmore-Brooks. People in Langdon could flip one way or another into either constituency, so if we were to lose a significant section of our constituency to another part and we had to compensate, Langdon would be the most logical, I think, to flip in because it's immediately on the border, and people in Langdon are almost exactly halfway between Chestermere and Strathmore. So if you were going to go that route, that's a possibility.

Strathmore itself is pretty similar to High River in the sense that it's an outlying community. It's not a part of Calgary. It does not ever want to be. But large portions commute in, and it's about a similar distance.

That about covers, I think, a broad overview of Strathmore-Brooks, but I'm definitely happy to take questions about where you guys want to go with this.

**The Chair:** All right. Thanks a lot.

Ms Munn.

**Ms Munn:** Yes. If the boundaries of Strathmore-Brooks on the west side were moved a little bit west to take Langdon into account, that would up Strathmore-Brooks. It would be up to 5 per cent over. Then we're looking at very underpopulated ridings southeast and north of Strathmore-Brooks. We would want to bring Strathmore-Brooks down again. Would it be better to up it on the west side? If we then had to change it on the east side or the southwest side, where would you think the boundaries should go?

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Well, being happy to represent my riding, I don't want to lose anyone.

**Ms Munn:** But you can understand that if we upped it with Langdon, we'd have to . . .

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Yeah. Well, I would preface that I'm not recommending that Strathmore-Brooks take in Langdon. I'm not recommending that that happen. Because I know that we border some constituencies that probably require growth in size, if the commission decides to take parts away from Strathmore-Brooks to go to our neighbours, be it Drumheller-Stettler, Cypress-Medicine Hat, or Little Bow, all constituencies that I know you probably want to grow at least somewhat – I'm not recommending where you would, although I would just say that you're better off moving counties rather than villages, or if you're going to move a village or something, move things intact rather than cutting through the middle.

I would strongly recommend against cutting Brooks in half. Brooks is very much a cohesive unit. It is its own thing. If there is any municipality in Strathmore-Brooks that should not be divided, it would be Brooks. I guarantee you that there would be a lot of people upset about that.

Whatever decisions you make, I'd just recommend that they be moved intact. If you do decide to make a change on that side somewhere, Langdon and eastern Rocky View county is the most logical place to grow, in my view, that is congruent with most of the rest of the constituency.

**Ms Munn:** If that grows, then you'll be way over.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Yeah. I know. What I'm saying is if you decide to cut it to move other parts to other constituencies.

**Ms Munn:** Oh, I see. Yes.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** If you decide to do that.

You're going to make your own decisions. I like my riding as it is. I'm sure most MLAs do. I don't really have an electoral advantage in any of this. Not to make me sound unhumble, we won pretty much every part of it, so it's not like there's an orange or blue part that is in my interest to get rid of. The whole riding was Wildrose.

If you do decide to move some parts off and those parts are large enough that we would have to grow elsewhere, the Langdon and eastern Rocky View county part is probably the most similar demographically and economically and within the same trade corridor. Again, everything is along the Trans-Canada, and if that's along the Trans-Canada, east of Calgary, it's all largely pretty similar.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Other questions?

**Mr. McLeod:** I've got one. You stated that Brooks is sort of its own thing, but is its community of interest more towards Medicine Hat, or is it more towards Strathmore and Calgary? I'm not saying that



we're going to pull it out. That's not the idea. We also like to look at the community of interest of the whole constituency. What would you think about it?

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** It has, until the most recent federal redistribution, always been a part of the greater Medicine Hat. It's massive. The Bow River constituency that we're in federally is from Chestermere to Taber. It's crazy.

If you asked people in Brooks if they are more Calgary or more Medicine Hat, they'll say: we're Brooks.

**The Chair:** Medicine Hat claimed them – you should know that – when we were there for our hearings.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** I know they did.

There certainly is a strong Brooks and Medicine Hat relationship. It's the closest medium-sized city. As a trade corridor a lot of people in Brooks do feel an affinity with Medicine Hat. I'd say that, in terms of Brooks' sphere of influence and whatnot, it's probably 60 per cent just Brooks and then 20 per cent Medicine Hat and 10 per cent Calgary.

If you're just going by newspapers, people in Brooks do not read the *Calgary Herald* unless it's online. They don't read it. They might read the *Medicine Hat News*, but they mostly read the *Brooks Bulletin*. People in Strathmore read the *Sun*, they read the *Herald*, and they read the two Strathmore local papers. That's just kind of a way to anecdotally measure the influence of the larger communities around them.

I don't mean to dance around your question. It's a very fair one. It's a question of the identity of Brooks that people do talk about. It's not disconnected from Medicine Hat. There is a strong relationship, whereas Strathmore is zero per cent Medicine Hat. It's its own, but 50 per cent does consider itself part of the greater Calgary area.

Does that sufficiently answer your question?

**Mr. McLeod:** Yeah, that works. Thanks.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much. You were very well prepared, if I may. Thank you.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you very much. Thanks for your time.

**The Chair:** Okay. Our next registered presenter is Jordan Pinkster.

If you could start by giving us the constituency in which you reside.

9:40

**Mr. Pinkster:** Yes. I actually live in Calgary-Acadia, but I'm going to be speaking to Calgary-South East as I am the president of the Calgary-South East PC Association. I've been the president of that CA for the last four years. The previous speaker talked about how their riding is quite well designed, and I'm going to speak a little bit to how this one is maybe not as well designed.

The real emphasis, or the focus, is the need to prepare for growth as it relates to Calgary-South East. When the riding was first established, in 2009-10, it had about 37,000 people, which was about 10 per cent under the variance at the time. The 2016 numbers show 92,148 people in Calgary-South East, which is almost 100 per cent over the total variance. The boundaries may have worked for the first couple of years, but very quickly they were well beyond even that acceptable variance that was allowed.

According to the 2016 city of Calgary census Calgary-South East is home to four of the seven fastest-growing communities in

Calgary. Mahogany is number one; they increased by over 2,000 people last year. Auburn Bay is number four, with an increase of about 1,400 people over the last year. Copperfield is number six, with an increase of about 1,100 people, and Legacy is number seven, with a population increase of just over 1,000 people from 2015. Many of these communities are approaching full build-out, but there are a few of them that have quite excessive growth still to be expected.

Southeast Calgary itself is the fastest-growing quadrant in Calgary right now. It has future growth areas in places like Seton and Rangeview, and Hotchkiss will be coming online in the next little while here. Calgary-South East is also home to three of the 20 largest communities in Calgary, period, from a population standpoint, and that's Cranston at number eight, with a population of just over 18,000 people. Cranston still has more build-out anticipated in the Bow River Valley; they've recently started building down there. Auburn Bay is number 12, with a population of about 14 and a half thousand people, and Auburn Bay still has more build-out anticipated. Chaparral is number 17, with about 13,000 people, and they also still have more build-out anticipated.

Population aside, the other question to ask is: are the boundaries logical? With Calgary-South East that isn't exactly the case, not in name and not in the geographical boundary that's been established. It really skirts the entire southeast, southcentral, and even a quarter of southwest Calgary in terms of the geographical composition. The communities on either side of the Bow River have very different needs and very different concerns. I'll speak specifically to some of the transportation concerns. Folks on the east side of the river are looking for improvements to Deerfoot Trail. They're looking for expansion in the LRT network with the green line. Folks on the west side of the river are more interested in things like the rest of the ring road, Stoney Trail, those types of concerns.

The recommendation that I would make is that Calgary-South East could be divided into as many as four different ridings, breaking them off into existing ridings that are already in place. When we look at a community like Silverado, which is the southwest tip of the constituency, that's probably more of a logical fit in either Calgary-Lougheed or Calgary-Shaw, one of those ridings.

**The Chair:** I'm going to interrupt you. This is all very helpful, and I'm hoping you're going to leave your notes with us.

**Mr. Pinkster:** I will.

**The Chair:** It would help me as an Edmontonian if you would go to the map as you're talking and speak slowly.

**Mr. Pinkster:** Of course. Certainly. I'll talk loud, too.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you. The clerk is going to give you a pen. Just draw the lines that you're suggesting. You said that logically you could argue for dividing it up into four different constituencies, so if you could show us how that could be done.

**Mr. Pinkster:** Okay. For Calgary-South East we are obviously this whole area over here, which, largely, doesn't look like southeast to me. The community of Silverado is down here in our southwestmost corner.

**The Chair:** Looking at the map, that would be the part of the constituency that is the most northwest.

**Mr. Pinkster:** Southwest.

**The Chair:** The northwest corner of Calgary-South East.

**Mr. Pinkster:** Correct. Yes.

**The Chair:** Right. Okay. Got it.

**Mr. Pinkster:** My argument is that you could move Silverado into either Calgary-Lougheed or Calgary-Shaw, which both have closer population variances and could take on a community that is close to built out but still has a little bit of room to grow.

The next areas that we're looking at are Lake Chaparral, Walden, and Legacy. Some of them are newer communities in more the southcentral component of the riding. I'll draw those there.

**The Chair:** But you're still on the west side of the river, just so I can remember.

**Mr. Pinkster:** Still on the west side of the Bow River. Correct.

Those communities lie directly to the south of Calgary-Shaw, and they're more of a logical fit, I would say at least, with Calgary-Shaw as opposed to in Calgary-South East, where they currently are.

Then the last bit that I have is the community of Cranston and the community of Auburn Bay, which lie directly to the south of Calgary-Hays. With the growth that those communities are experiencing, it's very hard for those still to be connected with the other fast-growing communities in Calgary-South East, so my argument would be that those could make a part of Calgary-Hays, or if we're incorporating some element of rural into those ridings as well, that would potentially make more sense than where we currently stand with the rapid growth.

The recommendation that I would make for what Calgary-South East could look like would incorporate the communities of New Brighton, Copperfield, Mahogany, and everything to the east Calgary city limits.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do we have another coloured marker there? Could you kind of shade that area with lines?

**Mr. Pinkster:** Yeah.

**Ms Munn:** I'm sorry. That was New Brighton, Mahogany, and . . .

**Mr. Pinkster:** New Brighton, Mahogany, Copperfield. Then you've got the new community of Hotchkiss, that will come online in the next two to three years in that area as well, and then south Shepard, which is a very small residential population. But there's still probably, I would say, a couple of hundred, maybe even up to a thousand residents that live in that area as well.

**The Chair:** Do you have any feel for how many residents live in that area you've now shaded blue?

**Mr. Pinkster:** I don't include Mahogany in that at this time. The notes that I put together had New Brighton, Copperfield – sorry; I'm wrong. New Brighton has 12,000 residents, Copperfield has 12 and a half thousand, and Mahogany has 7,000 and is growing by about 2,000 people per year. So if we just incorporated that and didn't include the kind of more acreages and south Shepard population that's out there, that would be about 31 and a half thousand people in that riding on day one. But with Hotchkiss coming online in the next two or three years and people potentially living there within five years, you'd see quite a bit of growth in the area, getting well above, I would think, what the variance would be in a short time again.

**The Chair:** Okay. I know you haven't finished your presentation.

**Mr. Pinkster:** I have, actually.

**The Chair:** Oh, great. Well, just while you're standing there – and acknowledging that this is not what you're suggesting should be done, but we have to look at all possibilities, and when we're back discussing all of these things, I don't want to have missed this opportunity – if you turn around, you'll see a map that's got Strathmore-Brooks and Chestermere-Rocky View and also the part of Calgary we're talking about here now, Calgary-South East. Not to suggest this is going to happen, because we certainly haven't got this far in our discussions, believe me, but just so that we have this information if we find we have to do it, if we had to move the boundaries of Calgary-South East outside of the city limits a little bit to make this all work, in your view would it make more sense to go into Highwood or Chestermere-Rocky View?

**Mr. Pinkster:** I think it would make more sense to push it to the east. The majority of the growth that we are seeing is sliding out to the east in that particular area of Calgary.

**The Chair:** Into Chestermere?

**Mr. Pinkster:** Into Chestermere. Yes.

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

Questions, panel?

Again, thank you. This is super information, so if you wouldn't mind leaving that behind, that would be terrific.

**Mr. Pinkster:** These two are for you.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much.

Okay. Our next registered speaker is Ric McIver.

**Mr. McIver:** Good morning.

**The Chair:** Hi.

**Mr. McIver:** It's a pleasure to be here. Thank you for making time for me. What you're doing is important, and I'm sure you feel the weight of how important it is, so thank you for the efforts that you're all making to do this.

I'm going to, just in support of the last speaker as well – I spent some time on city council for nine years, from 2001 to 2010, and information you should probably be aware of when you're making your deliberations is that the area of Calgary east of the river and south of 22X is expected to be north of 120,000 population in about 15 years, 15 to 20 years.

**The Chair:** North of what figure?

**Mr. McIver:** North of 120,000 people living down there, south of 22X, or the Stoney Trail now, and east of the river.

**The Chair:** And within how much time?

9:50

**Mr. McIver:** In 15, 20 years that's anticipated.

**The Chair:** What is it now? Do you know?

**Mr. McIver:** You know what? You'll have to forgive me.

**The Chair:** No. That's okay. Some of that 120,000 is already there.

**Mr. McIver:** I've been working provincially for the last five years, so I'm more in tune with that. But that's just a thing that I remember that would probably be important to your deliberations. Fortunately for me, I think that my presentation will be less than 10 minutes, so

I could include what I just did with that editorial and then get on to my presentation if that's okay with the panel.

**The Chair:** Of course. Sure.

**Mr. McIver:** Okay. I'm the PC member for Calgary-Hays and the interim leader of the PC Party. In the last 10 years our population has grown from about 3.5 million to about 4.3 million. That won't be a surprise to the committee. It is time for the boundaries to change. We all accept that. We just want to make sure, on behalf of our caucus, that the voices of Albertans are heard equally, and it's in that spirit that we put the three recommendations forward for the commission. Even this morning in the media it talked about a poll or how one party is ahead in Calgary, one is ahead in Edmonton, and one is ahead in rural Alberta, but I think, as you know, the objective should be equal voices for Albertans, not anybody's political advantage or disadvantage. So we appreciate that that's the spirit that you're operating in. We'll fight it out at election time on the other issues ourselves.

We just want to make sure that Albertans are being represented in the best way and to strike a balance between constituencies with a large average population and constituencies with a large average square kilometrage. I guess the other way to say that is that I recognize the value of equal voice, equal weight per voter, which would push towards the same number of people in every riding.

But there's another principle that we're going to strongly ask you to consider: access. Now, my understanding of the original definition of a riding is: the distance that a person could ride a horse in a day. That was because it was important for the constituents to have access to their elected official, and it was important for the elected official to have access to their constituents. Part of why we're asking you to still consider that today is that access issue.

Really, we realize that there are some rural ridings with a lot smaller population than some of the urban ridings, and we would ask you to not change that simply because of that access issue. Right now there are some ridings, not exclusively but particularly in northern Alberta, where the MLAs have to go a long, long way to get to all their constituents and the constituents have to go a long, long way to get a hold of their MLA. Making those ridings even bigger in order to make the population identical would not actually serve democracy well. It wouldn't allow that access. So we're asking you to balance the equality of voice with the access of the people to the elected official and of the elected official to the people. I think that will make your job a little more difficult, but I think it'll serve Alberta well if you're able to do that.

Again, that's why we're asking you not to reduce the rural constituencies or increase the size of the ridings and that the guideline variance not be reduced from 25 per cent for that reason, because we think that access to and from the elected officials is so important if people are truly going to be represented in this democratic system that we work under. Again, I've talked about it a little bit more outside of what's on the slide, but it's truly out of respect for rural Alberta. We recognize that the population is coalescing in the urban parts of the province, but we still need to – our rural brothers and sisters need to be respected and have access to their elected officials.

Recommendation 2 from us to you is that the constituencies have natural geographic boundaries – rivers, large parks, highways, railroad tracks – whenever possible. If you can avoid having to dissect a riding, we think that that will, again, allow better access even within urban ridings. But it actually allows people that have built their homes and chosen to live in communities that are together to go together with their voice to their elected official and, in most cases, not have those individual elected officials split any

more than they have to be, by having people that are already gathered together on one side of a river, one side of a large park, one side of a railroad track work together with their elected official to have their voice heard in Edmonton at the Legislature. We think that's something that will serve Albertans well.

I can tell you, as somebody that's been elected for a little while, that it actually makes it easier for the elected official to get around to those constituents, too. It's a time-consuming way to make a living, and when you don't have to drive three or four miles around a river to get into another community on the other side, then you can spend more time actually talking to people and representing them rather than running from pillar to post. We hope that you will consider that.

Again, in that spirit we're hoping that you can avoid whenever possible the mash-up of rural and urban ridings simply because it makes it easier for an MLA, no matter what party they're with, to be more effective if they're getting a clear signal from the people that they're representing and they can go to the Legislature and represent to the best of their ability all of their constituents as opposed to irritating half of them and making half of them happy. I think that rural-urban mash-up, if you go that way, will be a recipe for dissatisfaction of MLAs and, more importantly, dissatisfaction of the constituents, where they can't have their MLA going and feel like that MLA is representing their voices.

A third recommendation is to rename Calgary-Greenway Calgary-Bhullar in honour of our former colleague Manmeet Bhullar. Manmeet, of course, served proudly in the Legislative Assembly, and we lost him a year and a half ago travelling to Edmonton to do his job. It's a request to rename the riding. There is precedent. There is Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, in honour of the Premier's father, who proudly served this province. We hope the commission would consider that request as well.

Thank you for the opportunity. I've got kind of a reduced version. I'll give you that as well. As well, I left you with the PowerPoint. We certainly appreciate what you're doing. We recognize that what you're doing is so important to the future of Alberta, and we thank you for your service. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer those for you.

**The Chair:** Sure. Just before I ask you my questions, I'm going to ask our clerk, Aaron, if we can get a table-sized map of the map that shows the Calgary constituencies, like, the map that's first on the wall here. If you can ask somebody to give us each a copy of that. Oh, you've got one. Sorry. I withdraw that request. I didn't realize we were given a brochure with wonderful maps in it this morning.

Okay. Just while I'm looking at borrowing my colleague's map here – you're representing Calgary-Hays. I know you're not speaking about that, but I don't want to miss the opportunity to ask you these questions.

**Mr. McIver:** Sure.

**The Chair:** I appreciate that you're within 5 per cent of the variance according to Statistics Canada information that was released February 8. That said, we have to look at all possibilities, and when we get down to it, if we find that we have to move your boundary either because we have to move it or because we have to move some of the Calgary-South East population somewhere, do you have any observations as to where that boundary could be moved to not impede your ability to effectively do your job as an MLA?

**Mr. McIver:** You know what? I would say that the biggest thing is to keep it on the same side of the river. I think that's consistent with my earlier remarks, and I say this with a little bit of knowledge.

Interestingly enough – I’m not sure how much you trust Wikipedia – I looked up the definition of gerrymander, and it’s a riding that has the shape of a salamander, usually to advantage or disadvantage some politician either by putting in areas that they’re strong in or taking out areas that they’re strong in to disadvantage them. If you make ridings more of a block shape than a long narrow shape, which is the salamander shape, then probably that would be a good thing.

I feel okay with the previous speaker talking about Calgary-South East, if ever there was a salamander-shaped riding, that goes all the way from Spruce Meadows up to Copperfield and New Brighton. I’m not suggesting there was any malice aforesight when those boundaries were put in place, but I feel a little bit sorry for my colleague that has to travel that far. It’s a lot more travelling time and a lot less time serving his constituents based on the shape of that riding. I would say that I have a little bit of experience with that from my time on city council, when the ward that I had then included all of Calgary-Hays, most of Calgary-South East, about half of Calgary-Acadia, and part of Calgary-Glenmore. While I got it done, it did make the time commitment in travelling a lot more heavy than would have been necessary because of that.

**10:00**

**The Chair:** Okay. I will say that the commission has decided not to consider polling data from the last or any election and has resisted any attempt to submit it. Nobody, in fact, has attempted to do that. We stated right from the start that we’re not interested, as you suggest in your opening remarks, as to who holds a constituency now in our future considerations. That’s not one of the factors permitted by the act.

That said, seeing as you’re here, looking at the Calgary-Acadia constituency, which is immediately north of your constituency and which does straddle both sides of the river, do you have any observation to make about whether that’s a good idea or whether we should try to contain it to one side of the river?

**Mr. McIver:** My suggestion is to keep all the ridings on one side of the river or the other. It’s a natural break, and again the spirit of what I talked about earlier is having people in each riding with as much common interest as they can have so that their MLA, no matter what party they’re with, can go up to the Legislature and have their voice heard. So to whatever extent you can, and I realize that your job is difficult, if you can shape the ridings so that there’s a good chance that everybody’s voice will have the best chance of being the same – in other words, all rural, all urban, the natural communities that they’re already sorted out into by the building form in the form of the communities – if you can keep those communities together as opposed to drawing a line through the middle of them, I believe that would be best.

My riding now is actually split by Deerfoot Trail right down the middle. That in itself, because it’s on both sides about equally, is not a big problem. If anything else it probably helps me to get around my riding a little bit because I can either take the back roads from one community to the other or the highway from one community to the other. Crossing the river is a bigger consideration, in my opinion.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Questions?

**Ms Munn:** Yes. Can you please tell us: what is the neighbourhood or neighbourhoods just east of Calgary-Hays that are presently in Calgary-South East?

**Mr. McIver:** Going by memory from my time on city council: Copperfield, Auburn Bay, New Brighton, and then south of there is Mahogany, Auburn Bay.

**Ms Munn:** So on the other side of Stoney would be Auburn?

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah. The south side of Stoney is Auburn Bay, Seton, Mahogany, Cranston.

**Ms Munn:** Okay. So on the east side of your constituency is Copperfield?

**Mr. McIver:** On the east side of my constituency is New Brighton and Copperfield.

**Ms Munn:** Okay. In terms of the kinds of communities they are, are they much like the communities in the south part of Calgary-Hays?

**Mr. McIver:** Yes, and I probably know this as well as anybody because that was all part of my city council ward. I realize that we’re probably at about 45,000, 50,000 people per provincial riding, but when I left city council, there were about 110,000 people in what was then my riding. It was approximately two and a half provincial ridings by today’s standards, or two and a quarter.

**Ms Munn:** On 130th Avenue between 52nd Street and Deerfoot: that seems to be a top corner of Calgary-Hays?

**Mr. McIver:** That’s correct, yeah.

**Ms Munn:** Does 130th Avenue continue right over to the river?

**Mr. McIver:** Yes. It stops short at the river. It’s a natural break between the communities of Douglasdale and McKenzie Lake, 130th Avenue. When you go to the end of 130th Avenue next to the river, if you turn right, you’re into Douglasdale, and if you turn left, you’re into McKenzie Lake. I appreciate that the streets are named with “Douglas” on the McKenzie Lake side, but that’s more a function of the same developer developing both spots as opposed to the chosen community breaks.

**Ms Munn:** So even though there are some Douglasdale names on – is it the south side of 130th?

**Mr. McIver:** It’s all McKenzie Lake once you’re south of 130th. Once you are west of Deerfoot, between the Deerfoot and the river and south of 130th, that’s all McKenzie Lake, down south to – I wouldn’t break that up. It’s one community. It’s one community association.

**Ms Munn:** Right. But north of 130th is all Douglasdale?

**Mr. McIver:** Yes. Douglasdale and Douglas Glen share a community association. Everything between the river and the Deerfoot north of 130th is Douglasdale. Once you cross Deerfoot Trail on the east side, it’s called Douglas Glen. It’s technically a different community, but they share the same community association, and they also share that community association with Quarry Park. So keeping those three communities together in whatever form you do at the end, in my view, would be a good thing because they’re already working together on advocacy to their elected officials municipally, provincially, and federally.

**Ms Munn:** Okay. I’ve got to make some notes here. Douglasdale on the east side of Deerfoot Trail is Douglas Glen?

**Mr. McIver:** Douglas Glen.

**Ms Munn:** And Quarry Park?

**Mr. McIver:** Right. Those three communities share a community association by their own choice. So that's, again, my recommendation.

**Ms Munn:** Those two, Quarry Park and Douglas Glen, are presently in Calgary-Fort?

**Mr. McIver:** No. They're all in Calgary-Hays. They're all in my riding right now.

**Ms Munn:** I'm sorry. The east side of Deerfoot Trail?

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah. Douglas Glen is on the east side of Deerfoot Trail, just between the river – Deerfoot bends right there. Just on the south side of the river and east of Deerfoot Trail is a community called Douglas Glen and Quarry Park, which shares a community association with Douglasdale on the other side. They've chosen as residents to be one community and to have one voice.

**Ms Munn:** Quarry Park is right up in the northwest corner. Is that right?

**Mr. McIver:** Northwest corner of what? Sorry, I don't mean to be difficult.

**Ms Munn:** Of Calgary-Hays.

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah. The northern part of Calgary-Hays. Northeast, I would say, more.

**The Chair:** Do your current boundaries cut through any neighbourhoods?

**Mr. McIver:** Pardon?

**The Chair:** Do your current boundaries more or less honour the neighbourhoods in Calgary-Hays?

**Mr. McIver:** It's fantastic. I've got five communities as my whole riding: McKenzie Towne, which is about 25,000 people; McKenzie Lake, which is around 13,000 people; Douglasdale, which is about 12,000 people; and Quarry Park and Douglas Glen, and that I'm not as sure of because Quarry Park is currently a developing community. There's more and more people living there every month, so that number I'm not quite as confident giving you.

**The Chair:** So we don't need to correct anything to avoid cutting a community in half in Calgary-Hays, in your opinion?

**Mr. McIver:** I'm one of the most fortunate MLAs in Alberta in that it's, as they say in darts, good grouping. It's nice and tight. It's easy for me to get around my riding, and I believe it's easy for them to get to me if they want to.

**Ms Livingstone:** I've just got one question that's not about your riding, per se, but about your neighbours. Both Calgary-Fish Creek and Calgary-Acadia, which border Calgary-Hays, are 18 per cent under the ideal average riding size. Do you have any thoughts on those ridings and which way their boundaries might logically move to increase a little bit of the population there?

**Mr. McIver:** Both are going to be a little bit awkward for you probably because of the river dissecting it. When I was on city council, I did have, out of Calgary-Acadia, Willow Park, Maple

Ridge, and Acadia as well as Riverbend. It's not ideal. I love the folks in Riverbend, but getting around is a little bit inconvenient. I suppose you've got to do what you've got to do to make the numbers work. I would do that, yeah, based on the fact that my advice to you is: whatever you do, don't break up Douglasdale, Douglas Glen, and Quarry Park unless you moved all of them together into Fish Creek. That's going to be a tough call for you to make. Riverbend could work. It's a little inconsistent. I'm not as familiar with all the boundaries of Calgary-Acadia. Does it include Fairview right now, north of Acadia?

**Ms Livingstone:** Yes, I think it does.

*10:10*

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah. I think you've got no choice, then, to look east from there if you're looking to expand the population base there, and Riverbend is probably the most obvious place to look, in my estimation.

**Ms Livingstone:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. McLeod:** Earlier you talked about sort of the rural-urban mismatch, mushing them together

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah.

**Mr. McLeod:** To me, I'm going back to the community of interest. Those folks south of Dunbow Road are acreages, you know, five-acre kinds of lots and big houses and stuff like that, but their community of interest is still Calgary. They use a lot of the services that are in Calgary, or they go to Okotoks. If you look at that boundary, like, even for over by Spruce Meadows, same kind of idea, which is south of 22X, do you think their community of interest is more to Calgary, if there was some movement that had to be made in that area, moving over again to Livingstone?

**Mr. McIver:** I would say, in my estimation – and I would listen to the people living there before I listen to me, but I'm in front of you, and you asked the question – that Heritage Pointe is part of the municipal district of Foothills, so I think they've already got a natural interest with the rural area there. I think the community was built outside intentionally or maybe by virtue of just where the real estate leads outside of Calgary, and I think they already have strong connections with Foothills. So keeping them together with that is probably a good idea.

Interestingly enough, just the way political boundaries evolve, I would say that Silverado is strongly more connected to Calgary and Bridlewood and the Calgary communities next to it. I would say that what I just said is consistent, too, in that Silverado was developed within the city, and I think the average density of units per acre is more consistent with urban density in Silverado. In Heritage Pointe, with quarter-acre lots and stuff like that, I believe it's more generally consistent with rural development.

**Mr. McLeod:** Being from rural, though, I always – we've heard over the province in the last couple of weeks about, "Don't mix urban with rural," and then we've heard: "Oh, yeah. it works real fine where we are." I always sort of put that out there.

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah, I know. I'm only thinking of having people satisfied with their MLA and their MLA in a position where they can go to Edmonton and pound the table and say: this is what my people want. If you give somebody a half rural and a half urban riding, it's going to be harder for them to pound the table and say that this is what 47 per cent of my people want or 53 per cent of my people want. You're really putting the MLA, no matter whose party

they're with, in a position where it's hard for them to say that they're representing their people. If that makes any sense to you.

**Mrs. Day:** If I may weigh in on that one, it's a little bit interesting in certain parts of Alberta where we have those hybrids, we've called them, or I think you used the words mishmash or whatever. The hybrids in Grande Prairie, Fort McMurray, and I believe Medicine Hat have part city and part rural, but they are small cities, right? So we're getting some messages – I mean, it's mixed, but some messages are that they like those and they're working well. But, again, we're looking at a small city as opposed to the larger Edmonton, Calgary cities. Am I understanding that what you're saying is more directed towards . . .

**Mr. McIver:** The major population centres, the bigger metropolitan centres, yeah.

**Mrs. Day:** The metropolitan centres. Okay. So just to be clear . . .

**Mr. McIver:** You know what? There's no way you can have a separate MLA for a municipality of 7,000 people or 12,000 people. I understand that, and I think they understand that. So I thank you for asking me that question, Gwen. I think I'm talking more about the big population centres.

**Mrs. Day:** Okay. I think I had one other. You are here to speak largely about the ridings throughout the rural areas of Alberta. We heard from Derek Fildebrandt earlier, and he explained about expectations of the rural folks to see and interact and know their MLA, that there's an expectation that they get to many functions and that it's different than the MLAs in the city. So is that capturing it well? Do you find – I mean, you must have some nights where there are three different things to get to.

**Mr. McIver:** There are many, many nights where I go to three to five things. There are many other nights where there are six or eight things going on, and due to circumstances I don't go to any of them because I'm out of town, someplace else, or whatever. It's just a job that consumes as much of your life as you let it consume.

**Mrs. Day:** Do the expectations seem to be different between rural and urban MLAs?

**Mr. McIver:** Yeah. I think it is. I say this as a city boy. I think the expectations are in many cases harder on the rural MLAs because in Calgary there are 25 or 27 of us, and if you can't get McIver, you can get somebody else. If you can't get somebody else, you can get McIver. I think that in the public's mind there is an element of interchangeability whereas in Rocky Mountain House: "That's our MLA. We want you there. This is important." The poor person is, like, "Well, my son or daughter is graduating from high school that night, and I really kind of need to be there," and they say: "You're our MLA. We want you there." They're not nearly as interchangeable. That's their person.

**Mrs. Day:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** If I can just round out the discussion about the hybrid ridings, in your experience, for people who live in acreage areas which are outside of Edmonton or Calgary but perhaps work in Edmonton or Calgary, such as in Highwood or Chestermere-Rocky View, are their communities of interest more similar to the city or to the farm communities located in those constituencies? In other words, if we had to consider a hybrid, would it be more respectful of communities of interest to go into those acreage communities?

**Mr. McIver:** I would say that if you felt like you were forced to consider a hybrid or a partial hybrid, then you want to use the highest density areas if you're forced to. But that doesn't change my number one advice: don't do it if you can avoid it.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any other questions?

**Mrs. Day:** I do. When we look at the map of Calgary-South East, there is a large segment that is part of the city but is not developed yet. In my mind, that is not a hybrid because it's still not developed.

**Mr. McIver:** But it's in the city.

**Mrs. Day:** But it's in the city.

**Mr. McIver:** So there's an expectation, I believe. I think it's a reasonable expectation that if you've been annexed at some point in the city, you will have urban density at some point. I'm trying to be careful not to step on my city colleagues' toes here, but I think it's a reasonable expectation. Even if you didn't want to be annexed into the city but you got annexed in anyway, you may be unhappy about it, but there's still probably an expectation that at some point in the future you'll be redeveloped into urban density.

**The Chair:** We were just having this chat this morning before we started. Do you know – you're a former city councillor – whether there any current plans afoot in Calgary to apply to annex any additional land?

**Mr. McIver:** No. Actually, I'm the one person that was part of the last two major annexations in Calgary, one with Rocky View and one with Foothills. I was on both of those annexation negotiation committees. I think I'm the only one that was on both of those negotiating committees. Again, my memory is a little foggy because it's been a few years since I was on city council, but it seems to me that in both cases we annexed 30, 35 years of future lands.

You know what? City council could be meeting today, deciding on the next annexation. I don't know that, so please don't presume that I have any inside knowledge because I don't. But my recollection is that the last annexations were fairly big, and they were designed to last several decades.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any other questions?

All right. Thank you so much for coming. You have been extremely helpful, and, yes, we'd welcome your notes.

**Mr. McIver:** Okay. I'll get a copy to you.

10:20

**The Chair:** Okay. Thanks so much.

We'll invite our next registered presenter, Michelle Robinson. If you could start by telling us the constituency in which you reside, that would be helpful.

**Ms Robinson:** Good morning. I also reside in Calgary-Greenway. I want to open up by welcoming you to Treaty 7 territory, the land of the Blackfoot Confederacy. This land known as Calgary, Alberta, Canada, is known to indigenous as a place of treaty and equality because of the 1877 Treaty 7 signing, so I want to recognize the Kainai Nation, the Piikani Nation, the Siksika Nation, the Tsuut'ina Nation, and the Stoney Nakoda First Nation of Bearspaw, Chiniki, and Wesley nations. I also acknowledge the mixed and nonstatus, the Métis, and the visiting indigenous nations of Turtle Island, and the new Canadians from all around the globe.

The Crown signed the treaties on behalf of those who are considered Canadians, making us all treaty people.

I propose, in the spirit of reconciliation, consideration of any of the boundary changes with the following. Look at the Treaty 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10 boundaries. Design the new boundaries with respect to treaty boundaries. I think that adds to what Ric was saying about rivers going through certain areas.

Look at the Indian band boundaries. Design the new boundaries without cutting any of the bands in two. I was just looking at the map, and it looked like Tsuut'ina was a good example of that.

Look at the Métis settlement boundaries, and make sure that there's no cutting of any of those settlements in two, which I currently don't see, but with changes possibly happening, it's just something to keep in mind.

When we're naming electoral boundaries, consider the names of indigenous people that have contributed to the province. An example would be Charlotte Small, the Métis wife of David Thompson. Small spoke Blackfoot, Cree, French, and English, and Thompson credits her for his ability to be able to survey Alberta. Another example would be living elder Doreen Spence. She is one of the cofounders of the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples.

There are 444 recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, there are 94 calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and there are 43 articles to implement in the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. In the spirit of reconciliation, I would recommend looking at those documents in order to use them as an opportunity to have indigenous inclusion.

Lastly, although not related to indigenous issues, I want to advocate for the renaming of Calgary-Greenway to Calgary-Bhullar. Although I identify as a Liberal both federally and provincially, Manmeet Bhullar worked regardless of party affiliation. He helped complete my daughter's birth story by getting midwifery funded so that other moms like myself, who wanted a midwife but couldn't afford it, would have access to one. He was also a male advocate to stop family violence, including sexual abuse. He left a family violence prevention meeting when he travelled to Edmonton on the day of his death. As a resident of Calgary-Greenway I hope that Calgary-Bhullar is considered a legacy for a wonderful man.

That's all I have to say.

**The Chair:** Thanks. I'm going to kick off the questioning. Could you tell us whether any of the treaty area boundaries go through the city of Calgary at this point?

**Ms Robinson:** No. None of them would. Red Deer would be in the 7 and 6 areas, and then north of that in Edmonton would be 8 and 7. Those are the three main territories. Treaties 4 and 10 only have a small, little area that comes into Alberta.

**The Chair:** I'm going to take that step by step because I thought Edmonton was in the Treaty 6 area.

**Ms Robinson:** Part of it is, yeah.

**The Chair:** Aha. Okay.

Just starting at the south of the province, from the U.S. boundary north, what's that treaty area there?

**Ms Robinson:** Treaty 7.

**The Chair:** These treaty lines, as I recall, go east-west through Saskatchewan as well as Alberta, right?

**Ms Robinson:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** So there'd be a line there somewhere that would go from the Saskatchewan boundary to the B.C. boundary, which would be the northern boundary of Treaty 7.

**Ms Robinson:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** What area would that line cut through?

**Ms Robinson:** You'd have to look it up. I don't have the resources and money to have the maps.

**The Chair:** Okay. But your general impression, then, is that north of Treaty 7 we come to Treaty 8 land. How far north does that go?

**Ms Robinson:** Well, I don't – obviously, I'm going to google this.

**The Chair:** No, no. That's okay. I can google it, too. I just wondered. It's been a long time since I've looked at the treaty maps, but I have looked at them.

**Ms Robinson:** Treaty 6 is in between, so it goes 8, 6, and then 7.

**The Chair:** So Treaty 6 incorporates Calgary, more or less.

**Ms Robinson:** Treaty 7. We're on Treaty 7 land right now.

**The Chair:** Okay. So you're on Treaty 7 as well as all the way down to the border.

**Ms Robinson:** I'll just remind that the Blackfoot Confederacy is split because of a U.S.-Canada border there.

**The Chair:** Sure. Okay.

In any of that Treaty 7 land are you aware if the treaty boundary goes across current band lines?

**Ms Robinson:** I'm not too sure.

**The Chair:** I haven't heard, you know. I'm just asking myself that question.

**Ms Robinson:** I don't believe that there is.

**The Chair:** Okay. North of Treaty 7 we get to the area that includes Red Deer. That's Treaty 6?

**Ms Robinson:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** And then Edmonton is part Treaty 6 and part Treaty . . .

**Ms Robinson:** Eight.

**The Chair:** Any idea where that boundary is?

**Ms Robinson:** Yeah. You can look it up.

**The Chair:** I know, but do you know right off?

**Ms Robinson:** No. I'm pretty sure that one of the rivers separates them.

**The Chair:** Okay. And north of Edmonton . . .

**Ms Robinson:** That's almost all Treaty 8.

**The Chair:** Up to the Northwest Territories boundary?

**Ms Robinson:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thanks.

Any questions?

Thanks. It's been great to hear an aboriginal voice, if I may say. Thank you very much.

**Ms Robinson:** All right. Do you want my speech?

**The Chair:** Yes, please. That would be really helpful.

We're running a titch late, but that's not going to be a problem because we do have some extra time this morning. We did have a 15-minute break scheduled, so I'm going to take that break now. We'll resume at 20 minutes to 11.

[The hearing adjourned from 10:27 a.m. to 10:42 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Okay. I think we'll get going again.

Now, at this stage we don't have any other confirmed speakers for this morning, so I'm going to open up the floor to anybody who would like to come forward. I know that the two people who aren't staff in the room don't want me to finger them, but I know that you're here because you're interested in this topic, so it would be terrific if you'd come up and share with us your name and the constituency you live in.

Come on. Yes, please. By all means. Your name, sir?

**Mr. Jackson:** I go by Wayne. My full name is John Kenneth Wayne Jackson.

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

**Mr. Jackson:** I live in Calgary-Hawkwood, and I'm just here as an interested observer.

**The Chair:** Terrific. Well, I'm glad you're interested. Just so you know you're not alone, when we started out in Edmonton, the first morning we only had a senior citizens' group. I should be nice because I'm a senior citizen, right? Anyway, there was a whole group who'd come to watch, and we didn't have any speakers, but by the end of the morning every one of them had talked about their constituency. So it's in the spirit of that that I extend my gratitude to you for coming forward.

I'm looking at Calgary-Hawkwood right now, and the census figures from last week show that it's within 2 per cent of the provincial average, so Calgary-Hawkwood has not grown much in the last eight years. It's stayed consistent with the growth overall. That said, if we found we had to for some reason move a constituency boundary north, south, east, or west, maybe to accommodate population growth elsewhere in the city of Calgary, do you have any suggestions to make as to what we should do?

**Mr. Jackson:** I think I'd follow what many of the speakers before have said about thinking about sensible boundaries. We include several communities, including Ranchlands, Hawkwood, Silver Springs, Arbour Lake, and we do take only a portion of Citadel. That's another community. It's a fairly large one in the very north part of the constituency, and I think it's been chosen because of certain roads that go through there. I think it's Sarcee Trail, so it just made a sensible piece. I think that, similar to what other people have said, if you need to move a boundary, bring in a whole part of a community or a piece of a community that kind of makes sense.

From looking at it, you know, there could be some places where we could take on more of one of the boundary ridings, but it's hard to do without cutting communities in pieces, so it would probably make the constituency much bigger by taking another large community in. The reason why it doesn't change is that there isn't a whole lot of construction or new ways to develop.

In some of the nearby ridings there are some new high-density housing developments that are being considered. That would be – which is the one right next to it? – in Calgary-Varsity, I think. There's a development that's planned in there that would probably increase the Calgary-Varsity size. You know, if you can talk to the city developers and the city planners, I think they would be able to give you a good idea of where some of these major developments are happening within the city. There are a number, in my own opinion, thankfully, we're building up rather than continually building out. Speaking with those planners would help give you an idea of some of those changes happening within the city that are going to be important.

**The Chair:** Just looking at the map – and this isn't fair because you don't have this in front of you – on the southwest part of Calgary-Hawkwood, where it meets up with Calgary-North West, there's a broken line, Crowchild Trail. On your side of Crowchild Trail are all those communities intact?

**Mr. Jackson:** Yes, I believe so. When I say, "on my side," that would be more on the east side.

**The Chair:** Right.

**Mr. Jackson:** Yes, they are.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right. Any questions?

**Mr. McLeod:** You were pretty clear that you considered Calgary-Hawkwood as a mature kind of neighbourhood and that there's not going to be a lot of growth in there at all.

**Mr. Jackson:** That's right. There are no major developments that I'm aware of at this time.

**Mr. McLeod:** Okay. All right. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Okay. Just because you've lived in Calgary for a while, do you have any thoughts? We've talked a lot about the southwest portion of the city because there's been high growth, but we haven't talked yet about the northeast portion of the city, closer to where you live, where there appears to have been very high growth in Calgary-McCall, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, Calgary-Northern Hills, and Calgary-Foothills.

**Mr. Jackson:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Do you have any experiences which would suggest that some of the boundaries of those four constituencies could or should be changed to make more sense?

**Mr. Jackson:** I wish a few people that I know were here to speak towards that because, yes, there are definite changes needed. I mean, you can look at some of the boundaries for, like, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill. That is a very strange-looking riding, and it has actually had I think a tremendous amount of growth based on new communities in there. I definitely think there need to be some changes around that constituency, whether or not – it might not just be tweaks that you really need to do there. There might need to be some wholesale changes, which is difficult for everybody involved but would probably lead you to some more sensible ridings.

I should mention, I guess, that I've been a homeowner in Calgary since 2004, so I've been here quite a while, but I was out of the country for five years, and when I came back, I had a much different outlook on life because I'd gotten married overseas and had kids. But I've lived many places across the province. I grew up in Grande



Prairie. I still have family there. I went to school in Edmonton. I still have friends there. I lived in Edson for many years, worked there. So I've lived and worked across this province.

I was just talking to some of the other speakers outside, and I just wanted to relay how important I felt some of the points were that they were making about not being so much focused on numbers as focused on the grouping of people and their outlooks and to make a constituency as coherent as possible. You know, especially as Albertans, we need to remember our history, and we need to remember the fight that Albertans made back in the '90s pushing for representation by area as much as representation by population, because as a province in the federal regime we always felt we were losing out to our eastern cousins and brothers and sisters in that whenever an election was held at the federal level, the decision was made before it left Ontario.

**10:50**

We face a similar issue here in Alberta now, where if we just focus on the numbers, the decisions will be made as to who runs the province based on Calgary and Edmonton, and we can't forget that this province has a very wide demographic. We're a very large province with people living and working all across it, and growing up in a small community, I really want to support my family and friends that are left there, knowing that it's okay if some of these ridings have smaller numbers and that especially the metropolitan areas have larger ones because their voice should I don't want to say have a greater weighting, but it should at least be an equal weighting. What that means is equal in terms of the lifestyles they live and the work that they do for this province and the struggles that they have to live with every day in accessing health care, accessing education. We need to have a government, at the end of the day, that can recognize that our province has many different challenges, depending on where you live.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Questions?

Thanks, and thanks so much for coming out, Mr. Johnson.

**Mr. Jackson:** Jackson.

**The Chair:** Jackson. Sorry. Never call somebody by their name if you don't get it right. Mr. Jackson, thank you very much.

**Mr. Jackson:** Thank you, all. Thank you for the work you're doing here.

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

Ma'am, in the back, would you mind coming forward?

**Mrs. Fulton:** Are you talking to me?

**The Chair:** I am indeed.

**Mrs. Fulton:** Good morning.

**The Chair:** Good morning.

**Mrs. Fulton:** Thank you for the work you're doing. My name is Wendy Fulton. I'm on the agenda to present tomorrow, and I don't have my notes with me, so I'd rather leave all of this stuff that we're preparing. I'm part of a group that's looking at Calgary, most specifically south Calgary. As you know, the major problem is Calgary-South East, but once you start trying to fix one, it's a domino effect. All of my notes are at home, so I'd just as soon wait until tomorrow if you don't mind.

**The Chair:** Absolutely. I'm going to hold you to that promise to come back tomorrow.

**Mrs. Fulton:** I will be.

**The Chair:** We're interested in everything you have to say, but in particular it is so useful to gain the knowledge of people who live in different constituencies. We haven't heard from everybody, every constituency in the province, and I think we're going to be at a disadvantage in regard to some constituencies because there weren't people who came and said, "This road makes sense," "That river makes sense," or whatever. So thank you, and we'll look forward to your comments tomorrow.

**Mrs. Fulton:** Thank you. This is why we worked as a group, and I will be speaking on all their behalf. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Okay. Well, we've run out of speakers, then, at this point, so we'll take a break until the next registered speaker at 1:15.

[The hearing adjourned at 10:54 a.m.]





