



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission  
Public Hearings

Calgary

Wednesday, February 22, 2017  
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 18

**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**

Harold Beatty  
Happy Mann  
Kirstin Morrell  
Robert Nelson  
Don Thompson



9 a.m.

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning, everyone. Thanks very much for coming out. I'm Justice Myra Bielby of the Alberta Court of Appeal. I live in Edmonton, but at the moment I'm chairing the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province.

I'd like to introduce the other members of the commission. To my left is Jean Munn and then Laurie Livingstone. To my right are Gwen Day from Carstairs and Bruce McLeod from Acme.

Over the past few weeks, as news of our work got out, different people have asked me why we're having this review at this time, what the Electoral Boundaries Commission is, why we're doing it. The short answer is that our job is to research and make recommendations to the Alberta Legislature as to where and how our provincial constituency boundaries should be changed to ensure that we continue to have effective, proper representation by our MLAs in future provincial elections. That's in part because of the enormous growth rate that Alberta has experienced since the last time this was done, in 2009-2010.

While our legislation requires these boundary reviews every eight to 10 years in any event, it's particularly appropriate at this time because the Statistics Canada figures released February 8 from the 2016 census show that even taking into account the results of the recent economic downturn in Alberta, we have the largest and fastest growth rate in Canada. Our growth rate is over 14 per cent. The populations of both Edmonton and Calgary have grown by more than 14 per cent in the last eight years, and that population, over 600,000 people, is largely the result of people moving into Alberta from other places in Canada. True, there's some natural growth, some kids being born and what have you, but there's been a huge economic migration that's continued across Canada, and it's ended up with a lot of people in Alberta, particularly here in Calgary.

That's important to our elections and important to democracy because of the principle of representation by population, or, as it's sometimes described, that one person's vote should be relatively equal in effect to another person's vote in every election. But as the result of this increase in population and the fact that it hasn't moved equally into each of Alberta's 87 constituencies, we are at the moment out of whack, if I can call it that.

Just to take it step by step, we have 87 provincial constituencies. We have not been given the power to create more or to reduce that number. If the Legislature had wanted to do that, they would have had to do that before this commission was appointed October 31 last year. You might remember, some of you, 2009-2010. At that time the Legislature created four new additional constituencies to help deal with the influx of population that had occurred in the eight years prior to that, but this time the Legislature didn't choose to do that.

That's not in and of itself alarming. You'll see in a moment that our average population size per constituency is about 46,600 people in Alberta, and that's not a huge number compared to our federal constituencies, which have an average size of over 106,000 people, and even our city wards in Edmonton and Calgary for municipal elections have an average population of more than 46,600. But the challenge for us is that we then have to redivide the province into 87 pieces of a different size and shape, maybe, than exist at the moment to try to balance out the effect of some of this population increase.

As we all know, each of our constituencies has a population that returns one MLA to the Legislature. We have 87 MLAs in the Legislature in Edmonton. Our population has increased by 14 per

cent since the current existing constituency boundaries were approved by the Legislature. Our average population per constituency is 46,697, and that figure is obtained by dividing Alberta's adjusted population, 4,062,609, by 87.

Now, last night an alert man pointed out that this isn't exactly the Statistics Canada figure that's published on the Statistics Canada website. That's because Statistics Canada went into Fort McMurray after the fire and redid the census there to try to account for the effect of the population that had to move out of Fort McMurray because of the fire but hasn't yet moved back. So the figure on the StatsCan website as of last Friday has to be reduced by 9,100 people, which is that number which has not yet moved back into Fort McMurray.

We're also adding about 2,300 people because of the estimated population of the Saddle Lake reserve. For a number of reviews now the Saddle Lake reserve has declined to allow census takers in – I'm not sure what the reason is – so the department of Indian affairs has given us that estimated number.

This 4,062,609 number is the population of Alberta, resulting in this average population size of 46,697. If you look at the map on the wall there, the second from the right, the one with the big green patch at the top, you'll see all of our constituencies divided up. You'll see a blue number at the bottom, which was the size of the population the last time we reviewed the boundaries – it wasn't me doing it – or the last time the boundaries were reviewed, and then the red number on top tells you by how many people the constituency has grown or shrunk since 2010. It also tells you how far away the constituency size is from 46,697.

You'll see that there are a number of constituencies, particularly in the core of Calgary, where the population is very close to 46,697. That's because that population has been very consistent with the population growth in the entire province of Alberta. But in many constituencies it's a different story. The growth hasn't spread evenly across all constituencies, so our job is to recommend changes to the Legislature to ensure continued effective representation.

Now, there's a piece of legislation that exists called the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which is a law passed by the Alberta government most recently in 1990, but a version of this legislation has existed since the province was created, in 1905. I hope I'm right on that number, 1905. Every eight to 10 years the boundaries of different constituencies are either increased or reduced to cope with the population growth in the province. Alberta's historic story has been one of continued population growth, and the last eight years have been no different.

When this work was done in 2010, the average population of each of Alberta's 87 constituencies was 40,880. The boundary commission set the current constituency sizes and, I think, did a pretty good job. Over half of them were within 5 per cent of the 40,880 average, and 85 per cent of them were within 10 per cent of that number. But because of the growth in population, now our smallest constituency is 17,129 – that's Fort McMurray-Conklin – and our largest, Calgary-South East, right here, is 92,248 people, almost four and a half times the size of the smallest constituency. Our job is to make recommendations to try to bring these constituencies more into line.

The law, the legislation, however, says that we're not to consider only relative population densities. If that was the case, we could have sat down with a pencil and a ruler and just divided the province up into 87 squares, each of which had 46,697 people. Rather, we're also to consider common community interests and organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Métis settlements. We're going to try to avoid dividing up communities, and that includes dividing up neighbourhoods within Calgary and Edmonton. We're

going to try to avoid dividing up towns or villages at all if we possibly can. We're going to try to set constituency boundaries, where possible, to reflect major roadways, rivers, mountains, whatever, that might suggest natural boundaries so that people can remember where the edge of their constituency is.

But this isn't a closed list. The legislation says that anything you think is relevant to ensuring that MLAs can effectively represent their constituencies is something that we should consider. We're here asking for your input as to what you think is relevant to that activity. Of course, our goal, at the end of the day, is to create clear and understandable boundaries throughout the entire province.

9:10

We've been holding public hearings for three weeks now. This is our third week. My thanks to those of you who've registered to speak today. I'm pleased to say that we've received to this point 749 written submissions as well from the public in relation to constituency redesign. I like to say that the last time they did this, they received only 500 submissions in the entire year of their work, but I have to admit that now that we have the Internet and you can make a submission right on our website or you can use e-mail or social media to make your submission as well as the post, it's just easier. It's been made easier this time to have people send in submissions to us.

After we've finished this week of public hearings, we're going to meet together, the five of us, and go through each of the ridings in Alberta and make a recommendation as to whether the boundaries should be left as they are or whether the boundaries have to move out to capture more population to bring it closer to the provincial average or move in to reduce the population to move closer to the provincial average, taking into consideration these other factors that I've just gone through. Of course, if you move the boundaries of one constituency, then the immediate neighbours are affected, right? If you add population, you take away population from them. If you take away population from your constituency, then you're going to have to put that in one of the neighbouring constituencies.

All of this is going into a series of recommendations which we're obliged to produce before May 31 and table with the Legislature before that day, and they'll then be published on our website at [www.abec.ca](http://www.abec.ca). At that time members of the public will be given an opportunity to make additional written submissions based on the actual recommendations we're making, and we're having another round of public hearings in late July, early August to get further feedback on the actual recommendations. At that point we'll refine our 87 recommendations, we'll make a final report to the Legislature, which we have to file with the Legislature by October 31, and then our work as a commission is done.

Normally what we expect will happen is that the Legislature will then enact a law implementing our recommendations to change the constituencies so that in the next provincial election the constituencies will stand as they are redesigned as a result of this work. That's always been what's happened in the past.

Again, equality or parity of population isn't our only consideration. 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, but this legislation also permits variances of up to 25 per cent above or below the 46,697 figure and, for a maximum of four constituencies, up to 50 per cent below the average. Now, at the current time we only have two of these special constituencies, both up against the Northwest Territories border: Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, with a population about 51 per cent lower than the average, which is more than allowed by the legislation, so there will

have to be some changes there, and Lesser Slave Lake, that has a population 41 per cent below.

Otherwise, the 85 other constituencies have to fall within this range of between 25 per cent below or 25 per cent above. That said, we could only go to those numbers if there's a reason for it, and we're cautioned that we're to stay as close to parity as we can, taking all of the other reasons into account, and we have a job as the commission to explain why. If we go particularly far away from the provincial average in any constituency, we have to give a reason for doing that.

In summary, our job will be to consider the actual current population of the constituency, the number in red on the map, compare it to the 46,697 figure, and then decide if there's any acceptable reason not to adjust the constituency boundaries to increase or decrease the population size to get it closer to the average number.

Please be aware that our proceedings are being recorded by *Alberta Hansard*. Within a few days they'll be available on our website in audio form and also a written transcript, so everything you say today will be recorded and made available to the public. By the beginning of March we're hopeful that the 749 written submissions will also be posted on our website.

We've posted these maps around the room. You may find it helpful to actually refer to the map if you're talking about a particular constituency. We've got all of the Calgary constituencies on the map that's closest to me here on my right, your left, and then the maps of all of the constituencies surrounding Calgary in the event that you want to talk about one of those constituencies. If you do, I might ask you to take a marker, that our clerk will give you, and mark your recommended boundary changes on the relevant map. He'll then take a photo of that, and then we'll have that photo of your suggestion to use in our deliberations.

Again, welcome. Thanks very much for coming. I'm going to call on our first registered speaker, Harold Beatty. If you wouldn't mind, Mr. Beatty, you could come up and sit in front of one of the microphones.

**Mr. Beatty:** Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I have a presentation, a PowerPoint slide show, that I've prepared.

**The Chair:** Could you tell us what constituency you reside in?

**Mr. Beatty:** I'm in Calgary-Acadia, I think. Brandy Payne's, anyway.

Just while we're getting the slide show together, I prepared this based on research that I did online. A lot of the sources were media, social media, and whatever I could get from government sources. Of course, I realize that the commission has heard, probably, a lot of the things I'm about to say already. Anyway, thank you for going through it one more time.

**The Chair:** Not at all. I mean, everybody speaks with a different voice, and many people have come up with new suggestions, even last night, that we hadn't heard before. Please.

**Mr. Beatty:** Okay. I'll just go into it here. I took a look at the act. I guess the comment that I'd like to make there is that one of the prevailing narratives in the media and so on – and, of course, you've mentioned it today – is to achieve a certain mathematical target. You said 46,600. I've heard other numbers. In looking at the act, I was trying to basically discover online the terms of reference and exactly what the objective was, and I was trying to find a specific reference that said: you have to aim for that number.

I think we all understand that effective representation requires you to have some kind of parity, but it almost seems – and I'm going to basically talk about this a little bit here – that it works against, I would say, almost seven of those eight “shall” considerations. Anyway, I'll talk about it again here. Of course, in the media they talk about ensuring equivalence at the voter level. I think that as a principle within a riding that's true, but we have such a diversity of communities within Alberta that I think it's a little bit ambitious or perhaps idealistic to think that we'll hit that number. I don't know that the commission has ever promised that we will get it right on.

Anyway, I'll go into the urban versus rural idea. This has been another thing that has been occupying people's time. There are, certainly, political considerations involved with rebalancing. This has been one of the, I guess you could say, concerns that people have voiced in both directions. The urban versus rural debate has been, obviously, a historical fact within Alberta for some time. There are a lot of, basically, stories or information about that.

But I think that in the current context – I don't want to sort of bring in news items outside of Alberta, but in the recent elections in the United States, for example, the urban versus rural divide was a big factor in hardening positions. Brexit was also supported primarily by urban people. The far right in Europe: urban versus rural tensions have played a part in those. I think it's very important that the impact, the social impact, and the concerns of each of these constituencies be addressed and be one of the considerations that the commission considers.

Urban MLAs: one of the things that has been said is that they have – of course, there's a large urban population increase as part of the urbanization. It's a global trend, and certainly it's been the case in Alberta. The higher ratio of constituents to MLAs has been cited as one of the key drivers in ensuring effective representation. Also, urban centres have specific issues: poverty, homelessness. These are also diverse communities in terms of different languages, possibly different cultures, that have to be addressed.

I think, though, however, that in terms of overall representation it must be considered that within an urban setting – in Calgary this is certainly true – MLAs certainly have a peer group of additional MLAs who are, in many cases, simply 10 minutes away from them. I know my own MLA. We get two community newsletters just where the house is. Those MLAs live very close together. They can certainly support each other in a way that rural MLAs – they can't get together for coffee on Saturday necessarily because they might be hundreds of miles apart.

I also think that urban issues – there are common issues in, say, Calgary or south Calgary or my own particular neighbourhood. In fact, the voice of each constituent, a particular perspective may be represented by more than one MLA. I doubt that my concerns are very much different from someone who lives two miles east or two miles west of me, and that's certainly not the case in rural areas.

**9:20**

Economies of scale, of course: again, there are within cities – if there are resources that are made available, they can be made available to multiple electoral districts. You could have a conference or you could rent a hall and have 10 MLAs go there in Calgary and talk to people, again, something you are not able to do in the country.

The municipal level of government provides a lot of services, and I think that MLAs in the rural areas have a broader responsibility because they simply don't have well-developed or extensive and well-funded and so on and so forth municipal levels. In Calgary there are all sorts of services that the city provides that aren't provided in the country, and that means that MLAs in the city, to some extent, are able to point people to resources that are simply

there because it's within an urban area. There are community groups, organizations, volunteer groups, cultural organizations, and so on in the city that simply don't exist in the country.

Rural MLAs: the distance is one of the factors, but I think there are also factors of geography that come into play in terms of entirely different geographies. The northwest corner of Alberta is very different from the southeast in a way that, for example, Edmonton and Calgary may not be dissimilar. There is a diversity of communities as well there.

Transportation. I mean, I don't think I'm telling you anything new here. Communications technology has been cited as one mitigating factor that may allow rural MLAs to simply not travel so much. They'll just use the Internet.

Now, there is an urban versus rural difference in terms of Internet usage, Internet adoption, and these numbers are here. I don't think it's any surprise that people in the rural areas do not use the Internet as much. They don't have Wi-Fi spots. They have more difficulty simply getting access. This is a map that shows broadband coverage in Alberta, and as you can see, it's clustered around cities. If you're in the country, you may not be able to get good Internet access. This is cable and DSL. Satellite is an option; it's not always a great option. This is wireless coverage. Again, as we see, around the cities there's no problem getting Internet access, wireless access, data access, but it's more of a challenge in rural areas. Just one other point there about the digital divide is that for urban MLAs it also allows them to handle more constituents, so it really cuts both ways. It cuts down on distance, but it also allows people to handle more, potentially, if they have similar interests.

In the urban versus rural division I just broke down the Alberta electoral districts based on Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, Lethbridge: of course, it's a small slice of rural. I think that in the case of urban versus rural, if urban voters feel shortchanged, it may be some comfort for them to know they have two-thirds of the seats in Alberta.

Now, obviously, there are more factors than urban versus rural. Here's one of them that I decided to take a look at, and that's access to higher education. People, of course, in urban centres are able to go to school and potentially live at home. They don't have to travel. This is a provincial service. It's funded by the province, largely, and a very important aspect of being a citizen is to be able to be educated. Now, there's an advantage, obviously, to people living in the city. In terms of their access to provincial services they have, again, an advantage over their rural neighbours.

Health care is another thing. This was a list that I found of the notable research, medical institutions. They're all in Edmonton and Calgary. So if you have cancer, for example, if you're in Calgary, you might be able to take a 10-minute drive. I know that when my child was born, I drove 10 minutes to the hospital. You can't do that in the country. Again, in terms of the government providing the necessities to people, this is, I think, an important consideration that must be considered.

Now, obviously, we all know that there are advantages to living in the city. We all know that there are economies in terms of clustering things such as access to education. Universities: we're not going to have 50 universities spread all over the province. Nonetheless, that advantage is there, and I think that must be weighed in terms of the voice that people have and the benefits that they derive and their ability to live as citizens in this province. If there must be an inequality, I think that the advantages that people have from living in certain areas should be considered in addition to the straight mathematically average vote per person or average MLA per person.

I'm sorry. I didn't practise this. I'm not sure . . .

**The Chair:** Oh, we have plenty of time. Just carry on with your remarks.

**Mr. Beatty:** Sure. Okay. I guess that's the last slide I have here.

Final remark: we understand that there just plainly are advantages to being in an urban area, and people who move there do so with the knowledge of the representation that they have going in there. From a purely sort of economics perspective, they trade off the advantages of living in the city for the disadvantages. I think that it's worth while to not simply consider population only. I guess my ask here is that the commission take into account the benefits that people derive in the city and, if there must be a variance, that the benefit of the doubt should be maybe given to people who don't enjoy the same level of services.

I will maybe wrap up right there.

**The Chair:** Thank you. If you wouldn't mind answering a few questions.

**Mr. Beatty:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** I've heard and taken notes on the basis of your presentation, and we're certainly going to take that into consideration, those points made by others as well, when we come to deliberate.

Because you're our first speaker to come from Calgary-Acadia, I don't want to miss this opportunity to ask you some specific questions about that riding, in particular about the effect of the river cutting through your riding. In your view, has that posed any problems in regard to access to your MLA or your MLA having problems in serving constituents?

**Mr. Beatty:** In my case, no. I'm on the same side of the river as my MLA. I have visited her office. She has on Fridays open house something or other, so I've dropped by there. I can get there by transit. I could even walk there if I wanted to. The river, for me, is not an issue.

**The Chair:** I apologize for my ignorance, being an Edmontonian here, but are there bridges that cross the river that either are present in Calgary-Acadia or near Calgary-Acadia if you wanted to cross over to the other side?

**Mr. Beatty:** I'm not a hundred per cent sure exactly where the boundary ends. If I'm not mistaken, yeah, there's probably a bridge either close to or within the boundaries.

**The Chair:** Okay. Now, our maps show us that the population of Calgary-Acadia is 38,514 people, or about 18 per cent below the average constituency size in the province. During our deliberations, like with every constituency, we'll have to look at that. We have to consider all options. I'm not saying that we're going to do anything or move any constituency boundary, but we might decide that we need to do that to attempt to bring your population closer to the provincial average. Do you have a view as to where we should move a boundary to make the resulting addition to Calgary-Acadia work best? In other words, should we go south, north, east, west?

**Mr. Beatty:** I don't say south, personally, but I can't really say exactly. I would say that if you can keep the existing communities intact – I know that Southwood is where I live. There is a community organization there. That's a valuable asset to the community, and I would say that the riding should encompass, as much as possible, people who are served by that community association. Of course, the MLA can work in concert with that association to do so.

9:30

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

I'm going to ask my fellow commission members here if they have any questions.

**Ms Munn:** I don't have any questions. Thank you.

**Mr. McLeod:** Sure. Calgary-Acadia: just looking at the map here, is there any expectation of future growth in that area at all, or is it a fairly stable community?

**Mr. Beatty:** I would say that that's fairly stable. It was built in the '60s. I think retired people are moving out and families are moving in. There may be a slight increase in population that way. I would almost expect that. I've seen a lot of young families – and, of course, I have one as well – but I don't think there's going to be a lot of new construction and densification. Well, there is an effort on transit-oriented development in that area that may have an effect. I'm not sure exactly what that's going to be, whether it's commercial or residential. There may be some construction, but I don't think it's going to be one of these rapidly growing communities within Calgary.

**Mr. McLeod:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thanks so much for making the time to come and share your perspectives and also to answer our questions about Calgary-Acadia.

**Mr. Beatty:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Our next speaker this morning is Mr. Happy Mann. Good morning.

**Mr. Mann:** Good morning, everyone.

**The Chair:** Could you tell us what constituency you live in?

**Mr. Mann:** I live in Calgary-Cross, but I represented Calgary-McCall in the previous election. That's the reason I'm here representing, basically, and trying to give my views on the northeast side of all three ridings, which are Calgary-Cross and Calgary-Greenway as well as Calgary-McCall. I've been living in the area for the last 22 years, and the growth – if I look from the McCall perspective, there are at present three different communities that are under construction.

Not only is that the case, but because of the demographic of the communities or the individuals living there, from an ethnic perspective, most of them are very uncounted. Although the census is quite clear, I could see, the participation in the census is not as high as it's supposed to be. People are living as close families or within families or in basement suites, which are not accounted for, so the population in that area is much higher than maybe you would see from the numbers on the census. That is due to the involvement of the community. It's unfortunate, but sometimes it happens because of the community's way of doing things. So when I see the growth in the McCall area, it not only has to be considered with the three new communities coming in but also considered as uncounted voters living in that area as well due to the dwellings.

Secondly, the community needs are different because most of the new immigrants do migrate there, and the pressure on the representative MLA is quite a lot higher than normal because those are the individuals who are new to Alberta or new to Calgary and need lots of attention in order to get integrated into the communities and to get ahead. So when we consider those three ridings as being a growing fact in the northeast, my request is to keep that in mind,



the growth perspective, as I know that the commission can go up to 25 per cent or so. Those areas need different representation growthwise, so my request to the commission is to see how we're going to address those issues of the communities in need, being a growing community, and the newcomers to them and to take that into consideration by adding the additional numbers of represented people to one MLA's constituency.

**The Chair:** Great. If I may ask a question.

**Mr. Mann:** Sure. Please.

**The Chair:** Does that lead you to the conclusion that there's even more reason for establishing another constituency up in the Calgary-McCall area?

**Mr. Mann:** That could be done as well.

Secondly, if you look at putting 16th Avenue as a cut-off and put Cross, Greenway, and McCall pushing 16th towards the north, that still can give some representation. That way we can still have three MLAs representing that northeast side and still, I think, consider your normal and natural division of the Deerfoot as well as 144th Avenue, the city limit. There would be some pressure on the Calgary-Cross side, or whatever new name you want to give it, if you have to cut Calgary-Greenway in two by conserving 16th Avenue and adding those two wards to the McCall area. If we can have three representatives from 16th Avenue towards the north and still have the natural division which you call highway 2, or the Deerfoot, going towards the city limit, that would be appropriate. Again, add and leave some leverage in McCall because of the three growing communities and still having two years of time and then keeping 10 years ahead of the next review. Calgary-McCall has to be considered very differently, keeping the future growth in mind.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm going to just have another couple of follow-up questions. I have to emphasize that we have made no decision yet. We're just at the front end of our work. Just looking at the map, it suggests some possibilities here. If we were going to recommend the creation of a new constituency in Calgary's northeast to accommodate the growth in the north, in your view, should we put that constituency between Calgary-McCall and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill? Do you want to go up and look at the map? It might make it more . . .

**Mr. Mann:** Yeah, I know. The thing is that then you have to cross your natural barrier, the Deerfoot. If you want to bring some of the areas from the Calgary-Foothills side, which is also a growing community, if you look at Sage Hill and other communities which are growing, then you have to cross the natural boundary system. But if you want to avoid those naturalities and you want to bring in the perspective of redividing the boundaries and you want to stay east of the Deerfoot, or highway 2, then the only good suggestion will be to divide those three from 16th to that and make Calgary-McCall a bit smaller today, keeping the growth for a 10-year period of time. Having three new communities – all three new communities are building from 80th Avenue towards the east.

**The Chair:** Okay. So if we did that – and we're just looking at Calgary-McCall crossing Calgary-Greenway, just as you've suggested, should . . .

**Mr. Mann:** If you want, I can go up there.

**The Chair:** Yeah. If you can go up, I'll ask the clerk to give you a marker, and I'm going to ask you to draw where you think that new

fourth constituency should go if we decide to go that way. The clerk is going to bring an erasable marker up here to give to you.

**Mr. Mann:** The thing is that right now we are here at 16th Avenue, and Calgary-Greenway is crossing all the way to 17th. If we put this as an end, 16th Avenue and this, what that will do is to bring Calgary-Greenway on this side, and that will push Calgary-Cross on this side, and this will give room for Calgary-McCall to grow for a future 10-year plan as all the new communities have been growing here, okay? That will give you the naturality of the Deerfoot this way because the Deerfoot cuts, then, this way. And this is all industrial. This is not residential in this area.

If you're willing to cross this part, then you have to consider 96th and going somewhere here. Then you will cut into Calgary-Northern Hills, and everything has to be redistributed because Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill goes all the way up to here and to Foothills here. Then these three ridings have to be redistributed as well.

So the best way to keep the naturality of the Deerfoot is to cut Calgary-McCall and bring Calgary-Cross and Calgary-Greenway, or whatever name you want to recommend for the future – the three constituencies can be accommodated if the cut-off is at 16th, still maintaining the naturality. Then you don't have to add a new one in the northeast.

**The Chair:** Okay. Still, looking at our task from our perspective, if we did that, we would still be about 50 per cent over the provincial average size for each of those three constituencies, and that is something that we have to consider. If we decide that we have to do something about that, because 50 per cent is huge, that we have to take in more area in the northern part of Calgary even if it means crossing the Deerfoot, do you have any suggestions as to where that new constituency should be created?

9:40

**Mr. Mann:** Then what we can do is that we create across to McCall – we can cut this at Country Hills Boulevard right here and, because Redstone and Skyview are also growing, bring this forward. Then we have to redistribute some of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill and some of Foothills, part of it, and then create a new one.

**The Chair:** Okay. If we did that and we had to bring some of the population from Foothills and Northern Hills into this new constituency, would that be an acceptable mix with the ethnic communities you've described as living in McCall? Are they the same type of new arrivals in Alberta, sharing a common language, or are they different types of communities?

**Mr. Mann:** I personally think that out of this contest we should avoid – although we know that this vocabulary is needed in order to put a perspective on the different communities or service an ethnicity, I consider myself more as a Canadian to everyone. Although we have a language barrier, we can put more resources into the system to accommodate that. I think that when we keep on using the words "ethnicity" or "the minorities," that is not giving a feeling of the Canadian system. I came as an immigrant. I never took an oath of Canadian citizenship to be just that. It was my wish to live and die for Canada, and that's the reason I became Canadian.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, you just made it easier by saying that. That's terrific.

I'll just run this idea by you and let you tell me if there are any problems that you see, and this is just a possibility suggested by the numbers on the map you're looking at. They're 16 per cent over in Foothills, 28 per cent over in Northern Hills, 11 per cent over in

Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, 38 per cent over in Calgary-McCall and 7 per cent over in Greenway. When you add up those numbers, you come to about 102 per cent, a least the last time I did it, which suggests a new constituency could be created somewhere in Calgary north or Calgary northeast.

So if we decided we wanted to go that way, where should we put that new constituency?

**Mr. Mann:** Right towards the very end of the northeast, towards the boundaries and crossing the Deerfoot. That's where we can equally divide it. Again, I never came forward to represent just the Sikhs or ethnic people. I came forward to represent Albertans. My request to the commission is that although the resources are needed for those communities because they are new communities, ethnicity should not be the base of the representation because I want to make sure that the representation is done on the basis that we all are Canadians.

**The Chair:** I'm encouraged to hear you say that. I know that in 20 years it's not going to make any difference anyway, the ethnicity. That's the way living in Alberta is.

**Mr. Mann:** This word has created more problems than solved problems. I know Jean Munn from the last 20 years as being a lawyer, and she represented the ethnic community a lot in her career, too. The basics are that as much as we keep on bringing ethnicity and minorities in perspective, as much as the tolerance is getting away and, although by not knowing that there's this borderline between a tolerance and acceptance – a tolerance will never bring peace. It's a fight within. We've been preaching a tolerance towards minorities for the last hundred years, and that's what's bringing chaos in the communities to grow together. So my request to the commission is that if we can avoid the words "ethnicity" or "minorities" and bring two words, Canadian words together and, instead of a tolerance, bring acceptance into the perspective of the system, then we will have fewer problems and we can give good representation.

**The Chair:** All right. Thanks very much.

**Ms Munn:** Mr. Mann, I'd like to ask you about the southern part of Calgary-Greenway. On the map do you see the communities of Abbeydale and Applewood Park?

**Mr. Mann:** Yes.

**Ms Munn:** Now, they're currently in Calgary-Greenway. If they were to move into Calgary-Fort, do you think the people who are living in Abbeydale and Applewood Park have a suitable community of interest with the people in Calgary-Fort?

**Mr. Mann:** Yes.

**Ms Munn:** So if the ...

**Mr. Mann:** And the same in Calgary-East, too. Sorry to cut you off. The individuals living the same from a language perspective I see – there are lots of new Canadians who came in, too. They're suitable towards Calgary-Fort as well as Calgary-East. You can redesign these three also as you want, but the communities are welding together, to each other.

**Ms Munn:** So if the Calgary-Greenway southern boundary was now at 16th Avenue and we were going to move the northern boundary of Calgary-Greenway into Calgary-McCall, would it be

appropriate to move it up through Saddle Ridge, put Saddle Ridge in Calgary-Greenway?

**Mr. Mann:** What I'm suggesting is that this is up to the commission, how the commission wants to redesign it. But if you put a natural mark at 16th Avenue, it will be easier for you to redesign Greenway, Cross, McCall the way you want to do it. My suggestion is – because Calgary-Cross is not going to grow anymore. That's it. It's done, right? It's a community. It's the same with Calgary-East. At one point I know that Vista Heights used to be on the Calgary-East side. So you can redistribute some of this to Calgary-East and bring Calgary-Cross towards here and then do Calgary-McCall here or a new community or the way you want to do it.

**Ms Munn:** But would it be appropriate for the people living in Saddle Ridge to become part of Calgary-Greenway?

**Mr. Mann:** I don't suggest, quite honestly, to bring it up this way. I think it's more appropriate to build it this way.

**Ms Munn:** Right. Saddle Ridge is in Calgary-McCall right now, and Calgary-McCall has too many people.

**Mr. Mann:** Yes.

**Ms Munn:** So if we were to take Abbeydale and Applewood out of Calgary-Greenway and put them into Calgary-Fort, which would be a good fit, then we'd have to make Calgary-Greenway bigger. Can we take the northern boundary, which right now is at 80th Avenue?

**Mr. Mann:** Or what you can do is that you can take Calgary-Cross, cut some part of Calgary-Cross towards Calgary-East and make Calgary-Cross like this, adding Monterey Park and those areas into Calgary-Cross. Then you can put Calgary-Greenway here, towards 80th Avenue or whatever, and Calgary-McCall further on.

**Ms Munn:** But the problem is that if we take Calgary-Cross very far east, we'd be over in population.

**Mr. Mann:** It's only plus 2 here, but if you take Vista Heights into Calgary-East, that will give you a plus 6 and plus 2 here. The population of Vista Heights is, I think, equal to the population of Monterey Park. Calgary-Cross can accommodate an extra plus 2 because it's a close community. That way you can take McKnight Boulevard as still in Calgary-Cross by just only adjusting Vista Heights into Calgary-East. Then you can start your Calgary-Greenway from McKnight Boulevard onward. You can adjust your population the way you want to go in Coral Springs, Taradale, and all and see if you want to divide part of Saddle Ridge into two. Then you can continue on to Calgary-McCall and add a new one wherever you want.

Whether you are taking from the centre to expand or you're taking east to expand, I don't know. In the normal way it is the commission's jurisdiction to see, when they are exercising their right, whether they want to start from the southeast corner or northwest corner or from the centre to expand. That's the only viable way, from that perspective, we can go through. So I'm just here to give a suggestion, but it is the commission's view whether they want to take the centre and expand or if they want to take one corner and start expanding. I'm just here to give a suggestion from a northeast perspective.

Knowing there's growth of the population, knowing there are three new communities building right now in Calgary-McCall, and knowing the need of new Canadians to get more help, please

consider that the next review will be in almost 11 to 12 years and that this is a growing community.

**Ms Munn:** It's growing, yeah. Okay.

**Mr. Mann:** Thank you so much.

**The Chair:** Okay. Ms Livingstone has a question.

**Ms Livingstone:** Just one question. You seem to have pretty good familiarity with all of north Calgary there, so I wanted to ask you about Calgary-Northern Hills. Are you familiar with that area, as well?

**Mr. Mann:** Yes, to some extent.

9:50

**Ms Livingstone:** Okay. That riding is currently 28 per cent over the ideal average riding size, so I'm just wondering if you can identify for us what some of the major roads or divides are that exist in Calgary-Northern Hills so that if we have to look at shifting the boundaries there, we know what the natural divides in that area are.

**Mr. Mann:** I have to go back again here so at least I can then tell you the proper . . .

**Ms Livingstone:** Sure.

**Mr. Mann:** If you look at Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill and Calgary-Northern Hills, all this area from the new ring road is a new, developing community which is in Calgary-Foothills. If you look at the Calgary-Foothills boundaries, it touches on the east side of one side and then the west this way. In order to adjust Calgary-Northern Hills, you have to keep in mind that the communities living in this area, for example – again, I hate to use this word, but in order to explain, this is a Chinese community in this area, and it's different. The same in these areas, too. That does not mean that we have to keep them together. The main thing is how we can give good representation.

My suggestion would be to adjust Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, Calgary-Northern Hills, and Calgary-Foothills a different way, and that way your new riding will fit the northeast to accommodate the balance. Without adjusting Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill into Calgary-Northern Hills, you will not build a new riding. In order to accommodate a new riding in the northeast, you have to adjust, in my opinion, again, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, Calgary-Northern Hills, and Calgary-Foothills as well.

**Ms Livingstone:** And what are the natural, like, major roadways or natural divides in that area?

**Mr. Mann:** Beddington Trail is one we have to consider, and then we go from there. Secondly, when you go, you have to look at Country Hills Boulevard as another natural because this is what the cut-off is. If you see, Calgary-Hawkwood is crossing here, too. Calgary-Foothills is coming as far as Stoney Trail, and then Calgary-Foothills is coming all the way to John Laurie Boulevard as well and then to Calgary-Varsity. If we go to Calgary-Hawkwood, it's only plus 2 per cent. You can accommodate some here by bringing a natural toward Country Hills Boulevard and then Calgary-Foothills toward the new communities of Sage Hill and all that. That way, you will have adjusted the growth of Calgary-Northern Hills towards the new riding which could be created.

**Ms Livingstone:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Mann:** Any more questions, or can I take my leave?

**The Chair:** Absolutely. Thank you for coming. You've been very helpful. There's nothing like somebody who actually knows a neighbourhood, so thanks so much.

Now, our next registered voter is Don Thompson. Is Mr. Thompson here yet? We're a little early for that.

Okay. Finally, to finish off the morning we have Kirstin Morrell. Is she here? All right. Well, we're not at her time yet.

So we're going to take a bit of a break at this point, and we'll come back in an hour. Thank you.

[The hearing adjourned from 9:53 a.m. to 10:59 a.m.]

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

Welcome. Thank you, everybody who's come today to make a presentation. I know that some of you have been good enough to come a little earlier than the times you signed up for, so I give you a special thanks.

The next registered presenter I have is Don Thompson, so if you're here, Mr. Thompson, I'd invite you to come up. Have a seat at one of the microphones, and let me know the constituency in which you live.

**Mr. Thompson:** Oh, that's a good question.

**Unidentified Speaker:** Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Thompson:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** Hi. I am Don Thompson. I live in Calgary-Fish Creek; however, that's not what I'm really addressing. Anyway, first, I'd like to thank you guys for giving us the opportunity to appear and be heard, and I'd like to acknowledge a pleasant conversation with somebody named Aaron, who made scheduling really pleasant.

Essentially, what I'd like to say is that while representation by population is a cornerstone of our democracy and serves people well in much of the world, it does suffer from a serious weakness when imposed over large geographies. In larger geographies major differences in the economic and social environments of different areas make true representation and equal representation difficult, particularly when issues require opposing solutions or populations have sharply differing needs. Immense and diverse geographies such as Canada, Australia, and the United States attempt to minimize geographic underrepresentation through the division of the powers and responsibilities of government, by separating governments of the parts from government of the whole, and nationally through bicameral legislative arrangements, with one body primarily based on representation by population and the other primarily on geography. Despite being a large geographic area itself, Alberta must manage the problems of diverse representation in a single body.

The question that I would like the commission to consider is: does Alberta have distinct geographic sectors, not simply by physical geography, which is not necessarily relevant, but by the primary economic and social activities of the people in those areas? If the population's activities were homogeneous throughout the province, the answer would be clearly no, but Alberta does appear to have two very significant separations of economic and social activity varying by geography, rural and urban. I include suburban with urban because they are so close together and generally care about the same things.

Primary economic activities of rural areas are the physical activities of farming, forestry, mining, and resource extraction while those of the urban areas are particularly commerce, manufacturing, and distribution. There is a clear rural and urban divide in the province. From the point of view of representation in government, does this matter? Must representatives of one division differ in approach to issues from representatives of the other? Often the answer is clearly yes.

Further, Alberta MLAs must represent both the physical geographies of their constituencies and the citizens living within them, and there are serious distinctions. From the perspective of representation, Alberta's rural areas have more in common with each other than they have with their nearby urban areas and vice versa. Edmonton and Calgary would have more in common with each other than they would with the ridings that surround them. Additionally, simple geography makes representation more difficult for rural members and access to government more difficult for the citizens of those areas.

What stance should the Electoral Boundaries Commission take? Most importantly, do not lessen rural representation despite any increasing imbalance between populations. Failure to do so would leave rural areas suffering from both perceptual and de facto underrepresentation.

Secondly, acknowledge the clear rural and urban divide with clearly distinct electoral divisions, and by clearly distinct I don't mean a line on a map; I mean distinct in the citizens that live within them and the areas they serve. Avoid seriously nonhomogeneous electoral divisions, for example, as is the case currently in Grande Prairie, with Grande Prairie-Wapiti and Grande Prairie-Smoky each being a combination of half rural and half urban.

The resulting electoral divisions will have differing populations, be of significantly different sizes but be based on separate criteria. Urban electoral divisions should be developed based on population, with minor adjustments for geographic convenience, and rural electoral divisions should be laid out primarily based on area maximums, keeping in mind the physical difficulties of access for both MLAs and citizens. Current legislation allows for reasonable population ranges but does not impose limits on area; however, including limits on the geographic size would be helpful even if it resulted in more electoral divisions close to the minimum permitted number of residents.

11:05

In the longer term the work of the commission should move toward impartial and apolitical computerized boundary development based on current or future legislation. Available technology is more than adequate, and Elections Alberta could be tasked with implementing an automated system, the results of which would be reviewed by the commission.

That's it. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Just let me get caught up here. I've got a question if you don't mind. I know that you said when you started your remarks that you weren't here particularly as a resident of Calgary-Fish Creek, but I'm going to take the opportunity to ask you a couple of questions because you're our first person who lives in Calgary-Fish Creek to speak. We've found it very helpful to talk to actual residents about the boundaries of their own constituencies because we don't want to make any inadvertent errors in cutting things up that shouldn't be cut up.

Aside from the economic divide that you might see between city and country, what the legislation requires us to do is to try to keep neighbourhoods together if we can, so we want to try to do that. The commission is going to make 87 different recommendations. One

of the recommendations regards Calgary-Fish Creek. When we get to Calgary-Fish Creek in our deliberations, no doubt we're going to notice that the population there is 18 per cent below the provincial average at this time, and we're going to ask ourselves: should we move a boundary to increase the number of people who are in the Calgary-Fish Creek constituency?

If we did that, if we decided that that had to happen, in your view, should we go southeast into Hays and then maybe pick up some of Calgary-South East's population because it's 97 per cent over, or should we do something else? You don't have the map right in front of you – it's on the wall – but Calgary-Acadia, which is just above you, is also 18 per cent below, so you'd have to go pretty far north to pick up population to the north. Similarly, Calgary-Shaw, to the southwest, is 5 per cent below, Calgary-Lougheed 7 per cent above. It suggests that one of the options would be to move a boundary to try to pick up some of the Calgary-South East population. What's your view on that?

**Mr. Thompson:** I thought Shaw was also over, but apparently it's not.

**The Chair:** Five per cent under.

**Mr. Thompson:** Just because it's been growing so fast. In my limited experience, I guess, with understanding how people work in terms of this, personally, I don't think it matters to city people. When you're in an urban area, your representative, both provincially and federally, comes by the population of your riding. Both ridings are more similar than they are different, so moving boundaries within an urban area doesn't seem to me to matter too much, and making it fit with representation by population is obviously the goal.

There are occasional times, like in Calgary-East and -West, where people seem to think there's a serious division there, but the south part, southeast, Douglasdale and places like that are the same as where I live, which is in Canyon Meadows, essentially. So if we moved the boundary and took up some of the people from the east, making their population less and ours more, I don't think it would matter.

**The Chair:** Okay. Ms Livingstone just suggests that, in fact, if you live in Canyon Meadows, you're probably in Lougheed because, looking at our map, that's where that constituency falls.

**Mr. Thompson:** No.

**The Chair:** No? You're sure?

**Mr. Thompson:** We are definitely not. I think we're just close to the northern border.

**The Chair:** Okay. Possibly.

**Ms Livingstone:** We're not on the other side of Canyon Meadows. Sorry. Yeah; 14th Street is the boundary.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right. We've got neighbourhood maps that were just given to us, but they're tiny, so forgive us for that.

If we did look at moving the Fish Creek boundary to the southeast, we'd have to cross the river. Would that pose any difficulties, if your constituency grew so that it contained something on the east of the river? Like, Calgary-Acadia: right now it crosses the river. Under this model your constituency would cross the river as well. Would that pose a problem?

**Mr. Thompson:** I can't see how it would. The roads cross the river just as often as required, and the river is not the only boundary that

stops neighbourhood roads, for instance. Like, parks do, and some large commercial facilities have in the past, but major roads manage to go wherever they need to. I can't see the river being – it's not like we all stand on one side of the river and say, "Well, we don't like those people over there," or that they have significantly different issues. They don't.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thanks.

I'm just going to ask my commissioners whether they have any questions.

**Mr. McLeod:** Just one. In Calgary-Fish Creek there's also another sort of natural boundary there, which is Macleod Trail, that runs straight through you, straight through Shaw. If you took what would be the southwest area and if you moved over – I'm not saying that this is going to happen – to Macleod Trail, that would capture quite a bit of Shaw, that would be with you, let's say, down to whatever that is, Sun Valley, maybe not that far. Do you think there's a community of interest there?

**Mr. Thompson:** From having lived there for three, three and a half years now, I don't see any significant difference between crossing the river and going south because the park is in the way. I can't get to Shaw easily on all the roads, so whichever way I go, I have to take a major road to go to the other side, and we do. We shop in Shaw. We do things on the other side as well.

**Mr. McLeod:** It's just that I was looking at the map, and it looks like Macleod Trail is also a north-south kind of . . .

**Mr. Thompson:** Yeah. And it does the east-west division in Calgary, so the only thing I would say is that it may increase the social stigma of being on the east or the west, depending on which side you prefer.

**Mr. McLeod:** There are also railroad tracks there. That you could be on the other side of the tracks is what you're saying.

**Mr. Thompson:** Yeah.

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

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

Well, thanks very much for coming and sharing your views and answering questions that you probably didn't expect to have to answer.

**Mr. Thompson:** It's okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Our next speaker is Kirstin Morrell. If you could start by telling us the constituency you live in, Ms Morrell, that would be great.

**Ms Morrell:** You bet. I'm in Calgary-Fish Creek as well.

Good morning, Madam Justice and other commission members. Thank you for taking the time to allow us to speak today and to speak to this issue. I'm here to speak to you today as a former constituency assistant. I worked in the constituency office of MLA Darshan Kang in Calgary-McCall for approximately a year until the election of 2012, when I stood as a candidate.

It's my experience that the presence of an MLA is very much in demand within the riding. Individuals, stakeholder groups, advocacy groups, and other community groups make more requests on an MLA's time than an individual can reasonably fulfill.

Constituency offices as a separate entity also serve a number of roles in the community. As a New Zealand Member of Parliament

wrote in his opinion piece in *The Parliamentarian* magazine in 2011, the opening of constituency offices in his country was the beginning of a shift from members being in a solely legislative role to members and their assistants working in a de facto social service role. While I think the social service role of constituency offices detracts from the primary function of a Member of the Legislative Assembly, it is a current function, and constituency offices do catch many of the people who would otherwise fall through the cracks of society.

**11:15**

In my experience the amount of human suffering seen on a daily basis in the constituency office in Calgary-McCall was surprising. Perhaps my experience was atypical, but it is the only one I have to draw from. People with health issues, mental illnesses, child support conflicts; people struggling with joblessness, fighting to navigate the workers' compensation system; those abandoned or forced out of the social services safety net: all those types of issues and more are now faced daily in constituency offices in addition to the more pedestrian types of assistance like helping community groups access grant money, meeting with members of advocacy groups on issues, and increasing access and a feeling of representation by the elected members and government by appearing throughout the community at special events.

The aim we're all working towards is fairness and equality of representation and service as guaranteed by the Charter and reiterated in the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. Now, this question of fairness has been painted as a conflict between rural and urban areas in Alberta, but it could also be characterized as a possible conflict between Calgary and Edmonton and the rest of the province as we know that Calgary and Edmonton contain half the population of Alberta.

Ideally we would be able to use technology to surmount the problems of access. The Library of Parliament's parliamentary information and research service published a paper entitled *How Can Information Technology Transform the Way Parliament Works?*, in which the author concluded that information technology and connectedness can enhance communication with constituents, but access to high-speed Internet is not universal. Having used rural Internet recently, it's a frustratingly slow and discouraging experience. Instead of being a powerful equalizer, in some ways it may be contributing to the challenges of rural and remote representation.

Redistributions may be inconvenient and incur a cost, but they are a normal and expected consequence of the mobility freedoms we enjoy in Canada. There are some obvious fires that we need to put out, such as Calgary-South East and Airdrie, which have grown to have a population that is now greatly out of proportion with all other divisions in the province. I'm not advocating for no change but for the rules governing such change to still offer the same considerations for remote areas of low population density. In order to maintain fairness and equality of representation, the current system, which allows for differences in populations in an electoral division, should be retained.

I expect my opinion will be somewhat different from that of my partisan colleagues. Those in my political party would benefit from fewer seats in rural ridings or more in urban. I agree that, all other things being equal, ridings should have an equal number of people, but the challenges of geography reduce the effectiveness of representation in a way that should continue to be remedied. It's not unreasonable to retain the existing provision wherein up to four electoral divisions can be outside the 25 per cent above or below if they meet specific criteria outlined in the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. Instead of working against fairness, as some may

believe, it is contributing to fair and equal representation throughout the province.

That concludes my presentation. I just wanted to say thank you. I sit on a city commission, and I understand that with public consultations some choose to do the bare minimum, and some choose to go above and beyond. I just want to thank you. You guys have gone above and beyond, going throughout the province, offering so many opportunities to be heard, so thank you.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you very much for coming forward.

I'm also going to take an opportunity because you're from Calgary-Fish Creek. Not wanting to cause any conflict with the previous speaker, but would you agree with him in his observations about how the boundaries of that constituency, your constituency, might be moved if we felt we had to do it to pick up some population?

**Ms Morrell:** Yeah. You know, I see no conflict. I agree with what he said. It's funny because in urban ridings you have so much, in a way, sort of homogeneity, but you also have a kind of diversity that's already represented no matter how you slice it up. Right now where we live the listing prices for our homes are about \$230,000. Directly across the street, where we frequently park, the homes have been listed for between \$900,000 and \$1.1 million. We already have nothing in common with the people across the street. It's not going to harm us in any way if instead either Calgary-Fish Creek extends farther north or Calgary-Acadia extends farther south, if we extend into Shawnee Slopes.

I mean, obviously you're trying to create a geographically contiguous area that doesn't have too many boundaries in the middle that make it seem like they don't belong together, but in a way I think we already, you know, have a huge diversity of socioeconomic strata. You know, the southwest is equally nonhomogenous in terms of ethnic communities. I mean, we have the same amount in common with the people on the other side of Macleod Trail as we do with people to the north of us and people to the south of the park. However you slice it up, I think you're going to get the same kind of representation as we currently have.

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

Do you have a question?

**Ms Livingstone:** Just one. Just as we're looking at the map in that area, I'm noticing it looks like Woodbine and Woodlands are in the Calgary-Lougheed riding, but they're north of Fish Creek park. Would it make sense to add those guys to Calgary-Fish Creek and keep the riding sort of on that side of the park?

**Ms Morrell:** But then you're going to be a little short for – are they in Calgary-Acadia?

**Ms Livingstone:** No. They're in Calgary-Lougheed, so we'd have to do some other configuring on the south side of the park.

**Ms Morrell:** Yeah. You know, it's funny because Anderson Road is between them, but we have so much in common with them. Those neighbourhoods are similar in a lot of ways to Canyon Meadows. They don't have sort of the same high-value properties that we have, but that's kind of an anomaly you're going to have difficulty dealing with no matter what. Geographically, I mean, I occasionally shop there. I have friends who live there. As a resident of Canyon Meadows I get to that neighbourhood as much as I get to the neighbourhoods on the other side of Macleod.

**Ms Livingstone:** Yeah. I was just noticing that they seem to be separated from the rest of their riding by Fish Creek park. They're

sort of a bit alone, so I wondered if they would be – I recognize that you kind of have to go out and up Anderson to get to them.

**Ms Morrell:** It is interesting because that golf course creates a natural barrier, and it is one that prevents. Like, we don't go shopping. There's a Safeway on the other side of the golf course. We never shop at that Safeway. There is a little bit of, you know, an intellectual-like sort of barrier I think we create in our minds that keeps us separate, but I don't think it's one that we can't get over.

**Ms Livingstone:** Okay. Thanks.

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

All right. Is anybody else here who would like to speak?

We had another speaker. I don't think she's arrived as yet, so we'll just take a brief break until that happens.

[The hearing adjourned from 11:22 a.m. to 11:26 a.m.]

**The Chair:** I hear we have a volunteer, which is terrific, Robert Nelson. Mr. Nelson, if you wouldn't mind coming forward and telling us what constituency you live in to start off with, that would be terrific.

**Mr. Nelson:** Is this one on, or should I go . . .

**The Chair:** They're both on.

**Mr. Nelson:** Okay. I'm from Calgary-Glenmore. Actually, before I start, just a quick question because I didn't sign up to present, and then in the nine days since then I came up with something that I feel like I could present. Would it be at all possible to bring something up on the screen there just for ease of viewing for anyone else who's watching?

**The Chair:** Do you have something with you that you want to put up on the screen, or are you hoping that we have those?

**Mr. Nelson:** Yeah. I have something in my Google Drive that I could bring up. I have physical copies for commission members, but I figured for anybody else who's observing.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, we don't have that many people observing, but do you want to just take a moment to speak to our clerk here and see? He's been our technical guy on that.

**Mr. Nelson:** Okay. That should be there. I can fiddle around with that if it's not visible enough. I just figure that that sort of thing is built on a Google Maps sort of platform, so it gives a much better overview. I'll just give, with the commission's permission . . .

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

**Mr. Nelson:** There are five copies here. This is sort of a city-wide rough proposal for redistricting. The first page here shows district names, populations, and deviations from the city-wide mean as well as the provincial mean. It goes on to detail the communities that have been gained and lost from each riding as a result of this proposed redistribution. On the last two pages there are two maps. The first is just an overview map showing the different districts, and the second is the same but with the community boundaries shown.

Just to, I guess, preface this sort of proposal, I'm by no means offering this as, you know, a take-it-or-leave-it, all-encompassing sort of thing. It's sort of just a rough scenario for working with because I was trying to imagine what a redistricting in Calgary would have to look like if the number of ridings in Calgary was increased to 26. Under the population numbers from the Canadian

census it gives Calgary a population that equals roughly about 26 and a half provincial electoral districts. I assumed, because of the difficulties that had been mentioned in rural representation, the larger size of the rural ridings, that with half a riding each sort of allocated in terms of numbers to not Calgary or Edmonton, that the extra riding would go to not Calgary or Edmonton, Calgary would increase to 26 instead of 27. That's what this proposal was based on.

I wasn't sure – sorry; I'm blanking. There were a few points that I wanted to make.

**The Chair:** Well, perhaps I'll just help you with a question. Where do you add the extra riding in Calgary, then, on the basis of the map you've submitted?

**Mr. Nelson:** The new riding is in what is currently Calgary-South East. Calgary-South East, from this, is essentially split into an eastern portion, which I continued with the name Calgary-South East, and a western portion, which I called Calgary-South. I tried to think of a more creative name, and there really isn't one. It's just south Calgary. Then for the eastern portion, as well, I added a bit more industrial area to the north, I think just for aesthetic purposes more than anything.

The other sort of population imbalances in the city are taken care of by shifting the districts. It just made the most sense to add a purely new riding in the south because Calgary-South East essentially has the population of two whole ridings. It had a deviation of positive 97 per cent at the time of the last census, which was about eight months ago. It very easily could have the population of two full ridings at this point.

I guess one thing I will mention is that I did, as much as possible, try and stick to the two biggest natural boundaries that I consider to exist in the city, those being the Bow River, especially as it divides north and south Calgary, and then Deerfoot Trail, especially in the north part of the city, where there's a more marked undivide because of the concentration of industrial land around the airport. The result of that is that the ridings in the north of the city have a higher average population than the other ridings just by those sorts of boundaries.

The boundaries were crossed in a few places. Deerfoot is crossed more frequently in the south, where it tends to run up against residential communities, so there's less of a divide, you know, whereas in the north, if you go between Calgary-Northern Hills and Calgary-McCall, there's quite a large space of industrial land there.

The Bow River is crossed in a few places. In the south the crossing that currently exists with Calgary-Acadia is preserved and extends up to Ogden, and then in the western part of the city Montgomery is tacked onto Calgary-Bow, which again crosses the Bow River although the continuation of Bowness Road makes the river sort of a less consequential boundary than, say, going between south of the Bow River and downtown and then north in what is currently Calgary-Mountain View.

The other thing I'll mention, just from this sort of proposal, is that it does, as much as possible, as with the committee's mandate, keep communities whole. There are only two residential communities that are divided. The first is Hidden Valley, which is bisected by Beddington Trail. The part of that divide on the west of Beddington Trail is currently in Calgary-Foothills, and the part on the east is currently in Calgary-Northern Hills, and that's maintained. The other community that is split – it's not as necessary but just to balance population – is the community of Richmond, which is bisected by Crowchild Trail in the city's southwest and is divided here between Calgary-Elbow and the riding that is essentially a successor to Calgary-Currie. I called it Calgary-

Shaganappi Point as Currie Barracks moved into Calgary-Elbow under this, and I thought it would make sense to continue the Currie name.

I suppose that with this it would probably be easier to field questions than try and talk about a whole city-wide proposal because that would probably take far too long to go into in any detail.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, thank you for that invitation. I'll kick off; that's my prerogative as chair, I guess. Obviously, I haven't read your entire proposal yet – you just handed it out – but under the proposal to essentially create a new constituency in the southern part of Calgary, how do you address the surplus population in Calgary-Acadia and Calgary-Fish Creek as it currently stands?

**Mr. Nelson:** Just to clarify, you said surplus, but I assume you mean deficit.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Sorry. Deficit: yes, that's exactly what I mean.

**Mr. Nelson:** For Calgary-Fish Creek I extended the boundary northwards to encompass the communities of Willow Park and Maple Ridge, which are currently in Calgary-Acadia.

For the remaining communities in Calgary-Acadia – Acadia, Fairview, and Riverbend – I moved the boundary northward to encompass Inglewood and Ramsay, northward from the industrial areas that make up the current northern part of Calgary-Acadia. I moved it northward from Riverbend to take Ogden from what is currently Calgary-Fort and moved it westward across Macleod Trail from Manchester to encompass Erlton, Elboya, Parkhill, Britannia, Rideau Park, Roxboro, and Windsor Park between Macleod Trail and the Elbow River.

11:35

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

**Mr. Nelson:** I know this is very comprehensive to give out right here. I legitimately just finalized this yesterday. I wish I could have submitted it in advance.

**The Chair:** No problem. Questions on this side?

Okay. Well, I'll just throw out another one. I think you've been sitting here long enough perhaps to hear the presentation this morning from Mr. Mann, who was a former candidate for Calgary-McCall, and we were chatting about creating another constituency in the north. Do you have any view as to why we should choose the south for the extra constituency rather than the north?

**Mr. Nelson:** I think what I would say is that the first point is really out of simplicity. Like I said, Calgary-South East is essentially two districts crammed into one currently. In looking at the provincial mean as calculated under the Canadian census, you sort of have enough population to give 26 and a half ridings. Like I said, I took the other half and gave it outside the city and just increased Calgary from 25 to 26. That's part of why in areas such as the northeast, like Mr. Mann talked about, the population is a bit higher.

Now, what I did do to address that, because I did listen to his presentation there, was that the population bases of the ridings in the northeast were all shifted northward. You can see on here that the new riding of Calgary-Cross is quite small. It's sort of in the centre of that northeast conglomeration of ridings, and it is moved north to encompass the communities of Falconridge and Castleridge, which are currently in Calgary-McCall. That helps to take away from the surplus of population in Calgary-McCall. The

land area of Calgary-McCall is increased, but that's largely to take up industrial land which would have been tacked onto something else. The industrial land tacking onto Calgary-McCall was just done for aesthetic purposes more than anything.

Then Calgary-East was moved northward to encompass the community of I want to say Rundle – it's currently in Calgary-Cross – as well as the community of Vista Heights and the industrial area that's currently in Calgary-Cross. Then the neighbourhoods that currently make up the eastern component of Calgary-Fort, the riding that in this proposal is titled Calgary-Forest Lawn, were moved northward to take in the communities of Albert Park, Radisson Heights, Southview, Penbrooke Meadows, and Red Carpet from what is currently Calgary-East.

That's sort of how the imbalances in northeast Calgary are dealt with from that perspective. Then I don't think there were any further residential communities added on for Calgary-Fort.

Essentially, what I've done, to sum up, is take the current ridings of Calgary-McCall, Calgary-Greenway, Calgary-Cross, Calgary-East, and Calgary-Fort except for Inglewood, Ramsay, and Ogden and made them into, well, four new ridings, and then the boundaries of Calgary-Greenway stay the same. You sort of take three and a half current ridings and make four ridings there.

**The Chair:** Any social policy argument for why effective representation would be better achieved by adding that constituency in the south rather than in the north?

**Mr. Nelson:** In terms of social policy I wouldn't say that there is as much of an argument. The argument for the way the boundaries are constructed here is largely based on natural geographic boundaries. Like I talked about, Deerfoot Trail, especially in the north, is a fairly important geographic boundary as well as preserving communities of interest. This part of the city is incredibly ethnically diverse, especially in the far northern part of that area. The community of Coral Springs, for example: 85 per cent of that community are from visible minority groups, largely of South Asian extraction.

These proposed boundaries do try, as much as possible, to keep those sorts of communities of interest together. This is, like I said, at the expense of a slightly higher mean population than in other

parts of the city, but when I was looking over just the community numbers, it seemed to be the more workable solution.

One other thing I will mention – and I forgot to mention this at the beginning of the presentation, so I'll do it now – is that the population figures that I've given here are from the 2016 Calgary municipal census, so they'll be a little different from the federal census. I believe there was a difference in city-wide population between the two of about 4,000. The deviations won't be huge, but they are noticeable in a few places.

Two examples I'll pull from. For Calgary-Greenway, where the boundaries have stayed the same, the city-wide census gives a population total between 1,500 and 2,000 lower than the federal census. The other example I'll pull from is the riding of Calgary-Buffer, which on that map is at about 42 and a half thousand whereas by the municipal census it is something around 46,000 or 46 and a half thousand. The residential properties there are very much apartment or condo based, much more multifamily residential than other parts of the city. That might account for the difficulty in counting there between the two censuses. I just thought I'd mention that.

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

Questions?

**Ms Livingstone:** None from me. This is very comprehensive. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming along and sharing this with us, and we'll of course take it into account when we take a close look at Calgary.

**Mr. Nelson:** No problem.

**The Chair:** All right. Well, I think that finishes our list of presenters for the morning. We'll now break until the first registered presenter this afternoon. Mr. Clerk, is that still at 1:30? At 1:30.

Thank you very much, everyone.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:41 a.m.]









