



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission  
Public Hearings

Calgary

Tuesday, February 21, 2017  
7 p.m.

Transcript No. 17

**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**

David Campbell

Gordon Elliott

Ali Hyder

Keith Jones

Matthew Morrisey

Ron Taylor, President, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill Alberta Party Constituency Association



7 p.m.

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks very much for coming out this evening. I'm Justice Myra Bielby of the Alberta Court of Appeal. Normally I live in Edmonton and work throughout the province, but at the moment I'm chairing the Electoral Boundaries Commission. With me as commissioners are, to my left, Jean Munn of Calgary, Laurie Livingstone of Calgary, and, to my right, Gwen Day of Carstairs and Bruce McLeod of Acme, Alberta.

Over the last few weeks, once word got out that we were doing our work on the electoral boundaries, a number of people have asked for more information, so I thought I'd start our comments tonight by talking about what we're doing and why. The Electoral Boundaries Commission was created by the Legislature under the requirements of something called the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which is a law in Alberta that was most recently passed in 1990, but a version of it has existed since the time Alberta became a province. The purpose of the legislation is to create a body that determines whether the sizes of constituencies should change because of shifts in population over the previous eight to 10 years. Every eight to 10 years one of these commissions sits and reviews the boundaries in the province. The last time it happened was in 2009-2010, and as a result of the work of that boundary commission, we have the constituencies as they exist today.

If you look at the map that's second from the right there on the wall, with a big green patch at the top, that sets out our constituencies as they exist right at this time. The red lettering on there is the population of each of our 87 constituencies based on the 2016 Canada census information that was released February 8, so it's pretty current. The blue figures beneath are the sizes of the population in that constituency at the time the constituency was created in 2009-2010 as a result of the work of that boundaries commission. If you look at the map, you can see the changes in constituency size in each constituency since the last time this work was done.

Our work is particularly important right now not just because legislation requires it but because at this moment in time we're realizing that Alberta has experienced a huge increase in population over the last eight years. Notwithstanding the recent economic downturn, our population has increased net by more than 14 per cent, or more than 600,000 people. Depending on whether you read an Edmonton paper or a Calgary paper, either Edmonton or Calgary has grown the fastest of any city in Canada, followed only by Vancouver. Each of Edmonton and Calgary have had a growth rate of over 14 per cent. Vancouver came in third at 6.9 per cent, I think, so you can see how much larger the growth rate has been in Alberta than in the next competitive province.

Now, that poses a task, a challenge for us because Alberta has 87 constituencies called electoral boundaries, but I think people most often call them constituencies or ridings. We the commission have no power to increase or decrease that number. Some of you may remember that the last time the commission sat, the Legislature passed legislation to increase the number of constituencies by four. Alberta went from 83 constituencies to 87 constituencies to help deal with the influx of population between 2002 and 2009-10, but we don't have that happening on this occasion. If the Legislature wanted to increase the constituencies, they would have had to pass a law to do that prior to the time this commission was constituted on October 31, and that didn't happen.

Our challenge right now is to look at the province, know that it has to be divided into 87 pieces, and decide the size and shape of

each one of those pieces. As we know, each riding, or constituency, elects one MLA to the provincial Legislature, and there are 87 MLAs that sit in the Legislature in Edmonton. Our population overall has increased by more than 14 per cent since the last review, but – and this is the key fact – that population has not moved equally or proportionally into each of Alberta's 87 constituencies. It's moved disproportionately into certain constituencies, meaning they've grown more rapidly than the provincial average growth. The result of that is that other constituencies have had a drop in their relative population.

To break it down, in 2010 each of Alberta's 87 constituencies had an average population of 40,880. Today, as we see on the slide, our population is 46,697. That figure is calculated by dividing 87 into the province's current population of 4,062,609 people, and these figures are fresh. We received them February 8 from Statistics Canada when they released the population figures from the 2016 federal census.

As I said a moment ago, the population growth has not been spread evenly across all constituencies. In 2009-2010, when the recommendations were adopted by the Legislature, the result was that over half of our constituencies in Alberta were within 5 per cent of the provincial average and over 85 per cent were within 10 per cent of the provincial average. But today there's a huge range between the smallest and the largest. Our smallest constituency has 17,129 people, well below the 46,000 average figure, and our largest constituency here in Calgary-South East has grown to 92,248 people, four and a half times the size of our smallest constituency. That variation has arisen in small part because people continue to move from rural areas of the province into the cities, but the majority of it has come from people in other parts of Canada moving to Alberta for whatever reason, our beautiful life here in Alberta.

Our job, the job of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, is to make recommendations to the Legislature as to where or how constituency boundaries should be moved to ensure that each Albertan has effective representation by their MLA. We'll all remember that a fundamental principle of democracy is representation by population, that each Albertan's vote should be relatively as effective as every other Albertan's vote when an election comes along. So our task is to recommend adjustments to assist in making sure that that happens.

But we're not looking simply at population densities. If that was the case, we could have stayed home and taken out our ruler and pencil and drawn the province in 87 squares, each one of which had 46,697 people in it, and our job would have been done. But the legislation says that we're to consider other factors in addition to population, and that includes common community interests and organizations.

So our goal is to not divide up people in common communities, common organizations, not to divide up First Nation reserves and Métis settlements if we can avoid it. We're to take into account community and neighbourhood boundaries in each of Edmonton and Calgary and try to avoid splitting up a neighbourhood if we can possibly do so. We're to try to honour municipal boundaries in the smaller cities and towns in Alberta. We don't want to divide up a town if we can avoid it. We're to take into account geographical features that suggest natural boundaries to constituencies such as rivers or major highways.

But this isn't a closed list. Those are the factors that are specifically spelled out in the legislation, but in addition to that, we can consider anything else that you the public think bears on your MLA's ability to effectively represent you. That's why we've been travelling the province. Now we're in our third week, talking to people about the factors they think are important in having effective

representation, and we want to consider those factors in devising clear and understandable boundaries for each of the 87 constituencies in the province.

My thanks to those of you who have registered to speak here tonight. We'll be calling on you in a minute, in order, asking you to speak. When we're finished, for anybody else who would like to say anything, I'm sure we'll have time to hear from you tonight as well.

7:10

In addition to our public hearings, we've invited written submissions as to where constituency boundaries should be set through our website, abebc.ca, and we've had a terrific response. The last time they did this, they had 500 written submissions in the course of a year. This time we had 749 submissions in six weeks. Now, I have to say that that's probably because we've invited submissions on the Internet – you could put them right on our website, type them in, and send them in – or to send them to us by e-mail or social media or post. In any event, we had a strong response, and that was terrific. Now the deadline has passed for our first round of written submissions, but you'll have further opportunity before we're finished to send us written submissions in the future.

Now our task, when we're finished the hearings this week, is to consider the remarks that anybody has made at a public hearing and to consider the suggestions and requests in the written submissions. Then the five of us will sit down and go through the province and come up with 87 recommendations to send to the Legislature, one for each of the constituencies in the province.

After we file those submissions with the Legislature, which we have to do by May 31, 2017, they will be posted on our website, and we'll invite further submissions from the public. It may be that when people specifically see what's being recommended for their constituencies, they'll think of other suggestions they might have, and that's terrific. We'll also have a second round of public hearings in late July, early August dealing with feedback on our specific recommendations. Then our obligation is to fine-tune those recommendations and file them with the Legislature by October 31 of this year. Then our work is done.

Normally what happens at that point is that the Legislature would enact legislation creating those changes in the constituency boundaries so Alberta would be ready for the next provincial election. We're doing this work well ahead of time in part because this legislation specifically gives the date that we were to start as October 31. It gives these deadlines all the way through, so we are following those deadlines. Also, I understand that returning officers in the province have asked for at least a year to prepare for the upcoming election, so there was some wish to help them along in making sure that we have the best possible infrastructure for the next provincial election.

I want to emphasize that equality or parity of population in each constituency is not our only consideration. While our courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have interpreted our legislation as meaning that each Albertan has the right not to have the potential strength or value of his or her vote unduly diluted, the legislation permits variances in individual constituencies, where necessary, of up to 25 per cent above or below the average figure of 46,697 and a maximum of four cases of up to 50 per cent below average.

Now, we have only two of these special constituencies right now. They're right up against the Northwest Territories boundary. Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley actually has a 51 per cent below average population right now, so we're going to be compelled to adjust that boundary. We don't have any choice. Lesser Slave Lake

is another special constituency that's 41 per cent below the provincial average.

In summary, what our job is at the end of the day, after all the submissions are in, is to look at each individual constituency, consider the number of people that the census shows live in that constituency – that's the red number on the map – compare that to 46,697, and then decide whether there's any acceptable reason not to move the boundaries of the constituency so that the population in that constituency is closer to 46,697. Now, it's impossible to get that number exact in each of the 87 constituencies, and of course the population changes every day. Babies are born, people move to Saskatchewan, whatever. The legislation requires us to use the census figures from last year as the basis for our work.

Again, we have many factors that we can take into account in deciding whether or not to move the boundaries of any particular constituency. Of course, if you look at the provincial map, you'll see many constituencies, particularly in the centre of Calgary, where the population is very close to the provincial average, so the growth in those constituencies has been proportionate to the growth in the entire population. But you'll see other constituencies, largely toward the outskirts of the city, where the population growth has been much in excess of the provincial average.

Now, please be aware that *Hansard* staff are present and are recording everything that we say. It will be placed on our website within a couple of days in audio form, and also a written transcript will be posted there, so anybody can read what went on at these public hearings. Our written submissions will be posted within a few days of the start of March. All of the 749 submissions, more or less, will be on our website as well.

Now, for the people who are making oral comments tonight, I'm going to ask you about a certain point. If you think there is a good reason to move a boundary in any particular constituency, if you'd like to go to the map and show us exactly where you think the boundaries should be, our clerk will give you a marker, and then I'll ask you to mark that on the map. He'll take a photograph of that, and then we'll have a permanent record to assist us when we come to our deliberations, to be able to remember what you've said exactly about where the boundary should be.

With that, thank you again for coming tonight.

I'll call on our first registered speaker, Evan Legate. Mr. Legate? All right. David Campbell.

**Mr. Campbell:** Okay. Do you want me to sit here?

**The Chair:** Oh, please do. Could you tell us what constituency you live in, Mr. Campbell.

**Mr. Campbell:** I'm in Chestermere-Rocky View.

**The Chair:** Great. Thank you.

**Mr. Campbell:** No disrespect to this commission, but I don't believe that you should have the mandate that you've been given because all of the board members have been appointed solely on their political affiliations. The commission should be made up of regular folks with little or no political standing, not judges and lawyers with clear political aspirations. All areas of the province should be represented in this commission, and particularly right now we don't have people from the deep south or the far north. Therefore, there is no way that this commission can administer its duties in a truly transparent and open fashion. The rewriting of electoral boundaries should be based on what will enhance the governance of all Albertans. It should not be based on partisan politics or politicians' lust for eternal power.

I suggest you think of the social, cultural, and economic differences of our people in our vast province before you rewrite the boundaries to favour urban areas. Our current population of approximately 4 million people is represented currently by 44 urban constituencies, which is more than half already. I believe that giving power to urbanites would diminish the value and input of rural Albertans. I also believe that if you enlarge rural constituencies, it will be very difficult for people to engage in the political process, particularly now that this government has greatly reduced and capped election spending limits.

It will never be an easy task to divvy up the province into nice, manageable boxes given our geographical enormity, but it is something that you have been assigned to do. I urge you to do it in an unbiased manner, always keeping the average Albertan in mind.

I don't have any considerations about changing the boundaries and those types of things. I just don't think that you people should be here.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, I take that point. But while you're here, because you're from Chestermere-Rocky View and we have yet to have somebody from Chestermere-Rocky View come up to the mike, I'm going to ask you a couple of questions, if you'll just bear with us, because we don't want to miss this opportunity to gain the benefit of your local knowledge of what's going on there.

If you look at our maps that are against the wall there, you can see that the boundary in Chestermere-Rocky View is over the provincial average by – of course, I've not got my map right here in front of me – 16 per cent. So I'm hearing you when you say that we shouldn't be doing this, but our obligation is to look at everything. We don't have to recommend changes to everything, but I want to give you the opportunity to tell us, if we did decide that we had to move the boundaries in Chestermere-Rocky View to shrink it by 16 per cent, frankly: do you think that we should do that by moving in the northern boundary, by moving in the eastern boundary, the southern boundary? Do you have a view on that?

7:20

**Mr. Campbell:** The major part of the population, as far as I know, in Chestermere-Rocky View is in Chestermere.

**The Chair:** Right.

**Mr. Campbell:** So if you're going to move the boundary, you could probably, you know, take the northern boundary and hook it up with the Airdrie folks, and the western boundary is depending on – and I'm sure it's here – the electoral boundaries in the western part of Calgary, or do you take the eastern part of the Banff-Cochrane kind of corridor and put it in there?

**The Chair:** Okay. Some people have said to us that the population in Chestermere-Rocky View is very closely aligned socially to the Calgary population because a lot of people work in Calgary even though they live in Chestermere-Rocky View, so they would have more of a connection with Calgary maybe than with an agricultural farming area.

**Mr. Campbell:** You know what? I'd completely disagree with that.

**The Chair:** Okay. Tell us about that.

**Mr. Campbell:** I'm a resident of Chestermere for two and a half years. The reason I went there is to get away from the city of Calgary. I do believe that a lot of people have done the very same thing. So even though people would work in the city of Calgary, I

don't think they align themselves with the thinking of the people in Calgary. In fact, if anything, I think that we would more align ourselves with the folks in Strathmore, you know, in that type of thinking. I can't speak for everybody, but certainly the people that I do know have moved out of the city of Calgary to get out of the city of Calgary. I don't think that we'd really be more aligned with the people in the city.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any other questions? Anyone?

Okay. Thanks so much for coming and for volunteering your views.

**Mr. Campbell:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Our next registered speaker is Ron Taylor. Mr. Taylor, if you could start by telling us which constituency you reside in.

**Mr. Taylor:** My name is Ron Taylor. I am the president of the Alberta Party constituency association for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill. From what I can tell, the existing boundaries of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill are – it would appear that the last time this process was done, it was hastily put together, with a new community horseshoed around to another one, which have no real commonalities. My concern is that in the north end of the city, in the northwest, there are many, many new communities ever-growing, which is, obviously, why we're here. I think that as a group, if we were to group those communities together, we could move forward with communities with common issues to be addressed by one MLA, who would be responsible for working on those issues collectively.

So I would propose that those boundaries be grouped with the new communities on the fringe of the city into one district. Like I said, they share common issues – for example, schools and poor access to the ring road – all of which would work hand in hand with the municipality as well. With that in mind, if we were to lay those new communities out, for the majority those communities all reside within one ward of the city as well. It's easier to work with the municipal representative one-on-one as opposed to two or three different aldermen from the city.

What I have done – and I will offer up a package – is coloured up some beautiful little maps and kind of laid out how we could configure those with a more even distribution of the population into each group. I based those numbers on the recent census and how many people are in each community.

**The Chair:** Would you like to pass those out to us?

**Mr. Taylor:** I would love to.

**The Chair:** Okay. There's one set of these here, so I'm going to take the first turn, the prerogative of the chair.

**Mr. Taylor:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** I'm looking at this map, and it shows that you've coloured the northern part of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill. That would be more or less the communities ending with the northern border of the Calgary airport, so they remain in Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, and then you swing over and take in some communities that are currently within Calgary-Foothills that would appear to include – excuse me; I'm showing my age here – Nolan, Sage, Evanston, Sherwood, Kincoira.

**Mr. Taylor:** Correct.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do you know roughly, because you were looking at the census figures, what the population of that area would be?

**Mr. Taylor:** If we were to go with what you have there, we're looking at a population of 46,444, plus or minus. With that in mind, we currently have massive development in the area, as you can understand. We have continuous growth of the communities that are existing. There are two new communities that are coming on the grid, Carrington and Livingston, which are just east of Evanston, and development permits are being finalized now for a development north of Evanston and Sage Hill that is slated to be called Glacier Ridge. Easily another 6,000 individuals can be added to that area by the time the assumed 2019 election rolls around, which should bring the numbers to 52,000 to 54,000.

**The Chair:** If I can just carry on, you've also got other coloured areas. I haven't obviously had a chance to look through this yet. Am I correct in assuming that each one of these coloured areas you think would be a good constituency?

**Mr. Taylor:** That's where we've been able to group population together within close proximity to even distribution. We've added some rural, industrial, commercial areas that already have a high density of population, but with adding that land, it's not having any effect on the numbers of population.

**The Chair:** So part of this is area that's outside of the boundaries of the city of Calgary?

**Mr. Taylor:** No. It's all within.

**The Chair:** Okay. Now, I notice that you didn't colour in any other constituencies for the rest of Calgary.

**Mr. Taylor:** I was going to leave some work for you.

**The Chair:** Well, thanks.

Okay. What you're telling me is that the coloured part is a coherent whole, that they each have approximately 46,000 some-odd people estimated, but the rest you haven't considered. I'm not faulting you for this. This is good homework. But the effect on the neighbouring constituencies: you haven't particularly considered that in drawing this map up?

**Mr. Taylor:** I tried to keep everything above the Bow River. That seems to be a natural boundary that we all like. The only ones on that map that aren't taken into consideration are Greenway, McCall, and Cross, all of which are coming along nicely with numbers, and I don't think there's a lot of room to fudge those. Cross perhaps may have a bit of room.

7:30

**The Chair:** It's just 2 per cent over the provincial average. Are you suggesting that the areas you've coloured in on this map have more in common, one with the other, than you'd have with Calgary-McCall? That seems like a new area, too, that's been growing fast.

**Mr. Taylor:** In the southern part?

**The Chair:** No, no. Right up here in the north corner, on the southeast corner.

**Mr. Taylor:** Oh, yes. Up there is heavily developed as well. I can imagine that it's going to continue to grow over the next couple of years leading up to the election as well.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm going to pass your map along so that my fellow commissioners can take a look at it.

**Ms Livingstone:** Can I ask one question?

**The Chair:** Oh, yeah, of course.

**Ms Livingstone:** I'm just going to jump in with one question. The numbers that you've used in calculating and drawing this map: are those the federal census numbers or the municipal census numbers?

**Mr. Taylor:** I took those from municipal.

**Ms Livingstone:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Just for clarification, we're obliged to use the federal census numbers. We've encountered small differences in different areas of the province, depending in part, I guess, on how different municipalities treat people who don't live in their area all the time. So there may be some differences between the figures you've used and the figures that we're required to use.

**Mr. McLeod:** In your submission you were talking about some of these newer areas. Are those all north, up towards what would be considered the city of Calgary's boundaries to the far north?

**Mr. Taylor:** They are north of Stoney Trail and south of the city limits.

**Mr. McLeod:** Up in that area at the top there.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yes.

**Mr. McLeod:** You're estimating that those have somewhere in the neighbourhood of – what did you say? – 6,000 for Glacier, Carrington, and Evanston. How many were you expecting there?

**Mr. Taylor:** I would anticipate growth in the next two years of those three communities to be in the neighbourhood of 6,000.

**Mr. McLeod:** Six thousand for all three. Okay. All right. Would you have any knowledge of Calgary-McCall, by any chance, in that northeast quarter up there? Is there a lot of construction up in that area also?

**Mr. Taylor:** There is, yes.

**Mr. McLeod:** Okay. So there's going to be growth there also.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yeah. We'll be back here in eight years.

**Mr. McLeod:** Okay.

**Mrs. Day:** I'm just curious about this little lake, this little jot here. Is it because there's a hill that it makes more sense to bring it in with the rest?

**Mr. Taylor:** That's a community that shares – its main route in and out of the community would be Beddington Trail. The community south of Beddington and that little pocket use the same infrastructure and have many commonalities in their infrastructure and schools and things of that nature.

**Mrs. Day:** I could get you some pencil crayons; just do a little more homework here. That's great. Thank you for your – are you leaving a copy of this for us?

**Mr. Taylor:** Yes. That one is yours.



**The Chair:** All right. Thanks very much. Is there anything else you'd like to say?

**Mr. Taylor:** I think we've covered it.

**The Chair:** All right. Thanks so much. That's been perfect, Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

Now, there are a number of others of you here, and I'm sure you're here because you're interested in this in one way or another. I'd be more than pleased if any of you would come forward and just tell us what constituency you live in and what you think should be done, if anything. Sir.

**Mr. Elliott:** My name is Gord Elliott. I live in Calgary-North West. I'm the Wildrose Calgary-North West Constituency Association president. I'm the Wildrose Calgary-Acadia Constituency Association president. I'm a provincial director for Calgary on the Executive Committee of the Wildrose, and I'm also the chair of the electoral boundaries subcommittee of the Executive Committee for the Wildrose Party. I will be making a detailed presentation to you on Friday in Westlock.

I actually have some questions for you. The number that you showed for the population of Alberta, 4,062,609, is different from the number that Statistics Canada has on their website for the population of Alberta. I'm curious as to why there is a difference there.

**The Chair:** Would you happen to know the number that you recall Stats Canada having on its website?

**Mr. Elliott:** It's 4,067,175.

**The Chair:** All I can say is that I'll check that out. Obviously, if we're wrong on these numbers, we'll make whatever adjustments are required although it would be a relatively small adjustment. Nonetheless, we'd be happy to do that, of course.

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure. It's just – well, I guess I'm a geek, so I'm curious about those differences.

**The Chair:** All I can say in our defence, now that I'm thinking about it, is that – I don't know that this happened; I'm just speculating – Stats Canada agreed to go up and do a small census in Fort McMurray to see what the change had been as a result of the people moving away from the wildfire who hadn't moved back yet.

**Mr. Elliott:** Okay.

**The Chair:** We got those figures on Friday, the adjustment of 9,100 people, to this point, who haven't moved back and where they lived in Fort McMurray. Now, I don't know whether that has anything to do with changing this final number or not, but that was kind of late-breaking news on Friday. There might be, in fact, further adjustments to that Statistics Canada number, but we'll definitely check that out.

**Mr. Elliott:** Okay. The other query I had. You said that you were obligated by the law to use the Statistics Canada numbers. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** Yeah. I'll give you the section of the statute that I'm relying on in giving you that opinion. It says, under part 2, redistribution rules, that within the act population means the population of Alberta as provided in

the most recent decennial . . .

Every 10 years.

. . . census of population referred to in section 19(3) of the [federal] Statistics Act . . . from which the population of all proposed electoral divisions is available.

Plus

the population on [any] Indian reserves that are not included in the decennial census . . .

That's only the Saddle Lake reserve, and we do have an estimated figure for them, about 2,300.

. . . as provided by the Department of Indian . . . and Northern [Affairs] (Canada).

**Mr. Elliott:** Okay.

**The Chair:** There's another provision that if the census was a long time ago and you're in the middle, like it was in 2009-2010, you can adjust it with the best available information. Because, of course, we're in the lucky position that this information is two weeks old, obviously, you know, we're going to use that information.

**Mr. Elliott:** The problem I have with the Statistics Canada numbers: one, for the city of Edmonton, Statistics Canada, doing its census as of May 10, 2016, reported about 33,000 more people in the city of Edmonton than the city of Edmonton did in their census done on April 1. I was going to say that it's not likely that 33,000 people moved to Edmonton during that six-week period, but actually the answer is: yes, it is likely that 33,000 people moved to Edmonton in that six-week period, and they moved there from Fort McMurray to escape the wildfires.

**The Chair:** Except, just to help develop this argument, I don't think that Stats Canada counted them as Edmonton's population. They were still trying to count them as Fort McMurray's population. I think that maybe – and I'm just speculating here – what happened is that the city used a different approach to deal with what's called the shadow population sometimes; that is, the people who work in Fort McMurray but live in Edmonton. Where is their residence? Stats Canada tries to not count that as Fort McMurray, so if they have another residence in Calgary, Edmonton, Morinville, wherever, they'll put them in that city or that place. But the city of Edmonton might have a different approach in doing that. I'm not sure how accurate anybody is in determining, you know, whether somebody is working in Fort McMurray and living somewhere else.

That's the explanation we've been given. I'm just saying. This is our third week of doing this, and in virtually every centre that we've gone to, the municipal census that was done is off the Stats Canada census to a degree. That's the explanation we've been given for that.

7:40

**Mr. Elliott:** Okay. Well, reinforcing the argument about Edmonton is also the numbers for Calgary. The number that Stats Canada reports for the city of Calgary is about 4,000 people higher than the city of Calgary reported for the population of the city of Calgary. One can also hypothesize that those 4,000 people are evacuees from Fort McMurray.

The other factor that reinforces that argument is the population of Fort McMurray-Conklin, which went from 39,000 people and some back when the last boundary review was done to 17,000 now. Well, nobody believes that the population of Fort McMurray-Conklin went down by 22,000 people in the last six years. Those people have gone somewhere.

It seems logical to me that the excess population between the two censuses in both Edmonton and Calgary is evacuees. The way I do that is: if you look at the population of Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo, the change in Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo between

2010 and 2016 is about 31 per cent. If you add the 37,000 people, the extra people in Calgary and Edmonton, to the population of Fort McMurray-Conklin, you find that the population there has gone up by about 37 per cent. Thirty-seven per cent, 31 per cent: those numbers are very similar, which, I would say, validates or helps to validate the hypothesis that the 37,000 extra people in Calgary and Edmonton – well, they lived in Fort McMurray on May 2 and did not live in Fort McMurray on May 10 because of the wildfires.

We'll see what kind of discretion you have or choose to use. You have a very difficult task here because of the . . .

**The Chair:** What would you like us to do as a result of that? If you're right, how does that impact our work?

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure. All right. The way it impacts your work is – I propose to you that you should use the census numbers from the cities for the population of both Calgary and Edmonton in order to determine the number of seats that should be in those cities as opposed to the rural areas. Otherwise, you know, these extra 33,000 people in Edmonton may wind up giving an extra electoral division to Edmonton that isn't warranted because those people were only there temporarily.

**Ms Livingstone:** Can I speak?

**The Chair:** Yes, of course.

**Ms Livingstone:** Just a couple of questions to follow up on what you've been saying here.

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure.

**Ms Livingstone:** One, why do you believe the municipal census numbers are more accurate than Statistics Canada's? Two, what do you know about the methodologies between what Statistics Canada does and what the municipalities do?

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure. Well, let me answer your second question first. Both the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary do a census every year. The reason they do that is because the amount of money they get from the government of Alberta and the government of Canada is a function of how many people they have. When we've had rapid growth in the populations of those two cities, they want to keep their population number current so that they get more money from the two governments.

I can't speak for the city of Edmonton, but I know that the city of Calgary has a department that includes within its responsibilities doing this census every year as of April 1. There's permanent staff who oversees it, who come back every year to carry out this task. What the permanent staff does, of course, is that they hire temporary staff to actually go knock on the doors and find out how many people live in every residence. I can tell you, having lived in Calgary since 1984, that they're very thorough. If I'm not home when they come and knock on my door, they leave me a card with a phone number and expect me to phone them back and tell them how many people live in my house. The temporary staff that they use every year tend to come back year after year. They like the job – you're outdoors, walking in the springtime – and they get quite good at what they're doing. There's an expertise there.

As Madam Justice Bielby said, the StatsCan census is a decennial census, so it's only done every 10 years. It's a different staffing requirement that StatsCan has for carrying out their census. You can't have somebody dedicated to doing the census – well, I guess they do it every five years. I'm kind of surprised that this legislation only uses a decennial census rather than the census done in the fifth

year because the next one will be done in 2021. Actually, in fact, if you have to use the decennial census, the decennial census was done in 2011. This is the in-between one; 2016 is the five-year.

**The Chair:** Correct. That's correct.

**Mr. Elliott:** So you're going to use the data from 2011.

**The Chair:** Well, what the section after the one that I didn't read out to you – I said that if the information is dated, you can use other censuses. It says that if in the opinion of the commission there is some other province-wide census that is more recent than the decennial census of the population referred to in section 19(3) of the federal Statistics Act, from which the population of all proposed electoral divisions is available, the population of Alberta for the purposes of this part is determined by (a) that province-wide census of population and (b), with respect to Indian reserves, information obtained from the department of Indian and northern affairs. So if, in our opinion, there's some province-wide census that's more recent than the 2011 census – that would be the 2016 census – then we're obliged to use that census.

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm sorry. I should have read the whole thing out. It's so much fun reading this stuff. I wanted to shorten it up, but I shouldn't have done that.

**Mr. Elliott:** Isn't that what you do for a living?

**The Chair:** It is, absolutely. I love it.

**Mr. Elliott:** Yeah. In answer to Commissioner Livingstone, the calibre of the city census, I think, is quite high because of the permanent staff and the people who come back every year to carry it out. I would suggest to you that it's probably higher than what StatsCan does because they only do it every five years, so they're obliged to hire people who aren't as experienced as the people who carry out the city one.

**The Chair:** Do you have any actual knowledge of the criteria? I'm sure there's a page of criteria that StatsCan uses when counting population in a constituency and that the city of Calgary uses in counting the population. Are they identical? Do you know?

**Mr. Elliott:** I don't know that. Well, what do I know about StatsCan? I got a letter in the mail with a website and a code number to sign in, so I actually went onto the website and reported myself how many people lived in my house. You know, my number is accurate. How many other people did that? When people fill it out themselves, what is the quality of the response that Statistics Canada gets versus having somebody knock on my door?

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

Okay. Well, thank you for coming forward, and we look forward to your further and more fulsome comments presumably at the end of the week. Thanks.

All right. I see many other faces here, and I want you to know, just to appeal to your sense of competition with Edmonton, that when we did this in Edmonton, on the first day of our hearings we got everyone in the room up to the microphone by the time it was over. I see several faces who haven't come forward, and I'm assuming you're here because you're interested in the subject of constituencies and democracy in elections. So I'd invite anyone to come up and tell us what they think about this process.

**Mr. Taylor:** I'll go twice.

**The Chair:** Okey-doke.

**Mr. Taylor:** I've got a written description to accompany that map, which will help define . . .

7:50

**The Chair:** Okay. That's great, actually.

**Mr. Hyder:** My name is Ali. I'm just a citizen. I live in Airdrie.

**The Chair:** Which constituency do you live in?

**Mr. Hyder:** I live in Airdrie.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Hyder:** I just witnessed kind of, like, that Airdrie is also a growing city, and we have many issues, you know, like any other growing city, like roads, schools, and parks. When we raise any issue with the city council or sometimes the provincial politicians, we have this story of conflict, like, in some areas because: this is a provincial issue, this is a federal issue, this is a municipal issue. So when you're dealing with these kinds of new boundaries – of course, I consider this as a kind of fantasy, my political fantasy, let's say – if we can also have the consideration of other constituency influence because now we have municipal, we have federal, and also we have the education board. Sometimes, also, citizens start not being interested anymore in politics because it belongs in different areas, it belongs in different jurisdictions.

I don't know if these kinds of new boundaries are also considered in the representation at the federal stage because this will make the co-operation between these different stages easier. If these two areas or maybe three or four – I'm not sure – which are close to each other will be represented by one federal MP, it will be easier because this will make the communication easier for these politicians and solve our problems, of course.

I don't know if this – like, from my experience as a citizen or somebody living in Airdrie, I found out that sometimes when you have overlapping areas from provincial and, let's say, federal, we have this problem. If we want to build a bridge, they say that this should be on the provincial stage or should be in the federal representation, which is infrastructure, or it belongs to the municipal or it belongs to the federal. So if we can also consider that the representative of this area will communicate easily or if they have, maybe, better attachment instead of overlapping between other areas – this will also be easier for us to communicate with our representative.

**The Chair:** Well, that's interesting. You're the first person to make this suggestion, so if I can just go over it and make sure I understand it. There are 42 federal constituencies in Alberta compared to the 87 provincial constituencies, roughly.

**Mr. Elliott:** No, no.

**The Chair:** How many?

**Mr. Elliott:** Thirty-four.

**The Chair:** Thirty-four? You're sure?

**Mr. Elliott:** Want to bet?

**The Chair:** I don't. I thought there were 44.

**Mr. Hyder:** Maybe if I can go to the map?

**The Chair:** Oh. But we don't have the federal constituencies up here.

**Mr. Hyder:** No, no. I'm just saying that I will explain myself better on the map.

**The Chair:** Sure. But let me just run through my understanding, and you can tell me if I'm way off or not. I might be wrong on the 42, but I'm pretty sure that when they set the federal constituencies last time, in 2012, the average provincial population per constituency was 106,000 people, so even ignoring the growth since 2012, which we know was pretty substantial, the population of the federal constituencies, then, is about two and a half times the population of a provincial constituency.

But if I understand your idea correctly, what you're suggesting is that if we have to move boundaries provincially, we should try to only move them within the same area that's represented by the same federal MP. So if you have one federal MP, John Smith, who represents Airdrie and . . .

**Mr. Hyder:** Let's say Chestermere.

**The Chair:** . . . Chestermere and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, just picking those, if we have to move the boundaries, we should move between those three constituencies so that same MP is still the MP for the voters in those provincial constituencies. Is that your point?

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Hyder:** Let's say that we have one MP, which will deal with two MLAs dealing with 12 city representatives. This kind of communication is better instead of one MP dealing, actually, with overlapping MLAs because he has part of this constituency and part of the other constituency. It will be difficult, then, to deal with the problems of each area.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you. That's an interesting point.

**Mr. Hyder:** I don't know if this is possible. I say that maybe it's a kind of fantasy, that it's not possible because it's a different system. Like, the federal dividing is not the same.

**The Chair:** But we can keep it in mind, for sure. I mean, we've got the federal map, even though I don't have it with me here today, and we can lay that over the current provincial constituencies and see which ones lie within the same federal constituency.

**Mr. Hyder:** Exactly.

**The Chair:** I expect that the federal constituencies weren't drawn to completely overlap certain provincial constituencies, so it's not going to be a matchup all the way along. Some will be completely within one federal constituency, and some will cross borders there, but it's certainly worth a look at, for sure.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah. Exactly.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right.  
Questions?

**Mr. McLeod:** Actually, I have one. Airdrie right now, where you live, is 38 per cent over. It's expanded a lot. There are quite a few folks in there.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yes.

**Mr. McLeod:** Now, let's say that we had to divide it in half. What would be the natural boundaries north-south: the railroad tracks, let's say, or Nose Hill or the creek? Going east-west, would it be Yankee boulevard? I just don't know. I mean, it's huge. I'm not saying we're doing anything like that.

**Mr. Hyder:** Which is a good question. Now, if we divide Airdrie, if you go to the municipal areas, like, the Airdrie areas, and pick half of them, each one will be one constituency. Instead of making different constituencies for federal stages, we just divide the municipal areas into two areas. Let's say that we have eight municipal areas, like, eight neighbourhoods. Each neighbourhood has one representative, so if we pick four and then another four, not creating other areas – we just collect the municipal areas and make a federal representative – one federal representative will deal with these representatives of the municipal areas. Then if we consider that there's another federal area attached to this and we attach two of these main provincial areas to one federal area, we have one MP dealing with two MLAs and one MLA dealing with, let's say, 12.

It's going to be kind of, you know, a pyramid. This makes things easier for us. We have one representative in our municipal area, one representative over those municipal representatives who is provincial, and one representative of the federal stage, who's under the federal. Maybe I'm not explaining myself.

**Mr. McLeod:** I think I'm grasping what you're saying.

8:00

**Mr. Hyder:** I'll give you an example. When you talk about dividing, if we want to divide Airdrie, for instance, we don't need to create different boundaries. We just collect existing boundaries, say if we have eight or seven, because most of these areas have similar densities. We don't have, let's say, something with a very huge difference. If we're collecting each adjacent area – let's say that we have eight altogether – if we collect four of them and create one provincial, another four would make one provincial. This will be easier for us instead of overlapping or dividing.

Also, we have a school board, which could be different in terms of the areas for each school, which is going to be something else because we have these issues, as you talked about, when we're dealing with our representative at different stages. Sometimes we complain if we need another access to the highway, to the Deerfoot. The city is growing, but we still have only two accesses to the Deerfoot. They said: we still aren't clear yet who is funding all this – and we still need money – if we're going to be funded by the provincial or the federal. We need to have better communication between those representatives instead of overlapping with another in each area.

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

**The Chair:** If I could ask a follow-up question, on our map to the furthest at the back there, where it says, "47 Airdrie," can you tell me, sir, looking at it, whether that shows the entire municipal boundaries of Airdrie or whether it contains the city of Airdrie plus some rural land?

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah. That's actually rural land, too.

**The Chair:** Okay. So what you're suggesting – am I'm correct in understanding? – is that if we had to divide it up, we'd divide up the actual city of Airdrie into one part and the rural land into the other part. Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. Hyder:** No. This is rural area with the area of Airdrie. You said that this is the new one?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Hyder:** I think that this will make things harder for us.

**The Chair:** Well, this is the way the constituency looks right now.

**Mr. Hyder:** This is what it looks like now?

**The Chair:** The way it looks right now, the way it was in the last election, but the red numbers show the population increase.

The city boundaries of Airdrie are smaller than the rectangle that we see on that map. Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. Hyder:** Actually, yeah. Now it's bigger than this.

**The Chair:** Okay. Just before we started tonight, we were talking about the size of Airdrie. I looked it up on Mr. Google, and it said 63,000 people. I'm not sure whether that's the federal census or the municipal census, but just saying that that is generally close, that's quite a bit more than the size of one average constituency of 46,697 people.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah. That's one and a half almost.

**The Chair:** It's about one and a half. If we were to have to move the boundaries there – the act says, actually, that we have to because it's over 25 per cent more than the provincial average – do you suggest that we divide that land up by keeping as much of Airdrie as possible in one part and then adding the remaining 22,000 people to an adjacent rural area? Sometimes we call that a hybrid constituency, which is the model currently in place for Medicine Hat. Or would you think it would work better if we divided the town of Airdrie in half and put each half with an adjoining rural area so that they would both be hybrids, which is the way it is right now in Grande Prairie, just by way of example. Do you have any views on that?

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah. Actually, it depends on what your vision is of dividing. Do you want to put some rural area with some urban areas? Maybe you want to attach some urban areas to the rural areas. Let's say, if we have northeast areas, we want to expand this more and expand another in the northwest more and expand it in the south, because what you did there was just expand in one direction almost.

**The Chair:** Yeah, but that's the way it is right now . . .

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** . . . and that's not enough rural land, apparently, to solve the Airdrie growth in population, so we need to take in more rural land north, south, east, and west. It needs to take in more. So just you, because you're obviously a person who lives there . . .

**Mr. Hyder:** Maybe, if you asked me, I'd prefer it if you'd just join it with Crossfield because this will solve – like, if you want to build a new hospital, for instance, it's better to have a Crossfield representative and an Airdrie representative.

**The Chair:** Okay. So would we divide Airdrie east-west so that the north part of Airdrie would join with Crossfield and the land in between?

**Mr. Hyder:** Exactly.

**The Chair:** Okay. Because you think that would help you with your presentation for a hospital?

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah. Let's say for a presentation for a hospital.

Now, let's say that you don't join Crossfield with Airdrie, for instance. Crossfield has its own representative, so he doesn't care if we build – okay; I'm not saying that he doesn't care. Maybe he has a different plan, or he wants to join something else. This is why I'm saying that it's better if we have two adjacent municipalities and make them one provincial area, something like that, because we can solve problems more easily and make the communication easier.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm hearing or I'm assuming as a result of what you're saying that you don't have a strong view as to whether we should have two hybrid constituencies or we should have one that's completely the city of Airdrie and the other which is the leftover part of Airdrie plus a rural area.

**Mr. Hyder:** This is what I'm saying. Like, what is your vision for this area?

**The Chair:** Oh, no. I'm asking you what your vision is. You're the one. My vision doesn't count; I don't live in Airdrie.

**Mr. Hyder:** I'm saying no. I mean, in general, do you like to have kind of, as you said, hybrid areas, or do you just want to make purely municipal areas?

**The Chair:** Well, what do you think would work best to give you the best representation by your MLA?

**Mr. Hyder:** Maybe, actually, the hybrid is better.

**The Chair:** Two hybrids?

**Mr. Hyder:** In this case it's two hybrids, yes. But when we say "hybrid," I don't mean that we make one purely urban and that another one is hybrid. It's better to make both of them hybrids. This will have some rural areas, and the other one will also have some rural areas, so these people will communicate easily. Instead of expanding it in one direction much farther, it's better to expand in two directions equally. Maybe this is better in this case.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mrs. Day:** It's been a while, but we had one other small comment from someone in Airdrie, and I kind of asked the same thing. He was at the Olds hearing, and he suggested we use highway 2 as the dividing, so east and west.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah, because this is how the city is divided. Like, when the city is divided in this way, it's better not . . .

**Mrs. Day:** Naturally divided.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah, naturally divided. This is what I'm saying. If we're collecting the wards over the city, maybe expand it in other ways, but don't make it overlapping, because when you do overlapping, it's going to be harder for us to communicate with our representative. I'll give you an example. If you make Crossfield part of a provincial constituency with Airdrie but make Crossfield part of another constituency in terms of the federal level, they have different interests then. They don't have one interest.

**Mrs. Day:** You understand that we can't play with the federal boundaries at all.

**Mr. Hyder:** I'm not saying play with that.

**Mrs. Day:** We don't have that in our purview to do. We can't do anything about the federal boundary.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yes. Exactly.

**Mrs. Day:** We can look at them when we make our boundaries, but there's no way of us moving the federal ones at this point.

If I were to ask you: if you were a Crossfieldite – is that the right word? If you were in Crossfield, would you want to be part of the Airdrie riding?

**8:10**

**Mr. Hyder:** We mostly have the same problems, the same issues, like, in terms of schools, in terms of colleges. We're hopeful that we'll have, for instance, let's say, a University of Calgary Airdrie campus instead of sending our kids. We talk about Crossfield; we talk about Irricana, for instance; we talk about Airdrie. What is the population of all these areas? We still depend on sending our kids to Calgary, for instance. So you have one representative who can deal with these issues.

But if you consider, let's say, Irricana as part of another – like, make it east more, join it with another constituency on the east so that we don't have that strength of adjacents – if we may collect all of these municipalities which have the same issues, have the same problems, it's going to be better. If we say that we have this municipality and this municipality and this municipality, if we collect them into one constituency, it's better. But if you divide this municipality to another constituency on the north and divide this municipality to the south, it's going to be harder for us to have one representative. Maybe, for instance, we talk about our health service because we just have a 12-hour health service instead of a 24-hour emergency centre. The emergency centre in Airdrie is serving many villages and towns around the area.

Oh. You live there? I didn't know.

**Mrs. Day:** Acme, Carstairs, yeah.

**Mr. Hyder:** Yeah.

Also, regarding the universities, now we send our kids every day to Calgary to attend college and universities, but we don't have any campus, existing college. We just have an online college, which is on Yankee Valley, I believe. For so much stuff like this, if we have a representative who communicates better because they are collecting the same people, it's better than to have the overlapping or dividing of the cities between two constituencies or dividing, let's say, the provincial constituency between two federals. Our pressures will be less because each one has his own representative, yeah.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Any other questions?

All right. Thanks, and thanks for being a good sport and coming forward.

**Mr. Hyder:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** There must be other good sports in the room, people who haven't spoken yet.

Yes, sir.

**Mr. Elliot:** Can I just make a clarification?

**The Chair:** Yeah. Sure.

**Mr. Elliot:** I just wanted to make a clarification about what I said to you earlier. I listed the various roles that I have with the Wildrose Party, but I'm here tonight as a private citizen. I'm not authorized

to speak on behalf of the party, so the comments that I gave you earlier are my own personal ones. It's important that you understand that.

**The Chair:** Sure. Of course. Good points, though, good questions for us to check.

Yes, sir.

**Mr. Jones:** My name is Keith Jones, and I live in Calgary-McCall. I'm more here to ask you a question about what your mandate is with regard to producing your reports in both of our official languages.

**The Chair:** We have no mandate to publish in French. French is not an official language in Alberta for provincial legislation. I'm pretty confident in saying that because that's been litigated in front of the Court of Appeal. It's an official language in the Northwest Territories, left over from when the North-West Territories included Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and what we currently have as the Territories, but there was legislation passed in Alberta at a critical time that hived off French as an official language here, so the government isn't obliged to publish all of its statutes and records and documents in French. The legislation does not speak at all about publishing anything in French, and to my knowledge nothing has been printed in French in the past.

**Mr. Jones:** Okay. Well, just further to the point that I guess I'm trying to make is that if you look at the government of Canada website in terms of what the bilingual parts of our country are, you know, being our 150th anniversary, there seem to be eight. Of those eight, four are within the province of Quebec. So one province has provided us with four bilingual areas, and in the rest of the country the other nine provinces have provided four as well. I mean, those other four are pretty dodgy when you consider that they split off eastern Ontario and the capital region. The last time I checked, Ottawa was in eastern Ontario, and northern Ontario was pretty slim in terms of being bilingual as well. I just thought that at this kind of a meeting it's worth while to bring this point up.

**The Chair:** I only want to speak up on behalf of my colleagues in New Brunswick, who are so proud of the fact that they're the only officially bilingual province. We all think that Quebec is, but in fact Quebec is unilingual in French, so it's only New Brunswick and the Northwest Territories that have to publish everything in both official languages. Just kind of an interesting bit of trivia.

While you're here – we haven't had anybody speak from Calgary-McCall as yet – I wonder if you'd bear with us while we asked you a few questions about Calgary-McCall because you're one of the big growth areas in Calgary, 30 per cent over the provincial average, whereas eight years ago you were exactly on the provincial average. We have to consider all possibilities here, and we haven't made our minds up about anything. Please believe that. We've been going all around the province, and we haven't had enough time to focus in on Calgary-McCall before tonight, but I assure you that we'll be doing it after tonight.

Your growth is so large. You're above 25 per cent above the provincial average. We have to move the boundaries in Calgary-McCall to reduce the population in your riding. We're obliged to do that by law. So how would you think that would best work? Should we move in the boundary from the north to the south, from the east to the west, et cetera? Do you have any observations as to what might work the best?

**Mr. Jones:** I don't really have any strong feelings except for the fact that a lot of the growth is in the northern part, so I would think

that they share a commonality, being new. Geographically I don't see any other real way that you could divide it up. I would say maybe take Redstone, that northern area, out if that makes sense.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you.  
Any questions, anybody?

**Mr. McLeod:** In Calgary-McCall we've talked about the growth north. At the city limits on the east side, what is east of the city limits? Is there growth out there, acreages, whatever, or is it just industrial or farmland?

**Mr. Jones:** Last time I drove out that way, it was mostly farmland. I suppose that any city starts to get subdivision of land around it, but it's pretty rural.

**Mr. McLeod:** Okay.

**The Chair:** That would be north of Chestermere that you're talking about.

**Mr. Jones:** Yeah. The development is mostly urban, and it's within Calgary-McCall.

**Mr. McLeod:** Within Calgary-McCall. So that would mean within the city of Calgary's boundaries, then, the majority of it.

**Mr. Jones:** Yes.

**Mr. McLeod:** Okay. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Jones:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** All right. I see at least one more person who hasn't spoken yet tonight, putting the pressure on.

8:20

**Mr. Morrissey:** Good evening, Madam Chair and commissioners. My name is Matthew Morrissey. I reside in Airdrie, but my parents and myself grew up in Calgary-East.

Just speaking on – was it Ali?

**Mr. Hyder:** Yes.

**Mr. Morrissey:** Airdrie I would like to see maintain its boundary. If we start splitting up the centre, I think that would not benefit the city. If we were going to split Airdrie, I would like to see it with Carstairs. That's probably a 15-minute drive north.

As for Calgary-East, I believe it's only 6 per cent above the last census. I think it's adequate for where it's at right now. The only change I would see is to split it down 17th Avenue into Calgary-Fort. If I could, I would make 17th Avenue the boundary.

**The Chair:** Just looking at my map, I see that Calgary-East is immediately north of Calgary-Fort. Right now the boundary between the two is 7th Avenue S.E. and then 8th Avenue S.E. You're suggesting that that be moved to 17th?

**Mr. Morrissey:** Yeah; 17th would be the split in between Calgary-Fort and Calgary-East.

**The Chair:** Okay. Yeah.

**Mr. Morrissey:** The community of Forest Lawn – we have Forest Heights and Forest Lawn: 17th Avenue would be the split that I would like to see if I could.

**The Chair:** That would then move into Calgary-East?

**Mr. Morrisey:** That would move into Calgary-East.

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

**Ms Livingstone:** Just one question. The last suggestion you made there about moving the boundary to 17th Avenue: I noticed, looking at our numbers, that Calgary-East is currently 6 per cent over the ideal size and Calgary-Fort is 4 per cent below the ideal size. I think the suggestion you made would end up putting more population into Calgary-East. Do you have any suggestion for a way to move the boundary that would shift the population in the other direction to create more people in Fort?

**Mr. Morrisey:** Yes. Mayland Heights on Barlow Trail there. They're kind of an outlier in Calgary-East.

**The Chair:** Sorry. The name of that?

**Mr. Morrisey:** Mayland Heights. It's kind of an outlier on Barlow. It's a community on the other side of an industrial area. It just is a stand-alone. I think it would be better served in another riding, to shift the population.

**Ms Livingstone:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** And you could move that into Calgary-Fort. Is that where it's located?

**Mr. Morrisey:** That's north. Mayland Heights is north.

**The Chair:** Okay. So you'd have to move it into Calgary-Cross.

**Mr. Morrisey:** That's correct.

**The Chair:** Okay. Going back to her question – I'm sorry to pressure on this, and this is just theoretical, because these variances are very small – while we've got you here, if we found we had to consider increasing the population of Calgary-Fort by taking some of Calgary-East, that would require us to move the boundary from 7th or 8th north. Do you have a suggestion to make as to how we should move that boundary to add, say, 1,200 people to Calgary-Fort?

**Mr. Morrisey:** You want to add people to Calgary-Fort from Calgary-East?

**The Chair:** Right. Take people away from Calgary-East and add them to Calgary-Fort – we haven't decided to do that, but just if we wanted to do that – which would put you both pretty close to the provincial average.

**Mr. Morrisey:** I'd probably take it from Calgary-Greenway if you're going to add.

**Ms Livingstone:** Which neighbourhood?

**The Chair:** Calgary-Greenway.

**Mr. Morrisey:** I believe it would be north to Calgary-Greenway. If you're going to add to Calgary-Fort, I would take it from Calgary-Greenway.

**The Chair:** But to take from Calgary-East, what would we add? If we were taking that 1,200 people from Calgary-East rather than Calgary-Greenway, where would we take it from in Calgary-East?

**Mr. Morrisey:** It probably would be Red Carpet. That's the area right there, just on the other side of Forest.

**Mr. McLeod:** East of 52nd Street.

**Mr. Morrisey:** East of 52nd, yes. It would be north of that, the community just north of Erin Woods. If you were going to add to Calgary-Fort, that would be the community to add to Calgary-Fort from Calgary-East if you had to.

**The Chair:** I just want to emphasize that we haven't decided to do that at all, far from it. But just while you're here – and we haven't had anybody yet from Calgary-East – I thought we'd just ask you.

Any other comments or questions?

Okay. Well, thank you so much.

**Mr. Morrisey:** I just want to go on the record that it's good the way it is, but if you guys do end up changing, those are my suggestions.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right.

**Mrs. Day:** Just hold your horses there for a second. Going back to the statement about Airdrie, I'm a little confused. Because Airdrie is too large to stay as one – it's really one of the growing areas of Alberta – are you suggesting we split it going east-west?

**Mr. Morrisey:** Keep the city boundary as is with Carstairs added in and the rural areas around that. It looks to me like Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills could take some residents into a riding.

**The Chair:** To flesh that out, Airdrie proper, the city of Airdrie, has 62,000 people. That's more than 46,000 people.

**Mr. Morrisey:** Is that including the rural?

**The Chair:** We understand that that's just the city of Airdrie.

**Mr. Morrisey:** That's just the city. Okay.

**The Chair:** So there are too many people by law to follow your suggestion, as I'm sure you would like it to be, so we would have to look at somehow taking some of that population out. Am I hearing you say that that should be added north to the Carstairs area rather than somewhere else, in your view?

**Mr. Morrisey:** I was mistaken. I figured that 62,000 was including the rural. Ideally it would be just the city of Airdrie, but if that population is too large, then you will have to split it. I'm suggesting probably down the centre, then, if you would have to split it, down highway 2.

**Mrs. Day:** If you had to. I mean, nobody really wants to split it. I understand what you're saying. It's what makes the most sense.

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

All right. Thank you so much.

Anybody else have any second thoughts?

**Mr. Elliott:** Third thoughts.

**The Chair:** Sure.

**Mr. Elliott:** Gord Elliott again from Calgary-North West. I didn't actually talk to you about Calgary-North West when I was up here the first and the second times. Calgary-North West is made up of five communities, and that's all of five communities and no partial communities. They're the communities of Scenic Acres, Tuscany, Lynx Ridge, Royal Oak, and Rocky Ridge. Leave it alone is my

recommendation to you. I see on your map here to my left that it was plus 10 per cent last time; it's now plus 4 per cent. If you can get a riding that's within 4 per cent of the average, that's great. I personally find the plus or minus 25 per cent to be very large numbers. You can have huge differences between a riding that's 125 per cent versus one that's 75 per cent or even going down to 50 per cent. You have that chance to do that for four different ridings. My recommendation to you is to not change Calgary-North West.

I would also like to speak a little bit about the urban-rural split. I used to serve on the national council of the Conservative Party of Canada for seven years, so I got to know a lot of MPs. I took the lead in working with 14 of the ridings in southern Alberta. Eight of them were in Calgary at that time, and six of them were rural, so I got to see the differences between urban and rural.

**8:30**

One, in rural ridings the people who reside there expect their representative to live in that riding. In the city they don't. Stephen Harper didn't live in Calgary Southwest. He didn't live in Calgary Heritage. Devinder Shory did not live in Calgary Northeast. You can find lots of examples within the city, and that's because it's less important to the people who live in the cities than it is to people who live in the rural areas. The people in the rural areas expect that they know their representatives. Their representative was probably born there, grew up there, went to school, graduated, came back, and started a living and started a family. They run into their representative at church, in the grocery store, walking on the street. Rural people have a much closer connection to their representatives than urban people do. I honestly think it's incumbent upon you to as much as possible respect the urban-rural boundaries so that you're mixing as little as possible ridings that contain portions of both.

We just talked about Airdrie here. As you say, the city of Airdrie exceeds 125 per cent of your average. You're going to have to take all the rural component of the Airdrie electoral division and probably put it with Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. You're also going to have to take a portion of the city of Airdrie and put it in with Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills as well, so you'll be taking a portion on the north side. I would encourage you to do it either all on the west of highway 2 or all on the east of highway 2 in order to make Airdrie, well, below 125 per cent. Let me say that.

I'm an urban person. I've lived in the city of Calgary for, well, 27 years, I guess. I know that a lot of the people in the city don't know who their representatives are. Many of them don't even know that we have three levels of government, so for them it's not important. But on the rural side there are many programs that support the rural way of life. All of us at one point, probably our ancestors, lived on the rural side. We come from that and have moved to the city as we've become more urbanized. So please respect the rural-urban situation as much as possible.

I was very heartened to hear you talk about the different examples between Medicine Hat and Grande Prairie. You can imagine that at one point those cities were so small that they were like Airdrie was in the last election. It was an urban concentration with a piece of rural. But they've grown over time so that they are now bigger than

one riding. So the question is: do you split it in the middle like Grande Prairie, or do you create one urban riding with another one that has an urban piece and a large rural piece? The only answer I can come up with is that it depends on the circumstances.

I think in the north, like with Grande Prairie, you have to do what's done there already because otherwise, if you create one urban riding out of the city of Grande Prairie, you'll have a huge rural expanse with the remaining component of the city of Grande Prairie that doesn't fit there. In a certain sense that's what Medicine Hat looks like today. There's the riding of Medicine Hat, which is all urban, and then you have Cypress-Medicine Hat, which is the remainder of Medicine Hat. I think you can get away with that in the Medicine Hat circumstance because it's close enough to having a second full riding with the piece of Medicine Hat that's not in Medicine Hat, the piece that's in Cypress-Medicine Hat, so that the rural piece that you need to add onto it is not excessively large.

Going forward, when you make your recommendations, please try to respect that as much as possible.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

Any comments, anyone?

**Mr. McLeod:** I have one. In your Calgary-North West – I was just looking at the map here.

**Mr. Elliott:** Sure.

**Mr. McLeod:** What do you think it's going to be for the expansion in there for residents? Is there going to be any?

**Mr. Elliott:** No. It's pretty well built out. The – I don't even know what to call it – subdivision part of Tuscany that I live in was phase 46 when it was built. There's a little bit of Tuscany – they're building another 129 houses there now – but Scenic Acres is all done. Tuscany will be done in a couple of years. Lynx Ridge was actually part of Rocky View county and was annexed by the city of Calgary, so it's acreages. Well, not acreages; it's houses on large lots. But there's no more room there, you know, unless the city of Calgary chooses to annex more land to the west. Royal Oak is built out. I used to live there. Rocky Ridge has some room on the north side, but they're pretty well done.

**Mr. McLeod:** All right. Thank you. Just wondering.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you very much, everyone who came tonight and was prepared to come and speak even though you hadn't registered. You have done as well as Edmonton did in the same circumstances. I'm very grateful because everything is important. The more feedback we can get about individual ridings and the boundaries of individual ridings will help us avoid mistakes. We don't want to have to set a boundary without having any information about what local residents think should happen. Thank you for sharing your views tonight.

Good night.

[The hearing adjourned at 8:37 p.m.]









