



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Wednesday, February 22, 2017
1:04 p.m.

Transcript No. 19

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

Billie Barrett
Brady Bateman
Frank Bruseker
Benjamin Bysouth
Patrick Davies
Ray Domay*
Brian Dornan
Ella Dunn
Wendy Fulton
Jennifer Gorrie
Quinten Hauck
Ethan Holmes
Thomas Komarniski
Jenny Lyver
Sarah Mang
Jared Martin
Miguel Racin
Daniel Sadr
Paulette Savill
Kyle Woolman

*This spelling could not be verified at the time of publication.

1:04 p.m.

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

The Chair: Neither of our presenters is here yet. That doesn't surprise me because the first one has signed in for 1:30.

I understand that there's a group of journalism students from NAIT here, so while we're waiting for our first presenter to arrive, I think the panel – I haven't asked them, but I'm just going to be presumptuous here – would be happy to field questions if you have any for us. Don't be shy.

Mrs. Day: Do you want to start with the presentation?

The Chair: All right. Mrs. Day suggests I start with my presentation, which kind of explains what we're about with our PowerPoint slides, so why don't I do that? Then that might help you decide what questions to ask. You should be aware that in both Edmonton and Calgary yesterday we didn't let anyone leave the room without participating, so just a heads-up. That's the price of being here.

I'm Justice Myra Bielby. I'm a judge of the Court of Appeal of Alberta. I live in Edmonton, and I work throughout the province. Right at the moment I'm chairing the provincial Electoral Boundaries Commission. With me here this afternoon on my left are Jean Munn and Laurie Livingstone, both of Calgary, and to my right, Gwen Day of Carstairs and Bruce McLeod of Acme.

Over the past few weeks people have been asking me for more information about the Electoral Boundaries Commission and why are we doing it now and what is our job. There was some confusion, I think, with the now cancelled federal initiative to look at whether we should change the first past the post system to proportional representation. Many of my friends say: wasn't all that cancelled? Well, that bit was cancelled, but not ours. We're going ahead.

Let me tell you a little bit about what we're doing. Our job is to research and make recommendations to the provincial Legislature as to where and how our provincial constituency boundaries should be changed to ensure effective proper representation by our MLAs in future provincial elections. Now, I'm sure you're all familiar with the principle of representation by population, that each person's vote should be relatively equal in effect to every other person's vote.

Our work is necessary at this point, first of all, because it is mandated by legislation, but it's also necessary because Alberta's population has grown by a huge amount in the last eight years, since the last time the boundaries were looked at. We've grown by more than 14 per cent, more than 600,000 people. I was kind of proud to be an Albertan when I read the press last week, when Statistics Canada published its population census figures for the last 2016 federal census, and I saw that both Edmonton's and Calgary's population had increased by more than 14 per cent. The runner-up was Vancouver, at 6.9 per cent. We've just had a phenomenal growth rate here in the last eight years notwithstanding the number of people who may have moved out of the province due to the economic downturn.

This has created a problem, perhaps, for democracy, for the application of democratic principles if left alone because those 600,000-plus people did not move equally into each one of our 87 constituencies. They tended to favour certain constituencies. Most of them moved into Calgary or Edmonton, more into Calgary than Edmonton, but there was also a good number moving into Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray and proportionately fewer people moving into the other constituencies.

Just to take this step by step, we have 87 provincial constituencies. This commission has no ability to increase the number of constituencies or decrease them. If the Legislature had wanted to do that, they would have had to do that by passing a bill to that effect prior to the formation of the commission on October 31, 2016, and that didn't happen. Last time, eight years ago, the provincial Legislature did add four new constituencies to deal with the big growth in population that occurred between 2002 and 2009, but that didn't happen this time. So we have our 87, the same number. Our chore is to decide how to recommend that the province be divided up into 87 pieces. The map you see up on the screen – it's the same map as on the wall with the green patch at the top – shows the configuration of our current 87 constituencies, which is based on the population as it was in 2010. We all know that each constituency returns one MLA to the Legislature in each provincial election, so 87 constituencies, 87 MLAs.

Our population has gone up by more than 14 per cent across the province, and that's changed our average population size to 46,697. If you took the population figure given by Statistics Canada – and they did a mini update in Fort McMurray to account for the people who hadn't returned yet because of the fire and came up with 9,100 people. So if you take their base number, remove 9,100, and add 2,300 because the Saddle Lake Indian reserve chose not to participate in the federal census, you get the number of 4,062,609. That divided by 87 gives an average population of 46,697, which would be ideal for each of our constituencies. Of course, there are virtually no constituencies at the moment who have that exact population although there are a good number of them that are fairly close. However, that evidences the change in population from our current electoral map because when our current constituencies were drafted, the average constituency size was 40,880.

1:10

Last time the boundaries commission set constituency boundaries, over half were within five per cent of the provincial average of 40,800, and 85 per cent were within 10 per cent of the average. They did, in my opinion, a good job in getting close to parity, which is what's necessary for one person's vote to equal the same as every other person's vote in effect. But because of our influx of population and the increase of the population in Alberta, we're out of whack at the moment. Instead of most of our constituencies being within 5 or 10 per cent of the provincial average, the range has increased enormously. Our smallest population is 17,129 people, and our largest, 92,248 people in Calgary-South East. If we were to have a provincial election today based on these constituency boundaries, the vote of a person in Fort McMurray-Conklin would have four and a half times the effect of the vote of a person cast in Calgary-South East.

That kind of gives you a snapshot of what our problem is. Our job is to make recommendations to the Legislature as to how to move constituency boundaries to address this problem, but we're not looking at simply a mathematical exercise. If it was simply taking the province and dividing it into 87 squares, each of which had 46,697 people in it, well, we wouldn't have had to come here to Calgary. We could have just sat down and done that. Rather, we're considering more on the journey toward effective representation than simply population densities.

We're controlled by an act called the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which was passed by the province of Alberta for the first time in 1905, when the province was formed, and most recently in 1990. It sets out the criteria that we have to consider in making our recommendations to the Legislature. Those criteria, in addition to population densities, include common community interests and organizations, including Indian reserves and Métis

settlements. Ideally we don't draw a constituency boundary through the middle of an Indian reserve. Also, we don't draw it through the middle of a community of interest, so if you have a group of people who are doing the same thing, we try to put them in the same community.

As an aspect of that, within Edmonton and Calgary we try to respect neighbourhood boundaries. We don't cut a neighbourhood in half inadvertently. Now, we heard this morning that last time, in fact, two Calgary neighbourhoods were cut in half. I'm not going to try to remember the names of them, but presumably there was some reason that that occurred. As a goal we want to avoid that happening. Similarly, we want to respect the town and village boundaries of all of the other communities and small cities in Alberta and try to not cut them up inadvertently. For example, I do respect the work of the last commission more and more as we get into this, but they cut Tofield in half. I'm sure that was just an oops, but for the people in Tofield, which is a small community near Edmonton, half of them are in one constituency – well, more of them are in one constituency, and a few are in another constituency. That's an example of a thing we want to avoid. One of the reasons we're having these public hearings is because we've discovered that people who live in each of these constituencies have a lot of good ideas about how we could change the boundaries and not overlook those kinds of things.

In addition to common communities of interest and municipal boundaries we're trying to use natural geographical features that maybe suggest boundaries. If there's a major roadway that we can use to be one of the boundaries of a constituency, we use that. If there's a river, we use that if we can. That helps the people who live in the constituency remember where the edges of their constituency are.

Now, the legislation says that's what we must take into account, but it also permits us to take into account anything else that we think is important to allow MLAs to effectively represent their constituents in the future. That's one of the reasons we're having this series of hearings. This is our third week of public hearings. We've gone through most of the province to this point. We're looking for input as to other factors, your input as to things that you might think are important to allow MLAs in each of our provincial constituencies to effectively do their job. At the end, we're hoping to have a set of 87 clear and understandable boundaries throughout the province.

We're not only having our public submissions and recording what is said in the public submissions. By the by, *Hansard* is here, and they're taking down everything that's being said, and it will go up on our website in both audio and written form in the next couple of days. Anything you say: just be aware that it's going to be recorded.

We were also fortunate enough to have people respond to our invitation to make written submissions, and we've received to this point 749 written submissions about boundaries, some of them addressing the principles broadly and some of them making very specific recommendations or requests regarding boundaries. I like to brag that last time this was done, they got 500 submissions in the entire year, and we've gotten 749 in the first six weeks, but I don't think that that's all because of the effectiveness of our advertising this time. We've invited submissions directly on our website or by e-mail or through social media, and that's made it easier, maybe, to make submissions this time than simply through the post.

Even though the deadline has now passed for written submissions for the first go-round, we will, after we make our interim recommendations, post them on our website, send them to the Legislature by May 31. The Legislature, I'm expecting, will post them on their website, and then we'll invite comments from the

public on the specific recommendations we're making. We'll invite further written submissions, and we're having a second round of public hearings toward the end of July, beginning of August to invite input on those specific recommendations. We may well decide to fine-tune some of those as a result.

Then we'll file our report with the Legislature before October 31 of this year. In the normal course of events the Legislature would then pass legislation adopting those recommendations. It does not have to, but always in the past that's occurred, so I'm hopeful that that would happen again this time as well. On that basis new constituencies would be formed for the next provincial election.

This is done every eight to 10 years, so generally the provincial boundaries are reset once for every two provincial elections. It seems like we're doing this well in advance, but apparently the Chief Electoral Officer and the people who run the polling stations or whatever need at least a year's lead time to set all that up, so that's why we're doing this work now even though we're not on the doorstep of a provincial election.

Keep in mind that equality or parity of population is not our only consideration. While our courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have interpreted our legislation to mean that each of us has the right not to have the political strength or value of our vote unduly diluted, our legislation permits variances from average population, where necessary, of up to 25 per cent above or 25 per cent below Alberta's average population.

There's an exception to that, even an additional exception. If you look up against the border of the Northwest Territories, there are some really large constituencies. Two of those, Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley and Lesser Slave Lake, fall within this special category in the act, which allows them to have a population of up to 50 per cent lower than the provincial average because of the large size of those constituencies. Just in doing a little research last week and looking up fun facts, I found that Lesser Slave Lake is one and a half times the size of the country of Belgium. Peace River, a third large constituency, is one and a half times the size of the Netherlands, and together those constituencies alone are one and a half times the size of our Maritime provinces. It's a very big area, bigger, maybe, than the map even suggests. The Legislature in the past has said: "Okay. Special rules for that area because there's such a huge area to cover and such a small population. We won't set the goal of provincial average for them. It can be 50 per cent under."

But if you notice, the red figures are our current population, the census's population from February 8 of this year, and the blue figures are from last time. You'll see that Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley is now above the 50 per cent figure, so it's more than 50 per cent below the provincial average. It's 51 per cent below the provincial average. That is an example of a constituency where we have to move the boundaries because it goes over the maximum deviance allowed. That's just an example.

1:20

We're holding these hearings to receive input from people in Alberta as the people directly affected by changes to the constituency boundaries. In going about our task, when we start our deliberations, after we're finished our public hearings all around the province, we'll sit down, we'll take each one of the 87 constituencies in turn, we'll look at the actual population of the constituency as given to us by Statistics Canada on February 8 – I think that's not last week but the week before last – and we'll compare that to the average number of 46,697, look at the difference between the two, and decide if there is any acceptable reason to leave that difference in place, to leave the constituency as it is, or if not, decide whether we need to move the boundaries in or out to increase or decrease the constituency and how exactly to move those boundaries.

Of course, if you move the boundaries in one constituency, that affects the constituency immediately next to it, because if you shrink the constituency, then the constituency next door picks up the population that you've hived off. Then that might make them well over the provincial average, and so it goes. There's a bit of a ripple effect around the whole province. All of this is more specifically explained on our website, which you can find at abebc.ca.

That's also the place that you can look for our interim recommendations once they're posted in May sometime. Probably we won't be waiting until the very last day. That's my goal, anyway. Then you'll have the opportunity right on our website, if you want to use it, to make submissions.

What we're asking our people today who registered to present is that if they have recommendations about a particular constituency, they come forward and draw on the map where they think the barrier or the boundary should be of that constituency. The clerk will then take a picture of that, and we'll have that photo to match up with the record of their submissions when we actually begin our deliberations so we don't lose the specifics of some of these suggestions.

We have a few minutes yet before our registered presenters start. You've listened to that whole spiel. Any questions from any of you? This is a group of journalism students from SAIT, right? Okay. I'm feeling popular. You're our third group. Now, thoughts? Who doesn't live within the city of Calgary's boundaries? Okay. All but two.

So I'm going to start. The gentleman in the first row to the left with a hat on: what constituency do you live in?

Mr. Hauck: Calgary-Varsity.

The Chair: Okay. So have you lived in Varsity for long?

Mr. Hauck: I've moved around Varsity but been there for a couple of years.

The Chair: Okay. Looking at our map – I've got a mini version of the map that's up on the wall – Varsity is one of the four constituencies that hasn't moved. The growth in population there has pretty much tracked proportionally the growth in population for the whole province. Even though your population is 1,500 people, roughly, larger than it was eight years ago, you are 4 per cent below the provincial average population. Now, 4 per cent may not be that big a number, but if the commission thought, during the course of its deliberations, "Gee, we do need to increase the size of Varsity to pick up a little bit of additional population," in your view, should we go north, east, south, or west?

Mr. Hauck: West.

The Chair: Okay. Why is that?

Mr. Hauck: It just seems like – I don't know – the logical direction to move it. It just kind of fits with it. I haven't given a whole lot of thought to it besides right now.

The Chair: No, no. That's okay. I'm just reading Malcolm Gladwell's book *Blink*, which suggests that our initial impulses should be followed more than we credit them. On that basis, I'll just ask you a couple of questions. One of the things that we're supposed to keep in mind is the nature or character of the community, right? In Varsity we instantly think of the University of Calgary, and that gives a quality to the people who live in Varsity. If we were to move west, would we find people of a similar perspective in Hawkwood,

or should we cross the river, maybe, to go to Bow or down south to Mountain View? Where do you find more university people?

Mr. Hauck: Actually, now that I'm thinking about it: probably not west, probably more to the north as well as to the east, kind of around the Nose Hill area.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

I'm going to ask the woman next to you: where do you live?

Ms Mang: To be honest, I don't know what constituency I live in.

The Chair: Where do you live?

Ms Mang: Dalhousie.

The Chair: Dalhousie. Okay. That's in Varsity as well. You've heard my questions to your seatmate there. Do you have any thoughts as to, if we had to move the boundary out a bit to pick up some population, where we should go that would make the most logical sense given the nature of the community now?

Ms Mang: Yeah. Like, I think I agree with Quin, especially if it's mostly university students. They, I guess, are probably more in the northeast area, and I know that the northern part of the city is probably developing a little more at this point, so the population is probably rising in that direction.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you. You can see my scheme here.

The gentleman next to you: I bet you're all in Varsity.

Mr. Bateman: I'm in Calgary-North West.

The Chair: Okay. Looking at our map here, we see that North West is the converse. It's 4 per cent over, which isn't a whole bunch, but if we decided that we had to deal with that by decreasing the size of North West closer to par, taking off maybe 500 people, how do you suggest that we – well, it'd be closer to a thousand people. Which way do you think we should go?

Mr. Bateman: Well, directly to the south in the Bow is at negative 2 per cent of the average right now, so you could put an influx there. As well, Varsity is still at negative 4 per cent, so you could move there as well. South or east.

The Chair: Okay. Now, your first suggestion would require us to cross the river to go into Calgary-Bow. Do you think that's a big deal? If you had an MLA who represented a constituency that was divided by the river, would there be any difficulties posed by that, or are there sufficient number of bridges and continuity of communities that in the city that might not be such a big consideration?

Mr. Bateman: I would say that in a smaller city with fewer crossings over the river it could be a larger issue, but I think that in Calgary we have enough river crossings that it shouldn't be too much of a major concern.

The Chair: Okay. Great.

All right. The person next to you: hi.

Mr. Martin: Hi.

The Chair: Which constituency do you live in?

Mr. Martin: I live in Calgary-South East.

The Chair: Okay. Well, that's an interesting one because . . .

Mr. Martin: I was just looking at the numbers.

The Chair: . . . you're almost twice the size of the provincial average, and the immediate thought is: oh, well, we could divide that into two. But, you know, we've been listening to people all day here and all day yesterday. That's maybe not directly the solution, full stop, because if you look north of that, there are two constituencies that are well below the provincial average. Acadia and Fish Creek are each 18 per cent below or together 36 per cent below the provincial average. The logical place to make up some of that 36 per cent might be South East because we have to go a long way up into the northeast to get another pocket of excess population, if you'll forgive me for calling it that. We have to look beyond the simplicity of the idea of just splitting it in half. We could still do that, but then what do we do with these populations that are so much under to the north? Keeping that in mind, how would you suggest dealing with the situation in South East?

Mr. Martin: I think it's probably the largest obviously growing part of the city right now. I think there needs to be some kind of – most of these boundaries probably should be dropping south a little bit, in my opinion, just to make the South East one smaller. But it's such a heavily populated area that I'm sure if you dropped Acadia maybe more south and you dropped Fish Creek more south – and then I see that Calgary-Hays is 5 per cent under. So I don't know. It would be a gradual, like, southing of every border.

The Chair: Right. That's an example of the ripple effect I was talking about. If you move one border, then all the neighbours – so I'm going to go in a different direction because this is another idea that has been floating around here, and that is because this is such a fast-growing area, to look beyond the city boundaries. We're supposed to not do that if we can avoid it, but because this is an exceptional situation, we could look beyond the boundaries to Chestermere-Rocky View to the east or Highwood to the south, both of which are also well over the average. Be that as it may, if we decided that we would deal with some of this high population growth by expanding the boundaries of a new constituency out, should we go east or south, in your view, to better capture a population that's most like the people who are currently living in Calgary-South East?

1:30

Mr. Martin: I'm trying to think exactly where Chestermere is in relation to that.

The Chair: Well, I'm not talking about the city of Chestermere because it's far north. If you just look a little bit over your left shoulder there, you'll see that other map, not the coloured one but the one just above Aaron's head there. Do you see that constituency that goes like a horseshoe shape all the way around the city of Calgary? That's Chestermere-Rocky View, and the reason it's that shape is because that's the county, I understand. It followed the county shape, so it's not quite as crazy as it might seem. If we had to pick up some additional population – and this is just an option; we have to consider all options – should we take in that bottom bit of Chestermere-Rocky View to the lower right, or should we go into Highwood? They're both adjacent to Calgary-South East. Any thoughts on that?

Mr. Martin: I'm not really sure.

The Chair: That's a fair answer. Okay. Thank you very much.

We're right at 1:30. I'm not forgetting about the rest of you, but I'm going to now turn to the people who registered because I don't

want to tie up anybody who has registered and come along. Is Jasbir Dhari here?

Okay. I see Mr. Bruseker is here, so if you wouldn't mind coming forward and sitting right at the front here and telling us what constituency you live in.

Mr. Bruseker: One of these two chairs here?

The Chair: Yes, please.

Mr. Bruseker: Lovely.

The Chair: Because you weren't here for my entire introduction, just know that *Hansard* is here. They're recording everything that's being said, and that will be posted on our website in audio form and in written transcript form in a couple of days. So everything you say will be published.

Mr. Bruseker: I'm familiar with that.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bruseker: Just give my computer a moment to warm up here.

The Chair: Do you live in Airdrie?

Mr. Bruseker: I live in Airdrie. That's correct.

All right. Good afternoon, members of the commission. First of all, congratulations on being appointed as a member of the commission. This is exciting work. You'll probably think: this guy is nuts. That may be true.

My name is Frank Bruseker. I live in the Airdrie constituency, and I see it up on the map there. It is the fourth-largest constituency in the province by population. I'm not talking about area.

My interest and my experience with *Hansard* go back to 1989. I was first elected to the constituency of Calgary-North West, which looks significantly different today than it did in 1989, and I was the Liberal caucus member of the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries. We were in existence for about 14 months, and *Hansard* produced this volume of our 39 hearings, 23 meetings, meetings with literally hundreds of presentations. I give you that background so that – I wanted to share with you that I believe I have a good understanding of the issues that you are facing, the task that you have been given, which is fundamentally an important task for democracy.

Part of my interest goes back to that first election that I mentioned, when I was elected to represent Calgary-North West. My constituency, the constituency of Calgary-North West, had somewhat over 30,000 voters, and the numbers that I'm going to give you today – I'm going to talk about voters. I know the numbers you have up here are total population, but I'm looking at the numbers of voters because that's the data that I got from the website of Alberta's chief electoral office.

In 1989 there were 30,000 voters in Calgary-North West. That's from the voters list. Three constituencies in southern Alberta together, between the three of them, had 26,000 electors. The reason that's significant, in my view, and fundamentally flawed is that those 26,000 voters got to send three MLAs to the Legislature, and the 30,000 voters in Calgary-North West only got to send one, which I think was a fundamental imbalance, and it reflected a province-wide rural bias that I believe still exists today.

I heard Chair Bielby talk about particular constituencies. I want to talk more about broad principles rather than try to deal with the domino effect: when you move one boundary, then you shift another boundary and so on.

As I said, I've got a pretty good sense of what's going on. We had a lot of hearings, 39 hearings, around the province. Lots of people were making presentations like this to our committee – not the commission; the committee – at the time. We heard a lot of concerns from rural residents about the number of kilometres of road and hectares of land and sections and so on, all of which was interesting, but it's, in my view, irrelevant. Roads don't vote. Hectares don't vote. People vote.

The job of an MLA, which I did for eight years, is to represent the people. Nonetheless, rural residents said: "No, no. This is a big issue. Boy, oh boy, has our MLA got a tough job. He couldn't possibly handle any increase in workload by having a larger area." Then on occasion we would get into a constituency where that particular rural MLA had been appointed to cabinet. So I asked the question: "Well, you must have been incensed when your MLA was appointed to cabinet. What an extra workload." "Oh, no. That was just fine." Really, what it came down to, in my conclusion, was that it wasn't about representation; it was about a voice at the table, and that's certainly what you get with a cabinet minister.

This situation has been going on for a long time. The committee that I was a member of was in existence for about 14 months. A commission was created that created boundaries for the 1993 election, and then in 1994 the Alberta government sent a reference to the Alberta Court of Appeal with respect to provincial boundaries. This was on October 24. ABCA 342 is the reference that I have. In fact, the Alberta Court of Appeal spoke about the imbalance, which, as I said, existed then and still exists to this day. A couple of quotes from their report said, "This imbalance had a long history . . . Revisions of boundaries [have] not [kept] pace with . . . demographic changes."

In fact, this imbalance has been virtually institutionalized, in my view, to maintain a bias in favour of increased rural representation at the expense of urban representation, and while the court did accept that there might be division-by-division variation, they did not accept the general bias. Again, I'm going to quote from paragraph 46 of ABCA 342. "We affirm again that there is no permissible variation if there is no justification. And the onus to establish justification lies with those who suggest the variation."

I mentioned that I looked at the Alberta Chief Electoral Officer website and looked at data that is there from April 2016. It's not quite a year out of date, but I mention that in particular because I believe it's more current than the latest decennial census, which came out now six and a half years ago. In Calgary there are 25 seats; the average voter population is just under 32,000. In Edmonton there are 19 seats; the average voter population is just over 31,000. For the rest of the province, the other, remaining 43 seats have an average population of 28,500. I call them rural seats. They're kind of half urban and half rural. Airdrie, where I live, is an example of a smaller urban centre. Leduc-Beaumont is one, Spruce Grove, and even Banff-Cochrane has had considerable growth.

Now, I know that in your act, the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, you've been directed to use the most recent decennial census, but section 12(4) of your act allows for some variation. It says that you can look elsewhere. So I have two recommendations, and my first recommendation would be to encourage you to look at the data from the Chief Electoral Officer in Alberta. I know that the data you're looking at here is population and the Chief Electoral Officer looks at votes because that's his task, but I think that's a good source of information and is a little more current. I believe it's section 12(4) of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act.

My second concern – of course, the Supreme Court of Canada in a reference with respect to Saskatchewan's boundaries said that absolute parity is not critical, nor is it even perhaps workable. When

you look at communities, when I represented Calgary-North West, I had the westerly half of Dalhousie, and the easterly half of Dalhousie – the division was 53rd Street – belonged to Calgary-Foothills. The MLA there was Pat Black. We had the same issue. If you know the area well, the road curves up and becomes Edgemont Boulevard. I had the westerly piece of Edgemont, and the southeasterly piece, if you will, was, again, in Foothills with Pat Black.

1:40

You know, you do what you need to do to make it work. The reason I mention that is that when you look at Calgary-North West and if you were to look at just that one constituency and the evolution of the boundaries of that constituency over time, you would see that the community concept – I've heard much concern about community – really hasn't made any difference there.

A good question was: what about going across the river? That has happened in Edmonton. Kevin Taft had a constituency that I think was called Edmonton-Riverview. It went across the constituency. The federal constituency of Calgary West did, in fact, cross the Bow River. I'm not sure that that's necessarily a big issue.

The other concern that I've heard conversation about is about effective representation and what constitutes effective representation. That's a tough question, and I don't have a good answer for you. One of the issues, of course, is that when you get elected, there were probably more people who actually voted against you or didn't vote at all than those that supported you. Your task is to represent all of those folks, on average around 30,000 voters. Just think about the numbers. How would you, practically, get about to meet each and every one of your constituents? A vastly, vastly difficult job. I tried, and I don't think I ever met all of them, but certainly you try doing town hall meetings, community functions, and local community association events. Those are the kinds of things that you do as an MLA.

I think that many of the issues and many of the concerns that have been raised are really sort of leading us away from what the fundamental issue is. Again, I'm going to refer back to the Alberta Court of Appeal. They said in paragraph 71 that there are only three possible solutions. The first one – and I heard the Chair refer to this – is a mixing of urban and non-urban populations. When I was a member of this committee, we talked about a kind of, if you will, pie-shaped constituency, where the tip of the pie would be in a city like Edmonton or Calgary and then the larger part of the wedge would be out in rural Alberta. Albertans rejected that. Then the Legislature in 1991 rejected that notion as well.

The Alberta Court of Appeal said that the second possible solution is more seats overall. Well, you know that section 13 of your act says: no, the number will be 87. You've been restricted in that regard.

The third solution – and again I'm going to refer to this one – is fewer non-urban seats. Again I'm going to quote from the . . .

The Chair: Fewer non-urban seats?

Mr. Bruseker: Fewer non-urban. Yes.

The Court of Appeal says, "But, if one spurns this solution, none remains. The people of Alberta must understand that this last is the only solution unless they soften their attitude towards the other two." They suggested three solutions, discounted number one, discounted number two, said there's only one left that works.

When I come to that conclusion that the Alberta Court of Appeal raised and look at total population, Calgary and Edmonton together have a population of just under 1.4 million voters – I'm talking about voters again, so it's a little different from the data you're

looking at – or 53 per cent of the voting population. So 53 per cent of the voting population in Alberta right now, based on the data from the chief electoral office, gets 44 seats; the balance of the population, 1.226 million voters, or 47 per cent of the population, 43 seats.

If I use the reasoning applied by the Alberta Court of Appeal, this leads to my second recommendation. Edmonton and Calgary, 53 per cent of the population, should have more than 44 seats. In fact, they should have 46, those two cities, in an 87-seat Legislature. By contrast, the rural population comprises 47 per cent and, based again on just numerical calculation, 41 seats rather than the current 43. My second recommendation is a broad principle rather than a specific example of “move this boundary here or there” and would be to shift two seats from rural Alberta to Calgary and Edmonton. How you do that is the big challenge that you face.

That’s the conclusion of my presentation. I’d be happy to answer any questions if I can do so.

The Chair: Yes. Thanks. As a privilege of the chair, I always get to ask the first question. Just prior to you coming and in the introduction that I gave to our student audience here, I told them that we’re not considering voter numbers but population numbers. The act directs us to consider the statistics on those population numbers from the 2016 federal census, conducted by Statistics Canada. Those figures were released to the public February 8. We’ve got those figures, and they appear on our maps that are on the wall.

In each constituency – and those are the current constituencies, that we have now – there are two numbers: one in blue, which was the population in 2010, the last time the electoral boundaries were fixed and the percentage off average in 2010, and above it, in red, the population figure from the statistics that were released February 8, effective now, and the variance from the provincial average there. There’s a small variation in relation to 9,100 people who haven’t moved back yet into Fort McMurray, but that doesn’t affect this particular discussion.

Section 12 of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act – you referred to the electoral boundaries act – says specifically that we must use that information. We can’t use the electoral officer’s information, and we can’t use voter information rather than population information. That doesn’t affect your comments on the excerpts from the Court of Appeal legislation. While I was a judge in ’91 and ’94, I certainly wasn’t on the Court of Appeal yet in those days, but we are familiar with that legislation and the burden that it puts on us if we want to recommend a variance from the provincial average in any constituency. Just so you know the playing field that we’re dealing with.

Now, even though you said that you weren’t going to comment on Airdrie, I’m not going to let you go without commenting on Airdrie. We’ve done this for everybody no matter what they’ve come to say. Airdrie is one of our largest growth populations in the province. At 38 per cent it’s above the mandatory maximum we can have, the 25 per cent mandatory deviance from average, so we have to move some boundaries in Airdrie to reduce the boundary in the constituency. With that task ahead, what’s your view on where we should move, how we should compress the physical size of Airdrie – the map is at the very back there – to achieve a population closer to the provincial average of 46,697 people?

Mr. Bruseker: I think there are two possible avenues. One would be to make it strictly an urban population, but I believe that you’re still going to be above the average then. I think the population in Airdrie now is about 65,000 people, so it’s still too large. Airdrie is a unique community in that it’s almost like there are two cities with

this little thing called the QE II going right up the middle. I recall that back when I was in the Legislative Assembly, different cities, some of the smaller urban centres – Lethbridge-West, Lethbridge-East, Medicine Hat – had been split into two. The dividing line that would make a great deal of sense to me as an Airdrie resident would be to use highway 2 as a dividing line. It would be the eastern edge of an Airdrie-West, if you will, and the western edge of an Airdrie-East. You would take that chunk of the city of Airdrie plus enough rural area to put together a constituency closer to the mean that you’ve described. So you would use Airdrie to create two constituencies. I think that would be the way to deal with it.

The Chair: Just working with that, my impression driving through Airdrie is that there’s more on the west of the highway than there is on the east of the highway. Is that probably correct?

Mr. Bruseker: I think that’s probably correct. That’s my perception.

The Chair: Okay. So if we divided, we wouldn’t get a 50 per cent split of that 65,000 population number. The west side would be larger than the east. Looking now just at the east side – and we don’t have the exact number as to the number of people who live there right now, what proportion of the 65,000 – it’s not enough to make a full constituency. We know that it’s not a half constituency, so let’s say that it’s a third of a constituency, which would be about 16,000. If we had to add land to that 16,000 number on the east side of highway 2, looking at my provincial map, that would take us into Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills if we went to the east and Banff-Cochrane if we went to the west.

1:50

Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills is only 2 per cent below the provincial average right now, but Banff-Cochrane is 21 per cent above, so adding to Banff-Cochrane just causes the problem to move along. You might not have any thoughts on this – I know I’ve just asked this question on the spur of the moment – but do you have any ideas on how we deal with the rest of what has to be Airdrie-East, in this example, to bring it up closer to the 46,000? We’ve got to find 30,000 people somewhere.

Mr. Bruseker: In the city of Airdrie there are four major north-south roads. One of them is already over in east Airdrie, so that just doesn’t work. I mentioned highway 2. There are two others that are on the west side of Airdrie, on the west side of highway 2. Those are Main Street and 8th Street.

If you were to look at creating an Airdrie city constituency and something else, again, I don’t know exactly where you would draw the boundaries, but I would suggest that you’d want to look at those two lines, Main Street and 8th Street west, and look at the population that would occur then in the eastern piece of Airdrie, that would be created with all of that piece that’s east of highway 2 plus a certain chunk that is west of highway 2, and include that in the eastern part. Then, having a smaller piece remaining in Airdrie-West – for lack of a better name, I’m creating a new name here – you could then take a piece from the Banff-Cochrane constituency and combine it with Airdrie and probably come up with something that would be more workable in terms of the numbers, perhaps a piece of the town of Cochrane or perhaps all of the town of Cochrane. I don’t know.

The Chair: They have too many people there to make that work. Everybody has just been growing so much.

Mr. Bruseker: I know.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you. Those are interesting ideas.

I'm going to turn to my panelists, to my fellow commissioners, and ask if they have any questions of you. Any questions? All right.

Thank you very much for coming. I appreciate your thoughts.

Okay. I'm wondering if Mr. Dhari is here as yet? Okay. He's not. Mr. Pannu? Okay. Well, isn't it lucky that the students are here because we can go to the second row of the students now.

Okay. Starting with the gentleman in the brown or black top right there who is making eye contact with me, can you tell me what constituency you live in, sir?

Mr. Woolman: I guess I'd be in Calgary-South East. I live in Chaparral.

The Chair: Okay. You've heard the flow of our questions and concerns to this point and that you've got 97 per cent over the provincial average in Calgary-South East. We have to do something. That's well in excess of the maximum 25 per cent over. The creation of a second constituency just by dividing it up is something that many people have thought of, but then we have this concern about two constituencies further to the north that are way under. How do we deal with those? If we were to expand Calgary-South East and we found for some reason we had to go outside of the boundaries of the city, would it be better to go east or south? Do you have any thoughts that you'd like to share with us?

Mr. Woolman: Considering the lack of people in the Acadia-Fish Creek area, it would make sense to lower those constituencies south, keeping in mind that you would probably have to step out of the city boundaries in the southeast section, which is growing. You can kind of look forward in the future to seeing new communities built there. I mean, I live right behind a community that is flourishing. It's growing like crazy. I can't believe the number of people down there. You can keep that in mind a bit.

I think the most logical thing to do would be to drop down the Calgary-Acadia and Calgary-Fish Creek constituencies and then kind of plan as much as you can for southeast Calgary.

If you don't mind, I just have a question completely out of the blue. I don't even know if it's true or not. Around kind of the Auburn Bay-Seton area, with the new hospital and stuff being built and the infrastructure that's being built there, there's a lot of new stuff going in. I'm curious what the plan for south Calgary is. I've heard a bunch of different, like, options and stuff. I even heard one that was as far extreme as in the next 50 years, which is a long time, integrating Calgary into possibly Okotoks, creating two downtowns around the Seton area. Keeping in mind new train lines going that way and all that, I just want to know: what does the plan for south Calgary look like?

The Chair: I'm going to turn to my two reps from Calgary here to see if either one would like to respond.

Ms Livingstone: I think that's a question for your municipal councillor.

Mr. Woolman: Yeah. Fair enough.

The Chair: We asked for Calgary and Edmonton to give us their growth plans, and they both sent us wonderful aspirational documents with great white space and good photography, but they didn't actually help, on my reading of them, beyond the observation that we're going to get more of the same and that the same areas of growth are going to continue to grow, just as you were saying.

If I can go back, just for consistency with the last gentleman from Calgary-South East, if we had to go outside of the city limits – I'm

not suggesting we will for sure but just to look at options – do you see any difference between that very southeast part of Chestermere-Rocky View and Highwood in terms of the type of people who live there, whether they're more or less like the type of people who live in Calgary-South East? We've heard there are acreages in Highwood, in that area. I don't know what there is in that area of Chestermere-Rocky View. Any thoughts as to what might be more akin to the kind of development you see happening right now in Calgary-South East?

Mr. Woolman: I would probably push more towards Highwood. I live right on the border of that constituency, and there are a lot of rich people down there, which I think is leaning more towards the wealth of southeast Calgary. I think, really, you could push either way. I've been both ways, and I don't really see a huge difference in the people and the lifestyle of those people. But even just looking at the number, I think that logically it makes sense to go Chestermere-Rocky View, so east or southeast in general.

The Chair: Right. Southeast in general?

Mr. Woolman: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

If I could turn to the next person, could you tell me the constituency you reside in?

Mr. Komarniski: I'm not sure which constituency I live in. I live in Beltline.

The Chair: Okay. Anybody?

Ms Munn: Calgary-Buffalo.

The Chair: Calgary-Buffalo.

Just if you wouldn't mind standing up and walking over to the map here, that might be the best way. If you could just put your finger on the map as to where you live, then the clerk will be able to tell you what constituency that is. I'm sympathetic because I know these lines have moved over time, so it's not always obvious.

Mr. Komarniski: I think I live, like, right between Calgary-Currie and Calgary-Buffalo.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Starting with Calgary-Buffalo, we see on this map that that's 8 per cent below the provincial average, so while it's grown in the last eight years, its growth has not been proportional to the average growth in the province. Without saying that we're going to do this, because we certainly haven't made a decision, if we had to move the Calgary-Buffalo constituency border to pick up some people, do you suggest we go south, east, north, or west?

Mr. Komarniski: I'd say to maybe go a bit west. I'm, like, right on the line, and I think that, from where I live, a lot of the parts in Calgary-Currie are more similar to where I live than they are to the rest of the area. I think it would be great if it just moved over a little bit or if Calgary-Buffalo got smaller. I live right in between.

The Chair: Okay. We're looking at Calgary-Currie here, and handily it's 5 per cent over, so that suggests a solution. But let's just put that out of our mind for a moment. Because you are somewhat familiar with Calgary-Currie as well, obviously, if we're inclined to move the boundaries of Calgary-Currie to drop, say, 5 per cent of the population, do you have a suggestion as to which way that should go to move the boundaries in a little bit: north, east, south, or west?

2:00

Mr. Komarniski: Well, the drop for Calgary-Currie – it'd be better if Calgary-Buffalo moved, like, a bit west, probably to take in more of the population that's around the Sunalta train station because it's pretty much all the same area.

The Chair: Okay. Great.

Any questions? Any comments?

Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. The lady next to you. Where do you live?

Ms Gorrie: My name is Jen. I live in the northeast of Calgary in the Temple region.

The Chair: Is that in the Calgary-North East constituency?

Ms Gorrie: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. So we're looking at Calgary-North East. It also is very close to the provincial average. Let's say we found ourselves having to move a border there to reduce the size of Calgary-North West a little bit right up there in the northwest. It's just right at the edge of Calgary. Do you have any suggestions as to which way we should move it that would make more sense?

Oh, sorry. Ms Livingstone, who lives in Calgary, suggests that, in fact, you live in the east part of Calgary if you're in Temple.

Ms Gorrie: Yes. It's in the east.

The Chair: Okay. Sorry. I've got it wrong. In the northeast. Looking at the northeast, if you could put your finger on where you live.

Ms Gorrie: This general area. Yes.

The Chair: So you're in Calgary-McCall.

Ms Gorrie: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. That is one of our largest constituencies, 38 per cent over the provincial average. We have to do something about that. We can't leave it because it's above the maximum of 25 per cent, so we have to move a boundary to reduce the size at least to 25 per cent and maybe by more than that. Do you have any thoughts as to which boundary we should move?

Ms Gorrie: I'm honestly not sure. I know, like, in the Skyview area it's developing a lot and it's expanding, everything like that. Hmm. I'm not really sure, no.

The Chair: Okay. We had a former MLA for that area this morning who was very helpful, and there was some talk at that time of creating a new constituency in Calgary north because of the population among all our constituencies around the top of Calgary there. Do you have any view as to where that should go to make more sense, to try to make the people who were within that constituency similar in interests and culture? Should we maybe put it between Calgary-McCall and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, which is what we were talking about this morning or move it further east to pick up part of Calgary-Northern Hills or Calgary-Foothills? Do you have any thoughts?

Ms Gorrie: Probably the first one that you said, with Calgary-McCall.

The Chair: Okay. Between Calgary-McCall?

Ms Gorrie: Yes.

The Chair: Why do you think that might be best?

Ms Gorrie: I'm not sure.

The Chair: That's okay.

Any questions? Okay.

Thanks so much.

Great. Thanks, everybody, for being such a good sport. Honestly, we haven't had anybody from Calgary-Buffalo. We haven't had some people from this, so your talk is what we're going to have. You're providing us with the actual information, so thank you.

Where do you live, sir?

Mr. Holmes: I'm Ethan Holmes. I live in the Marlborough Park area. I'm not sure where . . .

The Chair: Could you point to it on the map?

Mr. Holmes: Yeah. So probably around Calgary-Cross, I believe.

The Chair: Okay. So looking at our map, we see that Calgary-Cross is one of those core constituencies that's almost at the provincial average, just 2 per cent above. One of the possibilities in dealing with the extra population in the north – I'm not saying that we've made any decision, because we haven't – but we could move some of the Calgary-McCall population south to get into some of these southern constituencies that are under, but of course we'd have to move that population and then move the next constituency boundary and the next constituency boundary to make that happen. If we were interested in thinking about that at all, do you have any thoughts as to whether that would work? If we were to move the boundary of Calgary-Cross to absorb some of Calgary-McCall, is there any logical place that that northern boundary could be dropped to if we moved it south?

Mr. Holmes: I know that in the community moving kind of towards the north into McCall, where I live, there's a large kind of community of people that share the same ideals. So I guess just moving it upwards, I think you might get people who share more of the same demographic compared to moving it down towards Calgary-East, I think.

The Chair: And if we were to move it north, is there an avenue or a street or a road that would suggest itself as a logical place to move that boundary?

Mr. Holmes: Not off the top of my head that I can think of.

The Chair: Okay. That would require us to then move your southern boundary into Calgary-East because we're moving kind of population south here. Any logical boundary that you can think of to the south? If we were to move south down into Calgary-Fort, what's the next logical street or avenue or railway track or whatever that might be there?

Mr. Holmes: Yeah. Not off the top of my head.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Thanks. That's been terrific. You've been a very good sport.

Any questions, anybody?

All right. Thanks very much for your help.

Okay. So the person who is sitting next to you. Sir, if you could maybe tell us what constituency you live in.

Mr. Sadr: I think it's Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

The Chair: Okay. Looking at Mackay-Nose Hill, it's 11 per cent over the provincial average. While it's not at the point where we're absolutely forced to do something to reduce the population in that constituency, it's something we might consider doing. If we were to move one of the boundaries, is there anything that comes to mind as to how we might logically reorganize that northeast corner of the city to add a constituency?

Mr. Sadr: I don't know. A little bit to the Calgary-Hawkwood area, I guess.

The Chair: Pardon me?

Mr. Sadr: To the Calgary-Hawkwood area, I guess.

The Chair: In Hawkwood? Okay. That's right over on the west side of the increased population area. That's interesting. Why do you think that might be better than putting it somewhere else, if you can give us a reason?

Mr. Sadr: Just because it's kind of – there are more people there.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Questions? Okay.

Thank you very much, sir.

And the person sitting next to you?

When we were doing this in Edmonton, on the first day there was a senior citizens' group that came in a bus, and we did exactly the same thing with them, so thank you very much. I know that Calgarians are just as civic-minded as seniors in Edmonton.

Where do you live, sir?

Mr. Bysouth: I'm Benjamin Bysouth. I live in Calgary-Varsity, more specifically Montgomery.

The Chair: Okay. We know that Calgary-Varsity is just under the average, just 4 per cent under. Earlier commenters who lived in Varsity suggested that if we had to move, it might be best to do it in the southeast corner into Calgary-Klein. What do you think about that idea?

2:10

Mr. Bysouth: I don't know much about moving into Calgary-Klein. If we're talking about natural boundaries, I would feel that Montgomery and Bowness are very, very close together in terms of communities. The boundary that follows the river isn't really congruent with the idea that most Bownessians and people from Montgomery are connected by the Hextall Bridge, and that's a very personal boundary between them, and I don't know if you could move Montgomery to the same constituency as Bowness.

The Chair: Okay. I've been to Bowness, but I can't find it on the map. Which constituency is it located in?

Mr. Bysouth: Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

You've heard our conversation here. Is there anything else you'd like to say or ask about this topic?

Mr. Bysouth: No, not that I can think of.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bysouth: Thank you.

The Chair: I think that's the end of that row.

If I could go to the lady at my far left, your far right, in the third row. Hi.

Ms Dunn: I live in Okotoks. I'm not sure what constituency that is.

The Chair: No. That's great.

Ms Dunn: My name is Ella Dunn.

The Chair: Thank you, Ella. I think if we move down the wall there, we'll find a map that shows Okotoks.

Okay. We see from the map that Highwood has had a big population growth in the last eight years and that it's now 18 per cent over the provincial average. We don't have to move a boundary there because it's below the 25 per cent maximum, but if we were inclined to move a boundary to make Highwood closer to the provincial average, so to compress the size of the constituency, keeping in mind that we're supposed to respect the Calgary boundary if we can – so maybe our first choice shouldn't be to go into or affect Calgary-South East there – do you suggest that we move the boundary in Highwood in from the south, from the west, or from the east?

Ms Dunn: I would probably say from the east just because – I'm not too sure.

The Chair: Okay. If we moved in the boundary from the east, we'd be picking up some of Little Bow, which is 14 per cent below, but just because we've already been to that part of the province, I know that people in Little Bow say that they're a rural constituency in the sense that they're all farmers and it's quite homogenous whereas, as I understand Highwood, outside of Okotoks has a lot of acreage dwellers and people who work in the city of Calgary, right?

Ms Dunn: Yeah.

The Chair: Because of that, on reflection, do you think it might match up better by moving your extra population into Chestermere-Rocky View rather than Little Bow or something else?

Ms Dunn: Yeah. I think Okotoks is growing anyway. I'm not too sure, though. Yeah. I'm not too sure.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

Questions, anyone?

Thanks very much. Actually, you're our first person from Okotoks, so how exciting is that?

The lady next to you.

Ms Lyver: I'm from Trochu. Jenny Lyver.

The Chair: Well, Trochu is in Alberta. Come on up. Is that in the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills riding?

Now, we're looking at our map of Alberta here, and I see that Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills is very close indeed to the provincial average. It is just 2 per cent below. But if for some reason we found we had to move a boundary to pick up a little population in Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, do you think it would more logically work if we went west into Banff-Cochrane, say, or north into Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, east into Drumheller-Stettler, southeast into Strathmore-Brooks? What's most similar to Trochu?

Ms Lyver: North.

The Chair: North. Okay. That's really helpful. Thank you.

Any other questions? Anybody?

Okay. The person sitting next to you.

Ms Barrett: I'm Billie. I'm from Calgary. I live in Southview. I don't know what constituency it's in.

The Chair: Could you maybe come up and put your finger on the map, and our clerk will help you figure out what constituency.

Ms Barrett: I live, like, right here.

The Chair: So I guess that's in Calgary-Fort.

Ms Barrett: Calgary-Fort, yeah.

The Chair: We see that Calgary-Fort is 4 per cent below the average, not a whole bunch, but we have the possibility, just a possibility, of moving some of that large new population in northern Calgary, northeast there, down into some of these constituencies that have a lower population. To get to Calgary-Acadia, Calgary-Fish Creek, we might have to move through Calgary-Fort.

Ms Barrett: Okay.

The Chair: So if we did that, do you have any thoughts, if we moved the northern boundary of Calgary-Fort south, in that analysis or in that exercise, as to where a good logical place would be in terms of a major street going east-west or a railway track or anything like that, to move that boundary south?

Ms Barrett: So, like, we're going to bring it down?

The Chair: Right. Bringing it down, and then we'll bring the southern boundary down proportionally.

Ms Barrett: Okay. Well, from my knowledge of the area, most of the houses are in this area and the rest of it is, like, industrial.

The Chair: Right.

Ms Barrett: So I don't know. If you move it down, I think you'd be missing most of the houses.

The Chair: So you'd have to move it well down to make a difference?

Ms Barrett: Yeah. Because from my knowledge – I could be mistaken – all of this over here is industrial, like, on this side of the train tracks.

The Chair: Right.

Ms Barrett: So if you brought it down, I don't know how many people would actually be living there. You might just – I don't know.

The Chair: Okay. Totally aside from that, if somehow we ended up doing that in any event, and we had to then move the Calgary-Fort boundary into Calgary-South East to pick up some population, take it away from Calgary-South East, I see there's a big undeveloped area there on the map.

Ms Barrett: Is it this area here that is undeveloped?

The Chair: Yeah.

Ms Barrett: Okay.

The Chair: Getting right down to where it looks like there is a subdivision there, any suggestions as to where the north boundary might move down to?

Ms Barrett: Maybe Stoney Trail. Like, if that makes sense, down to Stoney Trail. Then you can cut it in half

The Chair: Okay. That's an interesting thought that hadn't occurred to me before in all of our discussions, but it's a good one. If we were cutting Calgary-South East into two constituencies, we could cut it into a north-south rather than into an east-west. Do you have any thoughts, because you live generally in that area, in that quadrant of Calgary, as to what would work best, which type of division would work best?

Ms Barrett: I'd probably say that Stoney Trail would probably work best, but I don't go to that area a lot, so I'm not the most knowledgeable person.

The Chair: Okay. Any questions?

Thank you. That's interesting. Thank you very much.
All right. The person sitting next to you.

Mr. Davies: I doubt if I'm going to be much help. I'm from Edmonton.

The Chair: Oh, believe me, you will be a help. Where do you live in Edmonton?

Mr. Davies: I live in the Callingwood area, around where the Hamptons are, the Callingwood towers. There are three buildings that kind of dominate the skyline.

2:20

The Chair: Okay. Where are you in relation to West Edmonton Mall?

Mr. Davies: The West Edmonton Mall? The problem is that I just go by locations. I don't go by street names. If you drive the street down from West Edmonton Mall to about the Jamie Platz YMCA, I'm in that area.

The Chair: Okay. All right. I don't have my Edmonton map specifically in front of me. Does any of the staff have an Edmonton city map handy? Sadly not. Okay.

Mr. Dornan: That's 176th Street.

The Chair: Okay. I know that's another area of growth in Edmonton, you know, that is expanding outward toward the west. I can't say immediately which constituency you're living in, but around you where would the natural boundary be between the type of neighbourhood and area you live in maybe in comparison to the one that's next over? Can you make any observation about that?

Mr. Davies: Well, I'm not really a hundred per cent certain on the boundaries, obviously, but one thing I have noticed is that past Anthony Henday Drive, the big drag that just kind of wraps around west Edmonton, there's been a lot of growth. I lived out in this area where, when I first came to Edmonton, it was just all canola fields. Like, we could chase coyotes out there. Now it's completely residential areas. There's a Costco and all that. That's just out towards this casino. I guess a natural boundary I would say would be about that area, like, Anthony Henday Drive, just before you get into the Hamptons, because that's developed a lot in the last 10 years. I'd say that it's approaching its own constituency, really.

The Chair: Okay. So having heard all of the discussion here today to this point, do you have any observations or thoughts you'd like to make about this process?

Mr. Davies: In general, I mean, I would say that it's pretty important. I think it's unfortunate that you are limited to only being able to have 83 constituencies.

The Chair: Eighty-seven.

Mr. Davies: I would just say that there's definitely room to add a few more, but that's not up to me. Really, I wish you the best.

The Chair: I should say, not because I'm defending the Legislature – far from it; they didn't talk to us about this before they asked us to do this job – that when you compare our federal constituency size to our provincial constituency size, the federal constituencies are two and a half times the provincial constituencies in terms of population. Even the municipal wards in both Edmonton and Calgary have a larger population than our provincial constituencies do, the average. So I guess that it's not impossible that you could have effective representation with an average constituency size of 46,697. You know, adding constituencies wasn't perhaps necessary to ensure effective representation. There are additional solutions, I guess. It would perhaps have been easier for us if they had added those constituencies, but it doesn't mean that that precludes us from doing an adequate job. At least that's what we're counting on.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Davies: No problem.

The Chair: Now, is there anybody else? I see a few faces of people who are probably not journalism students from SAIT, and I'd like to invite any of you to come forward, if you wouldn't mind, and tell us what constituency you live in.

Would you mind, sir? Come on forward and sit in front of the mike there. That would be terrific. If you wouldn't mind telling us what constituency you live in.

Mr. Racin: Hi. My name is Miguel Racin. I live in Calgary-Northern Hills, which is certainly one of the ones that is growing in population, and it's certainly above the average in the city. I just had a question. It's interesting that when you look at the map, you see that it's right in the middle of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, which encompasses it almost entirely. If you don't mind telling me: how much above the average is Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill compared to it? It's just an interesting sort of division there in terms of constituency engagement and all of that stuff. How will redistribution help the expanding population in that little square of Calgary-Northern Hills in a way that – do you see what I'm trying to say? Do you think it will be redrawn in a way that will make it more, you know, square beside square rather than that sort of division like that, which makes it . . .

The Chair: That hole in the middle of a doughnut, that shape?

Mr. Racin: Yes.

The Chair: Well, that's totally possible. Part of what we're doing here is looking at these northern constituencies to see how much they've all grown and to see how much above average each one of them is. We haven't made our mind up yet, but it's quite possible that we could end up recommending that the Calgary-Northern Hills constituency boundaries be shifted so that your population gets below the 28 per cent over figure. We have to do that because we can't let anything over 25 per cent sit. We have to take that population and join it with some other constituency. We have to reduce it to a degree. Whether we go right down to zero or to something closer to zero, I don't know, but we have to do

something. So that was the question I wanted to ask you. Looking at our task to reduce the size of Calgary-Northern Hills, does it make more sense if we lose a bit of the northern part or the southwest part or the eastern part?

Mr. Racin: As you can tell, the northern part of the constituency is where a lot of residential development is going to happen in the near future. I think if I were to make a suggestion, I would suggest that Calgary-Northern Hills lose its more southern part, joining it with whatever Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill will become, in a way that Calgary-Northern Hills would then encompass the northern growth and, in so doing, balance out the numbers but also prepare for the very possible increase in population as the city expands northward, if you know what I mean.

The Chair: Sure. So if we did that, if we were inclined to take your suggestion, in your view is the population of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill more or less the same in culture and interests and what have you as the population in Calgary-Northern Hills? Sometimes we think, "Oh, suburban people; they're all young; they all have a couple of kids; they all have, you know, big mortgages," but they're not necessarily all the same. In your view, though, in this situation are the culture and social interests of these two constituencies more or less the same?

Mr. Racin: I believe so. Certainly, the lower income areas around the Beddington area I think would fit more with the areas that now are part of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill. The middle to north part of Calgary-Northern Hills, Panorama Hills and Country Hills and all those neighbourhoods, are comparatively higher income, so the new communities that would be built north of it would have more in common with these higher income communities rather than the south ones.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to ask you the question that I've asked all of our students here who lived up in that area. One of the possibilities that is open to us is to move the boundaries so that the extra population in these four or five northern constituencies are all joined together to create a brand new constituency. We've been talking. This morning we had a former candidate for Calgary-McCall. I asked him this question, and he observed that that new constituency would be possible by taking part of Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill and part of Calgary-McCall and putting it – you know, you'd have to shift the boundaries a little bit everywhere else. Do you think that's the best place to put it, in the north, or would another location make more sense?

Mr. Racin: I would be inclined to agree with that just because the northeast of the city is – you know, they have more problems with crowding, more so than in my own constituency of Calgary-Northern Hills. I would even suggest that that would help them out given that there are certainly many complaints from the northeast that there are too many people being represented by the same MLA. Certainly, the sort of homogeneous culture that Calgary-McCall has would suggest that it should stay as a bigger constituency.

2:30

But the population growth – and you can correct me if I'm wrong – is much higher than in the central north part of the city. So it would be far more efficient to give them the benefit of a new constituency rather than our own in that part of the city, yes.

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

I'm going to ask my colleagues here whether anybody has any questions.

Mr. McLeod: I have one. You live in Calgary-Northern Hills. I'm just looking at the map. Is Country Hills Boulevard sort of a natural divide there, too? It kind of squiggles through there, and it goes across Nose Hill also. Would you consider that kind of a natural east-west dividing line?

Mr. Racin: I would say not. My supporting argument for that – correct me if I'm wrong – is that that's the federal division between Calgary Nose Hill and Calgary Skyview. I don't believe that it's a natural divide given the town centre and the strip mall that are right there in the divide, the Vivo and the Superstore and all these areas. They sort of prove to be the core of that community, where all the surrounding communities join and participate in all the various activities that are there in the Country Village Link area.

It's efficient when I go door-knocking during election time provincially to just cross the street and continue door-knocking in that same area given that it's sort of clumped together all around, as I'm telling you, the stores in the strip mall. Federally, you know, the divide I think cuts down the middle of a similar-looking area and community. So I wouldn't suggest that the Country Hills would be a natural divide. I think that Beddington, on the other side, as it is now, would be a more . . .

Mr. McLeod: Okay. But here let's go straight instead of using that kind of curve to Country Hills. It actually goes west into 112th Avenue, so that would be even more directly east-west. Would that be kind of a north-south divide, too? I know what you're talking about. That's how the Beddington Trail goes down, and that divides it, right?

Mr. Racin: Yes.

Mr. McLeod: When it starts heading south, actually, or southwest. So 112th would be more parallel then.

Mr. Racin: Yeah.

Mr. McLeod: I'm just asking because we always talk about the community of interest in each group. You talked about the community of interest in McCall, which is a little bit different than what's in your area. That's why I'm just trying to figure out: is there a community of interest that is different? Using some sort of line, give me an example of a line, and then help me out here. That's all I'm trying to think of.

Mr. Racin: Yeah. I know what you're trying to get at. It's complicated to crack down on a specific divide, as you're suggesting, given that aside from Centre Street, that becomes Harvest Hills, there is no divide that would compare in a way that would clear-cut, you know, a riding division.

If anything, if there would be a new constituency drawn in the northeast, as was suggested earlier, to compensate for the increased population growth in that area of the city, if that were the case, then I would suggest that that would be the divide that the commission should use to divide Northern Hills in such a way that despite Northern Hills being divided, I think it would compensate for northern growth as well as giving Northern Hills the ability to dispose of a bit of population while giving Mackay-Nose Hill some of the baggage in whatever the new constituency would be.

That's what my suggestion would be, that if there is, in fact, a drawing of a new constituency in the northeast, then Northern Hills should be divided entirely upon that line that I suggest, Centre Street that becomes Harvest Hills, given that it's a geographic divide even though it would not be a comfortable community divide.

Ms Munn: It's clear that Calgary-Northern Hills has to be divided somehow, some way. From what I've heard you say, you're saying that it would be better to divide it east and west along Centre Street as opposed to north and south along Country Hills.

Mr. Racin: Yes, because if the decision is to create a new constituency in the northeast, then you really would not be able to create two different constituencies there. You have Mackay-Nose Hill. If we divide north and south, then you would be making three constituencies because you would be adding a new constituency plus dividing the north and south.

Ms Munn: Okay. For example, if we look at Country Hills Boulevard, at the way it runs over there, and we look at the neighbourhoods of Country Hills and the neighbourhoods of Harvest Hills, they're on the south side of Country Hills Boulevard, right? So if they were hived off of Calgary-Northern Hills, that would bring the population down in a big way, but they would be in a different constituency. That's one way of looking at it. We worry about how it turns out the rest of the way later. Northern Hills has to get divided somewhere.

If you divide it right up Centre Street, you're going to be putting Panorama and – is it Coventry?

Mr. Racin: Coventry.

Ms Munn: On the one side, and on the other side you will have . . .

Mr. Racin: Panorama.

Ms Munn: So it's Panorama on the west side and Coventry on the east side. Those are two very different neighbourhoods. So it could make sense to run it east and west.

Mr. Racin: Yes. One more argument against that, if I may, is that if you look at the demographics of these neighbourhoods, they tend to align toward more centre-right ideological views compared to the northeast. We saw in federal politics how the divide that we're speaking of, Centre Street that becomes Harvest Hills, divides these two neighbourhoods which are similar ideologically. The eastern side is clumped with farther northeast constituencies, which vote more left.

What happened in the last federal election was that a liberal MP was elected in this area – right? – because of the large population on the northeastern side. Then the more centre-right neighbourhoods in that area were sort of pushed to form – do you get what I'm saying? That's where a lot of the complication is, because of community differences there. These two neighbourhoods on the eastern side, Coventry Hills and Country Hills, are now forced to abide by what some very different communities on the more eastern side are . . .

Ms Munn: Okay. If we put the voting patterns aside and we just talk about . . .

Mr. Racin: I'm sorry. I'm getting off-track. Yeah. Okay.

Ms Munn: That's okay. Let's put the voting patterns aside. If we talk about what it is that people do, where it is that they go, their community of interests. Now, I think maybe the last time around the Electoral Boundaries Commission said: Calgary-Northern Hills people are all very, very much alike, and they all belong together. I think that's lovely. The problem is that we can't have a constituency of 60,000 people. We just can't. We have to divide it some way. What I'm asking you, voting patterns aside: in terms of having those people adopt new places, be it either north or south or east or west,

given your knowledge of the communities, what do you think? Are we looking for a dividing line that's going to go north and south, maybe not Centre Street, maybe further over – I don't know – or east and west?

2:40

Mr. Racin: Well, if the commission is more interested in a more north-south divide, then I would even suggest the Beddington Trail divide.

Ms Munn: But that's where it ends right now.

Mr. Racin: Yes.

Ms Munn: We have to split it right in Northern Hills somehow.

Mr. Racin: Right, right. But then in combination with Mackay-Nose Hill I would even suggest mixing the two constituencies. That would sort of surpass my initial concern of, you know, the puzzle there and then give Calgary-Northern Hills more northern ground to make the new communities being built there part of a Calgary constituency. Then instead of that we would have a north constituency and a south constituency divided either at the Beddington Trail like it still is now but giving the area a bit more of a north versus south rather than that sort of shape and, in so doing, compensating for the increased population growth in the north.

Ms Munn: You know, what you know about Calgary-Northern Hills is really important to me. Do you mind if I come and show you this communities map?

Mr. Racin: Absolutely. I hope this is not too boring.

Ms Munn: Okay. So Calgary-Northern Hills: we have no idea how we're going to cut it, but we know that it has to change. Here's Panorama Hills. Here's our Centre Street, that turns into Harvest Hills – right? – and this is Beddington Trail. This is what the constituency sort of looks like right now. The question is: if we had to carve it up, then based on what these people have in common, do you think we should do a west and east sort of thing or a north and south? And we are considering that if the city is going to grow, it's going to grow that way.

Mr. Racin: That's right. Yes.

Ms Munn: So what do you think?

Mr. Racin: It's difficult to find a clear north-south division line, as we've seen from this drawing right here. Is it the plan of the commission to add a new riding additional to the north-south divide? Is that a fair question to ask?

Ms Munn: We don't know yet.

The Chair: But it's open to us, yes.

Ms Livingstone: The one thing we do know is that right now the Calgary-Northern Hills constituency is 28 per cent above the average size, and by law the maximum can be 25 per cent, so we know that we have to divide it somewhere. That's the struggle that we're in. It's going to have to be cut somewhere, so we're looking for your help as to where the natural cut line would be.

Mr. Racin: A point of clarification. The law says that two ridings can be above the 25 per cent. Which ones are those?

Ms Livingstone: None can be above 25 per cent.

The Chair: Two can be below. Four, in fact, could be 25 per cent below, up to a maximum of 50 per cent, but no riding in Calgary comes anywhere close to that.

Mr. Racin: Sorry. So it's Alberta, then, that two ridings can be above the 25 per cent threshold?

The Chair: Right, it's Alberta, and it's right up in the northeast area of the province, bordering on the Northwest Territories boundary there.

Ms Livingstone: No riding can be 25 per cent above. There's an allowance for up to four to be 25 per cent below, but not above.

Mr. Racin: Okay. Then I would suggest that your suggestion to make a north-south divide would be far better for the incoming communities and would give room for the possible creation of a third constituency, that would bring in a lot of the northeast despite the fact that the homogeneity of the communities won't be as defined, but it would certainly take into account the increased population up in the north. That would be my suggestion, then, to cut up Country Hills, which would be far better because a lot of these neighbourhoods in the north would start being a part of Chestermere-Rocky View. Is that correct? Are they right now?

Ms Munn: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Racin: Everything out of Stoney Trail is Mackay-Nose Hill. Are we correct?

Mrs. Day: In the city limits.

Ms Livingstone: We're not talking at this point about where the outside boundary of that may be, but we know we're going to have to draw a line through what is currently the Northern Hills constituency. We were really just wondering from you: whatever we do, where would the natural breaks in that current constituency be? We have no idea where the outside of any new lines will be.

Mr. Racin: I could live with that north-south divide, then, at Country Hills. I think that would be best. If we're going to have to cut it up anyways, as you say, then it would certainly be a lot better. As long as the shape of the constituency is built in a way that constituent engagement is a little bit more comfortable to access, which is less the case in – like, Neil Brown was the MLA in Mackay-Nose Hill, and it was complicated to reach all these different areas given the shape of it and all that stuff, right? Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much.

Any other comments?

Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Racin: Do you have a question?

The Chair: Oh, sorry, Gwen. Go ahead.

Mrs. Day: I haven't had too many questions today. I just was curious whether you are familiar with the Calgary-McCall area as well.

Mr. Racin: Less so, but I'm just trying to think . . .

Mrs. Day: It's another area of, like, plus 38, right? There was someone, that did an awful lot of work earlier, that made some suggestions and gave us a map of some of the changes he suggested to move things about to make it more within the correct numbers. I just was curious – I didn't think of asking him while he was here –

whether that divides up those communities too much, or those communities are similar, and they're fine being in Calgary-Cross and moved about somewhat on the bottom part. On the south part, I think, is where he made his suggestions. I was just curious if you really knew that area. If you don't, that's okay.

Mr. Racin: No. The only suggestion I would make is that, if I'm not too mistaken, McCall is even higher above the average than is Northern Hills . . .

Mrs. Day: That's right.

Mr. Racin: . . . by a couple of thousand people. There's also a lot of ethnic community sort of unity happening in McCall. Despite the fact that it is a higher population there, they are a more united community and more similar community in income and in culture. So I would suggest that the evidence used be percentage of growth more so than the size of the constituency. I think – I could be wrong – that maybe the area where I live has a much higher percentage growth of population than McCall. I could be wrong about that, but I seem to have read somewhere that that was the case. So it certainly would be better for the residents of my area to get a cut-up of the constituency, more so than McCall, given that despite the fact that they have more people, their percentage growth is smaller. I seem to have read that somewhere, but I could be wrong.

Mrs. Day: Perhaps. Mainly it's that both of them would have to be – something has to be done because the percentages are beyond our legal parameters, right? So we have to look at something, but we don't want to do something that's – you know, we just want to make good decisions, as well informed as we can. I mean, people are going to get another kick at this, right? We're going to make some decisions, and then they're going to be able to come back and see us in July and August – you're all invited back – and give us more input about how that's going to work. We've got to take a stab at it somehow, and the more information we gather in this process, the better we can make decisions starting next week.

Mr. Racin: Is it legally viable for the Alberta government to pass legislation that would increase the threshold from 87 constituencies?

The Chair: They could have, but they chose not to.

Mrs. Day: That would have been last year.

Mr. Racin: Okay. That was an interesting question that I had.
2:50

Mr. McLeod: I have one more question. You talk about percentage of population and all that. That's fine. Northern Hills: would you consider that constituency a mature one, that is not going to grow anymore? Is it going to stay about the same size if it stays within it's boundaries?

Mr. Racin: Well, as we can see from the map, it's pretty enclosed, and the Panorama community in the last four years has increased dramatically. There's tons of construction in that area, but I believe that any surge in any expansion of that area is limited now compared to other ridings. I think Mackay-Nose Hill would have a far greater potential for growth up north there.

Mr. McLeod: Yeah. The whole north part, north of Stoney Trail there, is developing like crazy.

Mr. Racin: Yeah.

Mr. McLeod: That's what I was wondering. Sometimes we look at some of these communities, and we know they're pretty static. They're not going to grow at all. So that makes it interesting, too, for us.

Okay. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Racin: I mean, just in the sense of changing the shape of the constituencies to make it more of a north block and south block, to make access easier – then the communities that are now Northern Hills would encompass the northern part of the city, which would have population growth in the future.

Mr. McLeod: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much.

Now, the clerk has been waving at me. Is there something you want to tell me? Oh, our next presenter is here, the next registered presenter. Would that be Jasbir Dari or Satnam Pannu? Oh, Wendy Fulton. Sorry. It's written in hand here. I missed that.

Mrs. Fulton, would you mind starting by telling us the constituency in which you reside?

Mrs. Fulton: I don't mind at all. I came back. I have some material for you.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much.

Mrs. Fulton: Thank you very much. My name is Wendy Fulton. I'm from Calgary-Fish Creek. I'm just going to read what I have so I don't forget anything.

I came to the hearing yesterday to observe, and I'm very glad that I did as I found it very interesting to hear the different suggestions from those who presented. I'd like to thank all of you for the job that you're doing in taking the time to consult with Albertans because I think it's very important.

I was part of a group of people from several ridings in south Calgary trying to determine how we could rectify the population explosion in Calgary-South East. We agreed that it's very important to keep rural and major city ridings separate and that municipal boundaries be respected, so we only looked inside the Calgary city limits. We were mindful of natural boundaries like rivers, CP Rail, main roadways, communities, and the population in each riding. We also tried to have distinct, easily recognizable boundaries.

Even though we didn't want to split communities, we did split one because of the main roadway boundary. Richmond, an older community, which was formed long before Crowchild Trail, straddles Crowchild Trail. It's approximately one-third in Calgary-Currie and two-thirds in Calgary-Elbow.

We used the April 1, 2016, city of Calgary census numbers, which totalled 1,235,171, as they were broken down by community, and we were able to move things and make more sense that way. Calgary's number is 4,049 lower than the recently released 2016 Stats Canada numbers.

As expected, a domino, ripple effect started when we changed boundaries. The below-average population numbers in Acadia, Fish Creek, and Hays were noted. We needed another riding or two in the far south to accommodate the population growth, so we eliminated Calgary-Acadia by moving communities to adjoining ridings. A portion of this riding is nonresidential.

Parts of Calgary-Fort are better suited in Calgary-Buffalo: the portion shown in inset 1 on the Buffalo map of Elections Alberta, which is the northeast corner of downtown and the communities of Ramsay and Inglewood. Travel patterns for these communities are more likely to downtown than to the east. These communities are quite eclectic and fit in with the revitalization in the downtown east

village. We then moved the west and south boundaries to the major roadways of Crowchild Trail and 17th Avenue. The Buffalo changes mean changes to Elbow and Currie, enabling the major roadways Sarcee Trail, Crowchild Trail, and Glenmore Trail and natural boundaries like CP Rail and the Bow River to become electoral boundaries for them.

Attached are sheets showing the proposed boundary changes and population by community for Buffalo, Currie, Elbow, Fish Creek, Hays, South East, Shaw, Lougheed, Glenmore, and two new ridings, Calgary-Macleod and Calgary-McLean. Calgary-Macleod we named Macleod because those communities all border Macleod Trail and McLean after Archibald McLean, one of the founders of the Calgary Stampede. Senator Patrick Burns and A.E. Cross were part of the group of Calgary Stampede founders as well.

I also have included a map showing the proposed boundaries outlined in green. The green sheets at the back that I included are the city of Calgary census numbers by community.

I also want to mention that we felt that constituency name changes confuse the public and are costly for the government and constituency associations. Therefore, we tried to keep the same names wherever possible.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. Just taking a quick look at these materials, I see a range in the size of the populations of your proposed constituencies, again, as you say, taken from the Calgary census, which is a little bit different than the figures we're using, from a low of 36,370, which would be about 22 per cent below the provincial average, up to – again, this is just at a quick glance – 53,599 people, which would be 17, 18 per cent above the provincial average.

Mrs. Fulton: I think the number on the sheet also says what percentage they are.

The Chair: Sorry. I haven't picked that up right now. My quick glance.

Mrs. Fulton: That's okay.

The Chair: In any event, there's quite a range there in your proposed redistribution of southeast Calgary. If we're to go along with the deviations from average, we have to give a reason for that. That's what the Alberta Court of Appeal said that we have to do, in 1994. What reasons would we give for this redistribution, which creates new ridings which are substantially below the provincial average and leaves some ridings substantially above?

Mrs. Fulton: I think the short answer is that the ones that are below have the potential for major growth whereas the ones that are above are pretty well stagnant, with very little, if any, growth expected.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

I'm going to turn to my colleagues and ask if they have any questions.

Ms Livingstone: I haven't had a chance to read through the whole written package, so the explanation may be in there. I'm looking at the map you've drawn, and I can see that there's a line that's going through the Calgary-Lougheed riding.

Mrs. Fulton: Right.

Ms Livingstone: I assume that's the new dividing line. Is that a major roadway, or what is that dividing line?

Mrs. Fulton: The horizontal line, you mean, sort of a third up?

Ms Livingstone: Yeah.

Mrs. Fulton: That's 162nd Avenue, and that's the southerly boundary for Calgary-Lougheed, whereas the rest, that skinny little strip in there, is actually part of Shaw.

Ms Livingstone: Okay. Thank you.

3:00

Mrs. Day: So the premise of your work on this portion of Calgary, not all of it, is to add a new riding in the south. Did you do any work on solving the issues in the north, the overpercentages in the north, at all? Did you look at those?

Mrs. Fulton: No. We didn't, but there was a group that was looking at that. The south is more my beaten path, if you will. I don't know the nuances of north Calgary. I believe there's another group of people that are looking at the north ridings.

Mrs. Day: Well, anyway, I commend you for putting volunteer time and thought in and for putting this much energy into presenting to us. It's really appreciated.

Mrs. Fulton: Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions?

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. I just noticed a couple of other lines, so before I let you go, I'm going to get you to tell me what those roadways were. What is the new northern boundary of what you're proposing for Calgary-Hays? What is that horizontal line?

Mrs. Fulton: The northern boundary is 114th Avenue.

Ms Munn: No, no. The northern boundary of Calgary-Hays.

Ms Livingstone: Oh, sorry. The new northern boundary of Calgary-Hays. It looks like it's running from the . . .

Mrs. Fulton: It's sort of long and skinny.

The Chair: On our map 114th would be the southern boundary of Calgary-Hays.

Mrs. Fulton: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you're right. Peigan Trail.

Ms Livingstone: Oh, thank you. That line is intersecting with one that's running kind of northeast to southwest just below 28th Avenue. I'm wondering what the more vertical line is there.

Mrs. Fulton: Are we still looking at Calgary-Hays?

Ms Livingstone: Yeah, intersecting with Peigan.

The Chair: West.

Ms Livingstone: Is that Deerfoot?

Mrs. Fulton: Yes.

Ms Livingstone: Okay.

Mrs. Fulton: Part of it is the river. Deerfoot runs along the river there.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. I thought that's what it was, but I just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions?

Okay. Thank you so much.

Mrs. Fulton: You're welcome.

The Chair: You were very helpful. Thank you.

Mrs. Fulton: Thank you again very much for the work you're doing and the time you're putting in.

The Chair: Thank you for your work and all done since yesterday from the looks of things.

Mrs. Fulton: Well, most of it was done before. I just had to fine-tune. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

All right. We've kind of had a lot of to-and-fro here this afternoon. I'm not sure where we are on our registered presenters list, but is there anyone else who's here who would like to come forward and tell us what constituency they reside in and make any observations they'd like to make?

Now, I'm looking at the lady who has been here all afternoon very patiently and hasn't said a thing. I'm assuming that you must be here because you're interested in this topic. Would you mind coming forward and telling us what constituency you live in? Yes, indeed, ma'am.

Ms Savill: Hi. My name is Paulette Savill. I live in Marlborough. I'm not sure what constituency that is now.

The Chair: Perhaps one of our people who are looking at the neighbourhood map can . . .

Unidentified Speaker: Calgary-East.

Ms Savill: Yeah. I think it is Calgary-East.

The Chair: All right. Looking at our constituency maps here, Calgary-East is six per cent above the average. Now, that's pretty close to the average, but if for some reason we thought we should recommend moving a boundary to reduce the size of Calgary-East maybe because we want to move some of the population from Calgary-McCall south – just a possibility – or for any other reason, do you think that we should move the boundaries south, east, north, or west?

Ms Savill: South or east, I would think, because west you're running into Deerfoot, and that is a big difference, a big change. To the north of 16th Avenue: a very different culture and neighbourhoods north of that.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

Calgary-Greenway: that looks like it's a new constituency, to my eyes, a new growth area in Calgary. Is the eastern part of Calgary-East somewhat similar to Calgary-Greenway?

Ms Savill: I'm sorry. I don't know that.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

All right. I'm going to invite my colleagues to ask you any questions if they'd like. Anyone?

Now, if you don't mind my asking, what brought you to attend our hearing this afternoon?

Ms Savill: Pure curiosity. I was wondering, when I saw this in the paper that you were having this review, as to the mechanism for

ensuring that there's equal representation in constituencies. For me, particularly, rural versus urban: how do we address that? How do we make sure that our urban vote is matched by a rural vote? I was wondering that a majority population of young people seem to be in urban centres and how to make sure that their voting opportunities are captured. Basically, it's just curiosity about how this whole process works. It's been fascinating.

The Chair: I hope we've answered some of your questions. It's not mechanical, but there is a kind of mechanics to it because we have arithmetic limits, obviously, that you've heard about, that we have to operate within. But I think part of the overall mechanism designed by the Legislature, when the province was founded, was to do these periodic reviews because Alberta has always been a recipient of immigration from other places in the world and from eastern Canada. We've constantly been growing over the past 110-plus years, so every eight to 10 years there's one of these reviews. We try to rejig everything so that we're closer to the provincial average, but that does make a change over time, for sure.

Ms Savill: Well, I may be at the next one.

The Chair: Great. Well, I hope so. I'm not sure that I'll be around. Thank you very much, ma'am.

Ms Savill: Thank you.

The Chair: Is there anyone else here who would like to say anything? We have another 25 minutes before our last registered speaker for the afternoon. I don't want to foreclose him. He's expecting to come at 3:30, so he probably organized his day so that he'd be here.

Sir, would you like to talk about your constituency a bit?

Mr. Domay: Ray Domay*, Calgary-Greenway. You asked about Calgary-Greenway. It is a weird constituency. It's long and thin, and the demographics at the top end of it, the north end, are totally different than the demographics at the south end of it. So, I mean, if something needs fixing, this is probably it. It looks like it was gerrymandered, or it was just a leftover, and that's how it came into being.

The Chair: Well, we don't like to talk about gerrymandering, but there is a possibility it's a leftover because it's right at the edge of the city.

Ms Munn: When you talk about the north and the south, what's the dividing line, in your mind?

Mr. Domay: Probably 16th Avenue or even a little bit north of 16th Avenue. South of 16th Avenue is probably lower middle class. There's a lot of social housing in there. The further north you get, there are different cultures.

The Chair: When you say different cultures, are you talking about different ethnicities?

Mr. Domay: Different ethnicities, and not just one different ethnicity. There are a number of neighbourhoods there where they have cultural differences.

Ms Munn: Multicultural.

Mr. Domay: Yeah. It's very multicultural.

The Chair: We've heard that Calgary-McCall is also very multicultural. It's immediately to the north of you. Would you agree

*This spelling could not be verified at the time of publication.

with that, that there is a similarity between the northern part of Calgary-Greenway and Calgary-McCall?

Mr. Domay: Yeah, totally. The person who ran for the New Democrats was from Calgary-McCall. The person who ran for the Liberals, I believe, was from Calgary-McCall. They had their connections, their community supporting them.

Mrs. Day: Hi. Thanks for coming today. I guess my question was: if we were to make adjustments, then, to Calgary-Greenway, you're suggestion is that kind of the dividing line north and south would be 16th Avenue?

Mr. Domay: Sixteenth Avenue is a natural dividing line. I mean, there's a big shopping centre in there that sort of divides the communities.

Mrs. Day: Would you say that the south part of Calgary-Greenway would have affinity fitting in with – I mean, Calgary-East is already over, but just saying that this . . .

3:10

Mr. Domay: Calgary-East and the south end of Calgary-Greenway are more alike than the south end of Greenway and the north end, and the north end of Greenway is more like Calgary-McCall. Even Forest Lawn is more like the south end of Calgary-Greenway.

Mrs. Day: Okay. Yeah. Then, I guess, along which I think on this map I'm looking at is the new Stoney Trail, in the north part of Calgary-Greenway, looking at the long, skinny piece, is there still build-out happening there, or is that pretty filled in?

Mr. Domay: There's talk of it.

Mrs. Day: I'm seeing white space, but I don't know if that's parkways or they're going to fill that in more.

Mr. Domay: Well, East Hills is at 17th Avenue and 84 Street. That's a big commercial – it's Walmart, Costco, a number of big – and I expect that there will be residential around there, okay? Now, whether that residential goes into Calgary-Greenway or goes into Chestermere-Rocky View or whatever that next constituency is . . .

Mrs. Day: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: And what about Calgary-Fort? The southern part of Calgary-Greenway would also be similar to Calgary-Fort in terms of the cultural composition.

Mr. Domay: Well, parts of Calgary-Fort because Fort is another one that's got a real difference from one end of the constituency to the other, east and west, though. It's not north and south so much.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. McLeod: If I may, directly south of 17th Avenue South in Calgary-Greenway by Stoney Trail there's a lot of blank area in there.

Mr. Domay: They don't vote.

Mr. McLeod: No. Blank areas don't vote.

Mr. Domay: No. It's the garbage dump.

Mr. McLeod: Part of it's the garbage dump. Part of it's also the sewage lagoon.

Mr. Domay: The industrial area. Yeah. There's a big section there set apart for industrial south of East Hills.

Mr. McLeod: Okay. That's what I was wondering exactly because I haven't lived here in a long time, but I do know where the dump is.

Mr. Domay: Well, it's growing.

Mr. McLeod: Oh, yeah. Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Anything else?

Okay. Thanks so much for coming along.

We'll take a break now until 3:30, and we'll wait for our last presenter.

[The hearing adjourned from 3:13 p.m. to 3:37 p.m.]

The Chair: We're shutting down the hearing now. Our last registered speaker hasn't appeared. We're five minutes past our time, so we're going to adjourn, and we'll resume tomorrow in Edson.

Thank you.

[The hearing adjourned at 3:37 p.m.]

