



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Edmonton

Tuesday, April 20, 2010
8:56 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-13

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

Dr. Keith Archer

Peter Dobbie, QC

Brian Evans, QC

Allyson Jeffs

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Chief Electoral Officer

Brian Fjeldheim

Deputy Chief Electoral Officer

Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

Nathan Black

Neil Brown, MLA, Calgary-Nose Hill

David Coutts

Ray Danyluk, MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul

John Dodds

Doug Elniski, MLA, Edmonton-Calder

Gary Racich, President, Glenwood Community League

Muriel Stanleyvenne

Support Staff

Clerk

W.J. David McNeil

Clerk Assistant

and Director of House Services

Louise J. Kamuchik

Senior Parliamentary Counsel

Robert H. Reynolds, QC

Shannon Dean

Administrator

Karen Sawchuk

Communications Consultant

Melanie Friesacher

Consultant

Tom Forgrave

Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Liz Sim

8:56 a.m.

Tuesday, April 20, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. My name is Ernie Walter, and I'm the chair of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce you to the other members of the commission: Dr. Keith Archer of Banff on my far right, next to him Peter Dobbie of Vegreville, then to my left Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton, and next to her Brian Evans of Calgary.

As you're aware, the five of us have spent the last seven months reviewing the electoral boundaries of our province, and I can tell you we've examined every square inch. I know I speak for all of us when I say the commission has found it both very interesting and challenging to weigh the concerns and relevant factors put before it during the preparation of the interim report. I'd like to note also that we're very pleased with the large amount of public feedback received. We have received and read almost 500 written submissions, and we're looking forward to additional feedback during this hearing and the further hearings we will be holding. Once we have considered the feedback, the commission will issue its final report by July of this year.

With that, I'm pleased to touch on a few of our findings and recommendations setting out the areas, boundaries, and names of the 87 electoral divisions we propose for Alberta together with the reasons for the proposals as outlined in the report. I can tell you that the foundation of our decisions has been effective representation for all Albertans. In undertaking the work, the commission has been guided by the requirements of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, relevant decisions of our courts, advice received at the first round of public hearings and in written submissions as well as the latest census information available to us.

When I speak of census information, the 2009 municipal census data for Alberta's cities shows there has been a consistent pattern of growth since the 2001 census. Fifty-two per cent of Albertans currently reside in Edmonton and Calgary. Using the 2009 official census list, the total population being considered by the commission is 3,556,583 people. Given this pattern of growth this means the quotient, or provincial average population, has grown by 10,100 since the 1995-1996 commission and is now at 40,880. So, essentially, the act directs the commission to divide the province into 87 electoral divisions with a population within 25 per cent of the provincial average in a way that will effect and ensure effective representation for all Albertans.

Taking into account available population information and factors affecting effective representation, the majority of the commission concluded that the redistribution of the 87 divisions should allow for the following increases: Calgary by two additional divisions, bringing it to 25; Edmonton by one, bringing it to 19; and the rest of Alberta by one, providing it with 43 divisions. This would ensure effective representation across the province.

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

In our efforts to respect the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the primary principles and factors which have guided the commission's recommendations are:

Population. The commission has attempted to limit the variations in the average population per division. The average population per

electoral division from the quotient is plus 4.3 per cent in Calgary, plus 0.7 per cent in Edmonton, and minus 2.8 per cent in the rest of Alberta.

Scarcity of population. The commission recognizes the scarcity of population in the two proposed special divisions of Dunvegan-Central Peace and Lesser Slave Lake. Dunvegan-Central Peace meets all five of the criteria for a special division, and Lesser Slave Lake meets four of the five criteria.

Community interests. The commission has taken into consideration community interests of which it is aware.

Community boundaries. The commission has attempted, as requested by the municipalities, to respect community boundaries in Calgary, Edmonton, and other areas.

Municipal boundaries. The commission has made every attempt to respect municipal boundaries. This has not been possible in all cases, but the commission has attempted to reduce the fragmentation of municipal boundaries resulting from the existing divisions.

Geographical features. The commission has considered geographical features, including roads, which provide natural barriers between communities of interest.

Understandable and clear boundaries. The commission has attempted to recommend boundaries which are clear and easy to understand for the residents in the areas. In addition, the commission is using digital mapping technology to describe the boundaries rather than the extensive written legal descriptions previously used.

Distance and area. This is primarily an issue in the rest of Alberta. In recommending those boundaries, the commission has considered the area of the proposed electoral divisions and the travel distances involved both within the division and between the division and the Legislature. In addition, MLAs have to maintain relations with more than one school board, more than one municipal council, and several community and business organizations.

Inner-city urban issues. The commission acknowledges the submissions stressing that inner-city urban ridings generally have their own challenges such as a large number of linguistic and cultural communities, a disproportionate number of people dependent on social programs, increasing numbers of new immigrants and our aboriginal people, and other urban issues.

Other Calgary and Edmonton issues. The commission acknowledges that there will only be one council and one school authority; however, maintaining relationships with a number of community leagues or associations, business revitalization zones, and other identifiable organizations places demands on the time of a city MLA.

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

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

Now we're ready to proceed. For the record if you would give your name for *Hansard* to record.

9:05

Mr. Elniski: Thank you. My name is Doug Elniski. I'm the MLA for the Edmonton-Calder constituency.

The Chair: Thank you. Please proceed.

Doug Elniski, MLA
Edmonton-Calder

Mr. Elniski: Okay. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As I just indicated a brief second ago, I'm Doug Elniski, the MLA for Edmonton-Calder, and I'm very pleased to be here today. I did not attend the first round of discussions and presentations because my own expectation with respect to what would happen to the boundaries of Edmonton-Calder were in fact realized. In past boundaries reviews the constituency has continued to move and, shall we say, creep to the north. Originally, at one point in time, it extended as far south as 111th Avenue and included the Inglewood community, which was lost in the last redistribution.

So to come to a constituency that begins at the Yellowhead Trail and extends north to the city limits west of 127th Street comes as no surprise. I would in fact applaud you for your decision with respect to what the new boundaries look like. Indeed, I really, to be honest with you, don't have a great deal of issue with the way the boundaries are distributed.

My real issue, ladies and gentlemen, is in fact with the change of the name. There was at one time in history a northwest Edmonton constituency when the hon. Tom Chambers was the MLA for the area. At that point in time there was nothing north of 137th Avenue. It was pretty much all just farmland.

The constituency name Edmonton-Calder – and I've provided you with some written information with respect to the history and the background of the name – speaks well and strongly to the single largest geographic entity within the constituency, which, of course, is the CNR Walker yards and the Calder neighbourhood. All of the traffic in the constituency is affected by the presence of the CNR. It's now the southern demarc in the constituency, and everyone coming from the north part of the constituency deals with the CNR and deals, in fact, with the Calder yards.

The young people who attend school in the northwest iteration, in the Oxford and Skyview districts, which are to the west of 127th Street, actually attend school in Calder because the Skyview school hasn't been constructed yet. The constituency name itself extends back a number of years, and what you've really done with your new demarcations is you've actually – oh, yeah. Okay. There we are: Oxford, Skyview. Those kids go to school over here. Now, there's a school being built in Skyview that's going to take the burden off the kids at this end, but these kids in this particular area are going to continue to come down into the bottom end of the Calder constituency. We have Calder down here, and then Kensington, the neighbourhood where I live, is the neighbourhood immediately to the north.

You've actually created a more compact constituency than the one that we had before, and you've placed – everyone who is in the constituency now deals directly, in fact, with the CN and deals with it with respect to Calder. It may be a small point, but frankly, ladies and gentlemen, for me it's a significant pride issue for us as well. I'm born and raised in this community, and it's always been Edmonton-Calder. I really do feel very strongly that there's no compelling argument with respect to making the change.

To just talk briefly about some alternatives for you with regard to demarcation. The Hon. Thomas Lukaszuk, who is the MLA for Edmonton-Castle Downs, and I had expressed some concern about the loss of this particular area here – that's the Caernarvon neighbourhood – because that is in fact very much a demarcated point and well recognized as being within the traditional Castle Downs neighbourhood.

You have a couple of options here with respect to population balancing. One is to go back over to the Griesbach neighbourhood.

Typically, Griesbach developed quite separately and quite a long time before Castle Downs did. Griesbach was the old military PMQs for CFB Edmonton, and it's subsequently been redeveloped by Canada Lands into, actually, a rather remarkable sort of inner-city, urban community. But it doesn't have the same association and connection to Edmonton-Castle Downs in terms of community supports and those types of issues as do the folks over in Caernarvon. So my suggestion to you would be at the very least to extend the demarcation west along 137 Avenue to 127 Street and north and retain Castle Downs for the Hon. Thomas Lukaszuk as his full entity.

If you need to adjust for population, you have two options. One is to put the Griesbach community back into the Edmonton-Calder constituency or, alternatively, to follow the federal demarc and at this end of the constituency extend the boundary along the Yellowhead Trail to the Edmonton west city limit. That picks up a little bit of population out in here that is primarily acreage dwellers and those types of things. There is a little bit of development out there but not very much. I wouldn't at any point in time suggest you reallocate the constituency south of the Yellowhead Trail because the Yellowhead is really, in everyone's mind, the big southern block. It's a very, very significant block.

For people that live in the constituency, particularly at this end of the constituency, which is largely senior citizens, 137th Avenue is a very significant mental roadblock as well. People typically don't walk across 137th Avenue because it's just too wide and it's too dangerous, so they stay pretty much in their own areas. However, if you adjust the boundary and use 127th Street as the main north-south thoroughfare, we do capture everybody up in this area, we capture everybody in here, we turn these folks back over to Thomas, and then, like I say, it gives you two spots here to kind of balance out what you want to do for population. Again, it's Griesbach or the properties out in the west end.

Once again, my main concern, my main issue, ladies and gentlemen, and the thing that I would really ask for your serious consideration on is less with respect to the demarcation of boundaries – I'm actually quite fine with what you've done with regard to the boundaries here – but it is really with the name. We've gone to a lot of trouble in the Edmonton-Calder constituency to brand our constituency and to make everyone aware. Our slogan is It's All in Calder. We do that because based on the existing boundaries of the constituency, planes, trains, and automobiles all form a significant part of the constituency, as does the presence of 66 per cent of the industrial land in Edmonton.

I often tell stories in meetings about the fact that every perogy that comes to Edmonton comes from my constituency, as do all the potatoes, as does all the milk. The largest private landfill site in the city is in fact in the Edmonton-Calder constituency, and most people have no idea that it's even there. So we're very, very fiercely proud of the name. I believe that it serves a purpose. It serves the purposes of identification both for of course myself as the MLA as well as the people who live within the constituency because it shows and shares some pride.

The new parts that we pick up in terms of this territory up here are in fact closer to the Calder yards than most of the property that we left. When we had the land to the south of the Yellowhead Trail here down by the airport and down to 111th Avenue, we actually moved considerably further away. Those people had very, very little relevant attachment to the constituency. If you lived in Westview Village, which on this map would be actually way down here, considerably south of the Yellowhead Trail and to the extreme west end of the city, those people in Winterburn really had no connection with the constituency name at all. So I would suggest that we're

probably more relevant today with regard to the population than we were even in those days.

With that, I would be more than – I don't really have a whole lot more to say about it. I think I've kind of made my point, and I'm not sure that there's much more that I need to say. If you have any questions, please.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks, Mr. Elniski. That's really helpful. I'm trying to think back to our discussion in the commission at that time at which the name change was proposed. I know generally what took place in our discussions is that when we changed a name, it was because a community that was associated with that name within a constituency was no longer in the constituency. If I understand you correctly, are you saying that all of what was generally regarded as the historical Calder area remains within the Edmonton-North West constituency?

Mr. Elniski: Yeah. It's right there. It actually goes from 113A Street to 127 Street and incorporates the yard. This is the neighbourhood that's actually referred to as Calder. The district itself in this whole area is Calder, largely. But the Calder name refers more to the railroad yards than it actually does to the neighbourhood. The railroad, of course, extends all the way through.

Dr. Archer: Right. Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Elniski: But, no, you didn't take anything related actually directly to Calder out at all.

9:15

Dr. Archer: Thanks. The only other question I have has to do with the possible switch between Griesbach and Caernarvon, with Edmonton-North West and Edmonton-Castle Downs. It seems to me that the disadvantage of going that route is that we would end up with a constituency boundary on the west end for Edmonton-Castle Downs that seems to go around, up and down, and around communities, and it would have a very odd look to it.

Mr. Elniski: It would, yes.

Dr. Archer: Is there a compelling reason for us to do that notwithstanding that oddity?

Mr. Elniski: Well, the main reason, Dr. Archer, has to do with the fact that the Edmonton-Castle Downs community associations, the leagues within Edmonton-Castle Downs, are very, very strong and very, very well organized. They see themselves as part of the greater Edmonton-Castle Downs community, less so, for example, in the people in Griesbach.

Development in Griesbach really began on 97th Street and 137th Avenue, in the southeast corner down here, and has grown this way. The map is sort of indicative of it. There's a great big piece of land within here where there's no development. These people's association in Griesbach is less with Edmonton-Castle Downs than, certainly, these folks in Caernarvon is. These people are very, very clearly Edmonton-Castle Downs residents.

It does give Thomas's constituency a little bit of a different look, but then as well, if you get to the top of his constituency – you have him on the east side of 97th Street. That's another issue that they had – I think it's covered off in one of the proposals – to cut him back and put him back on the west side of 97th Street.

Edmonton-Castle Downs is much like other communities. It was all developed at roughly the same point in time, and those people

have a tremendously strong affinity with each other. I would if at all possible attempt to keep that whole. You would be better in terms of population numbers to consider, again, following the federal constituency boundary demarc and heading out to the west end at this end of it. Take a little bit of that out of La Perle, and then leave this within Edmonton-Calder.

Dr. Archer: Great. Thanks very much. That's all I have.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Mr. Elniski, for the presentation and pronouncing the name of that neighbourhood. I've looked at the way it's spelled, and I had no idea how to pronounce it.

Mr. Elniski: Which one is that? Caernarvon?

Mr. Dobbie: Yes.

According to my calculations, according to the information we have, that neighbourhood has 4,347 people in it. If we remove it from the existing proposed constituency, which we should rename Edmonton-Calder – I agree – it takes Edmonton-Calder's population to 38,886, not counting anybody we might be able to capture or liberate in the very west side, which puts it 4.8 per cent under the provincial quotient. My question is about the likely development in the northern part of that constituency.

Mr. Elniski: Okay. Well, this map is actually a little bit old. Right now 167th Avenue, which is up here – there's no residential development up in this area. There's a little bit at the very top. It's all acreage-type development. The new remand centre exists up over on this side, right up in here. This will be, I think, very soon built out all the way to 142nd Street. Then this particular area here, where St. Albert Trail is – and, again, we don't have a really good view here of the route to the Anthony Henday – that area will ultimately be all built out. The Dunvegan yard, which is the second CN Rail yard, over here – and that track heads north. Then, of course, you have the next one, which is the spur to St. Albert over here. That area, that portion, is not industrial land. That's actually intended as residential land, but it's going to be a ways off. That's where the soccer centre is right now, and the Shriners have a big hall in there, a couple of other places like that. It's going to be a long time before it actually gets developed. This stuff is building out, actually, quite nicely in here, in Skyview. I think Oxford is fully built out now.

Mr. Dobbie: My follow-up question is about Edmonton-Castle Downs. If we simply add the neighbourhood and add 4,347 people to Edmonton-Castle Downs, it takes it to 42,795, which is about 4.7 per cent above the average. Is Edmonton-Castle Downs, if it's the rectangle, even if we leave the northeast portion, fairly fully built? It's not likely to grow as much?

Mr. Elniski: No, it's not going to grow as much. Thomas has got a little bit of room up at the top here, but, see, the Henday is coming in there, and development, at least in this area along 97th Street, has really gone about as far north as it can go now. He's got a little bit of room up on this side north of the remand centre, but again that's acreage-ish, and I say "ish" because I don't know of any real new subdivisions that are up in that area.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. What your proposal essentially is is that it will switch the two constituencies.

Mr. Elniski: Yeah, basically.

Mr. Dobbie: They'll be 5 per cent over; you'll be 5 per cent under.

Mr. Elniski: Yeah. I just offer that to you if there is some way for you to draw those two numbers closer together. It is really very important. I have to go on record as supporting Thomas completely on this one because Castle Downs is a very vibrant, very, very close, tight-knit community. Those folks will have an expectation that, in fact, they would share amongst all the community associations a single MLA. The Oxford folks and Skyview over here, because they're on the other side of 127th Street, have got kind of a natural demarc. They don't have that same feeling. Griesbach also doesn't have that same feeling because, really, Griesbach was there first, and Castle Downs sort of grew up around the periphery of Griesbach.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. Those are my questions.

Mr. Elniski: Wonderful.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Elniski, for coming this morning. I'm just going to follow up a little bit on what Peter Dobbie was talking about. You spoke about the areas that will build out and that it's a ways off. Do you know how far off we are talking, bearing in mind that the next commission will be 10 years or so, so eight to 10 years?

Mr. Elniski: I would honestly expect that given the rates of development in the city of Edmonton, between now and then we would be fully built up. I believe that the only area in there that you'll find there are not plans for is this particular little triangle here. Again, the Anthony Henday cuts off a chunk of that, and there are a couple of other bits of demarc in there. I'm not really sure where they are, so I don't know how much is left over in here. In this area, once you get north of 167th Avenue, which is up here, they accurately describe a little lake there, which is probably a little bigger than that, actually. That will be the last area to get developed, and I don't know how long that will ever take. When you get a little bit north of there, you run immediately into acreages.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. So in the next 10 years this portion . . .

Mr. Elniski: Oh, yeah. Within the next 10 years I would expect the whole thing built out.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Thank you.

You made reference to that little pie-shaped piece of La Perle down there on the south edge. Are we dealing with much population in there? I would imagine not.

Mr. Elniski: Not really, no. The big population centre in that end of my constituency today is actually Westview Village, which is way down here, way south of the Yellowhead Trail. That's a mobile home community. It's basically Winterburn Road and Stony Plain Road. It's the very extreme southwest corner of my constituency. That, I believe, has already been rolled into Edmonton-La Perle. When you get north of the Yellowhead Trail, there are some acreages and a couple of small, little subdivisions, but I'm guessing the total population of all those polls is maybe 500, 600 people. It's heavily industrial land.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much for your presentation. It's very clear. I'm having trouble visualizing what it will do for us the rest of the way across the north, but you've made a nice sort of clear, understandable presentation. I appreciate that. We'll take it into consideration.

Mr. Elniski: Wonderful. Thank you.

Ms Jeffs: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks very much, Mr. Elniski. I'll be very brief. First of all, I agree with you on the name Edmonton-Calder. I agree with you about the southern boundary with Yellowhead Trail. It makes a lot of sense.

Your presentation talks about your current population at 36,790. Is that with the 2009 municipal data from the city of Edmonton?

Mr. Elniski: You know, I do not want to be held to that number. I don't believe so. I'm not sure where that number came from.

Mr. Evans: Right. Either way, if we take Caernarvon out, put it back into Edmonton-Castle Downs, regardless of what we do with Griesbach, which really is quite unique – I mean, I grew up in pretty much that area, a little south of the Yellowhead. I know Griesbach very well, and that was one of my Trudeau's dry cleaning routes as a summer job.

Mr. Elniski: My dad worked for Trudeau's.

Mr. Evans: Oh, really? We'll have to talk after.

Mr. Elniski: We'll talk after.

Mr. Evans: That area has developed independent of Edmonton-Decore or Edmonton-Castle Downs or anything to the south or the west. It seems to me that you do have some opportunity for growth. You've said that yourself. My inclination is that we leave Griesbach where it is and just move Caernarvon over. As far as you are concerned with the conversations you've had with Mr. Lukaszuk, that wouldn't cause any difficulties for him whatsoever?

9:25

Mr. Elniski: Oh, no. Thomas would be fine with that. I don't really have much to do with the Edmonton-Castle Downs communities. I'm reasonably well known there, but he is actually quite well known in Griesbach as well. It would be no issue whatsoever whether he represents them or I represent them or whichever constituency it's deemed to be part of. Ultimately, that wouldn't be a real issue. The bigger area over there, which is the issue, of course, is the Caernarvon community. That's really the one that does need to be attached to Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Well, those are all my comments and questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Elniski: Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, sir. We'll certainly take into account all of your comments, and we'll use it in our final report.

Mr. Elniski: Wonderful. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to have been here today.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Dr. Neil Brown, MLA for Calgary-Nose Hill.

Dr. Brown: Good morning.

The Chair: Good morning. Since we are being recorded by *Hansard*, we'd ask that for the record you give your name.

Dr. Brown: Yes. I'm Neil Brown. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Nose Hill.

Mr. Chairman, I do have a written proposal. I was actually advised that I didn't have the opportunity to do a PowerPoint. I see you have the technology here; I could have done it on the screen.

The Chair: Well, you can access the PowerPoint as you go through.

Dr. Brown: Right. Anyway, we do have it in printed form just for your benefit to follow along in my presentation.

**Neil Brown, MLA
Calgary-Nose Hill**

Dr. Brown: I will be fairly brief because I have given you a fairly extensive written submission regarding the proposal that I'm about to make. First of all, let me say that the presentation that I am making and the written brief that I have previously filed with the commission are made with the consent and the agreement of all the affected communities. Those would be the Sandstone MacEwan Community Association, the Beddington Heights Community Association, the Huntington Hills Community Association, and the Northern Hills Community Association, which contains Coventry Hills.

My purpose in being here today is to argue for some changes with respect to the interim report: first of all, with respect to the name of the constituency; secondly, to argue that of those three constituencies which are affected – Calgary-Country Hills, Calgary-Mackay, and Calgary-Foothills – there may be a possibility to make a swap, which would make more sense in terms of geography and in transportation and in keeping the communities intact.

First of all, with respect to the name change it's my respectful submission that the interim report name, which is proposed as Calgary-Country Hills, would be inappropriate because it contains the words "Country Hills," and Country Hills community is not one of the communities that's proposed to be included in the new electoral district. My preference would be to keep the name Calgary-Nose Hill, not for selfish reasons but because two-thirds of the riding, the Huntington Hills and Beddington Heights communities, both belong in the Calgary-Nose Hill constituency presently, and they would continue to have the same name. The alternative proposal that I put before you would be to rename the constituency Calgary-Nose Creek for the geographic feature that goes along the eastern side of the constituency. That's along here.

Page 4 of my written documentation shows the existing electoral district of Calgary-Nose Hill, containing Thorncliffe, Huntington Hills, and Beddington. The proposal of the commission is that Thorncliffe would be added to the Calgary-North Hill constituency below. I understand the reasons for that, and really I can't object to the fact that that community would be moved.

According to the interim report, the considerations which we are to direct our minds to, shown on page 5, are the population, of

course, the existing community boundaries and interests, geographical features, existing road systems, and the desirability for understandable and clean boundaries. On page 6 I have listed the arguments that I believe would justify some changes to this.

I would point you to the large map that I have given you, which was also part of my written brief. If you look at Nose Hill park, towards the top of Nose Hill park there you'll see the two communities of MacEwan Glen and Sandstone Valley. You have proposed in the original interim report that MacEwan Glen would be part of Calgary-Foothills and that Sandstone Valley would be part of the Calgary-Mackay riding. They, however, are constituted in a single community association. They share the community centre, they share all of their recreational facilities, and they also share a lot of the sports programs, particularly soccer and hockey, which are the ones that I'm aware of. So the proposal would be that both of those communities, Sandstone and MacEwan, which are in one community association, would become part of the Calgary-Country Hills riding, as you have called it.

In return for that I proposed, with the concurrence of all of those communities that are affected, that the Coventry Hills, what you see in the upper right corner there with the little red line around it, would continue to be part of the Calgary-Mackay riding. You see in the upper right corner there Coventry Hills. There's Country Hills Village, which is mainly a commercial district and a shopping area.

Now, if you look at the bottom part of the Calgary-Mackay riding, I'd like to point out to you that Beddington Trail, which is the dividing line there, is a major artery. Although the map would seem to indicate that access could be had off Centre Street, which is right in the middle of the existing Calgary-Nose Hill, going north, there is no access across Centre Street because there is a bus trap there. It's deliberately blocked off so that there's no access to the Northern Hills community directly from Beddington Heights. In the original written submission I had given you the Google maps showing the various routes that one would have to take to get from Beddington up into the Coventry Hills, and it does involve quite a bit of manoeuvring and driving and a considerable amount of time to get there.

The other point. As I mentioned, Coventry Hills presently is part of the Northern Hills Community Association. The developer, Cardel, which developed all four of those Northern Hills communities, also built a community centre called Cardel Place. Cardel Place is the focal point for all four of those communities in that particular area, therefore, I think, an additional argument that it should all be retained within the Calgary-Mackay riding.

Just to summarize, on page 7 the proposal that I am making, with the concurrence of each and every one of those community associations that are affected there, would be to retain the Coventry Hills community within Calgary-Mackay, remove it from the Calgary-Country Hills electoral district, add MacEwan Glen and Sandstone to Calgary-Nose Hill, or Calgary-Country Hills as you called it, and retain Nose Hill park, which does not have any residents.

9:35

For the Calgary-Mackay district that would involve the retention, the status quo, of Coventry Hills and the loss of the Sandstone community under your proposal and retaining Hidden Valley. About two-thirds or three-quarters of it is presently in Calgary-Foothills, so you would retain Hidden Valley in the Calgary-Foothills district. Then, of course, MacEwan Glen, which under your interim proposal is to be in Calgary-Foothills, that again is part of the proposed Calgary-Country Hills, the new proposal for the boundary.

Now, the implications in terms of population I've laid out on page 8. With the proposed changes there are some implications. Calgary-

Country Hills would now be approximately 9 per cent below the mean for those particular population numbers. However, in some justification of that I put in on page 9 some of the statistics, which are, I think, quite impressive.

Our constituency office is a very busy office. We have a very high needs community. As you'll see, Huntington Hills is first out of 186 communities in a number of social criteria. We have the highest number, out of 186 communities in the city of Calgary, of single-parent families. We are number 1 out of 186 communities for the number of persons with disabilities. We are number 1 out of 186 communities for the number of seniors receiving government support. We are second in 186 communities for the number of unemployed persons over 25. That puts us second, according to the city of Calgary, out of 186 communities for the overall number of persons experiencing need. Incidentally, just in case you were wondering, number 1 is the Beltline area, where all the homeless shelters are.

That concludes my presentation, ladies and gentlemen, and I'm pleased to answer any questions you might have.

The Chair: Thank you.

Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Dr. Brown, for your analysis, your maps, et cetera. It makes our world a lot easier to live in with this kind of detail.

First of all, on your demographic analysis I must say that I'm shocked by the results that you've indicated here. Because of the location in Calgary I would have thought, you know, that Calgary-North Hill, to the south of you, would have been higher in needs assessment. Maybe I could just ask you to begin by commenting on that.

Dr. Brown: The Thorncliffe area was actually built before the other two communities. It contains quite a high population of seniors, but they're all sort of middle-income seniors. There is no low-cost housing. We don't have any of the Calgary Housing, which is the supported government housing, in that particular area. For example, in Huntington Hills we have the Inn from the Cold. Kids in the three schools that serve Inn from the Cold, which is the homeless kids, are all in Huntington Hills as well. Basically, it's in terms of the housing stock, the reason that it's higher needs in the northern part, the newer part.

Mr. Evans: Okay. That information all came from the city of Calgary, I presume, from their data.

Dr. Brown: Yes, it did. That's all directly from the city of Calgary's data.

Mr. Evans: Now, what difference would it make to move Thorncliffe out of your constituency? Would that have much of a dramatic impact on these statistics?

Dr. Brown: In terms of overall need, you're referring to?

Mr. Evans: Yeah.

Dr. Brown: Well, Thorncliffe would be lower needs. My analysis of that is that it's right around the middle of the pack in terms of the 186 communities. It's definitely not in the higher needs, and it's not at the bottom.

Mr. Evans: Okay.

My other comment is just regarding the analysis of the populations. In our interim report we had Calgary-Foothills, because of the growth potential, at right around the median. You're proposing now 13 per cent over. That still leaves us with a big issue in terms of development potential in that area and what might happen to the numbers in the next six or eight years. Calgary-Mackay we had at 12 per cent over, so at 11 it's not much different. Then your realigned Calgary-Nose Hill, our Calgary-Country Hills, we had at 6.43, and now we're quite a bit under. So maybe you could just make some comments on whether there is much development potential in your proposed realigned constituency because that really is an issue in Calgary.

Dr. Brown: Well, you know, truthfully, I can't say that there would be a lot, although east of Coventry Hills I'm not sure what the plan is with respect to that, but conceivably there could be in that area east of Coventry Hills and east of Harvest Hills, between the Deerfoot Trail and the existing development. I would think that that is a potential growth area. It's just across the street presently.

I really can't comment on it. I do recognize and would acknowledge that the Calgary-Foothills and the Calgary-Mackay ridings are more likely to experience a significant population growth than the revamped boundary that I proposed, no question about that. But, as I said, if there is any justification for having a bit smaller riding, it would lie in the fact that this is a really high social needs area that we're serving here.

Mr. Evans: High needs, yeah.

Thanks very much. Those are my questions. Appreciate your time.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Dr. Brown, for coming and thank you for the very clear presentation. Just more of a comment, really. I am a little concerned about the proposal, really, with respect to Calgary-Foothills, starting out with that constituency at 13 per cent over. I think we had left that pretty close to the average, understanding that there was going to be quite a bit of growth out there. I don't know what that will do to the rest of it, but obviously we'll have to take that.

I don't know if you have a plan B. You know, I'm not as worried potentially about having yours a little below. Given the statistical information you've given us about the high needs, I'm a little less concerned about it. I am a bit concerned about the Calgary-Foothills constituency being at 13 per cent over to start.

Dr. Brown: Yeah. There's no question about it that the Calgary-Foothills area is ripe for development in the north there. It's probably going to grow. I guess my only answer to that is that at some point there's going to be another redistribution, and hopefully those things will be taken into account at that time.

Ms Jeffs: Yeah. That's eight to 10 years away, though. Again, you know, I understand that. Certainly, we've tried to avoid that pitfall of having a balloon.

Dr. Brown: Yeah. There's no question about it. I mean, in that regard I guess we're not any different than a lot of the inner-city ridings which don't have a lot of growth potential. As I said, I'm not familiar with what the development plans are in the northern area

east of the Coventry Hills area on the map there. Whether or not that is ripe for development, I really couldn't honestly say.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Let me just have a moment.

I think that would be my only comment, Mr. Chairman. I have nothing further.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: No questions. Again, thank you, sir, for the detail and also for actually addressing the questions that we posed in the interim report and giving us a basis for your proposal. That really is helpful to me.

Thanks.

Dr. Brown: Thank you.

9:45

Dr. Archer: Thanks again, Dr. Brown. Your presentation looks pretty similar to something we heard by a group from the Calgary-Mackay area while we were in Calgary last week. They were arguing, I think, pretty strongly for us to include Coventry Hills within Calgary-Mackay and to keep those four communities together. You know, the challenge that we talked about at the time – and it's certainly come up in our discussions here – is the population differences between MacEwan Glen, on the one hand, and Hidden Valley.

If we move Hidden Valley into Calgary-Foothills and move MacEwan Glen into what we had called Calgary-Country Hills, what you're calling Calgary-Nose Hill or Calgary-Nose Creek, that results in the area with the highest growth potential having the highest population at the moment in the group and the area that seems to be pretty much built out in most of the area having the lowest population. That's the issue that we're struggling with.

We certainly appreciate your comments about the particular needs in the Nose Hill-Nose Creek community. I'm sure that will come up as we continue to discuss this in this round.

Dr. Brown: Right. As I said, the Northern Hills Community Association is quite forceful in saying that, you know, they'd like those communities to remain as part of the same unit.

Also, I should mention that in the original report at the request of the Northern Hills Community Association I also put in their request that the name would be appropriately called Calgary-Northern Hills. For your benefit I just raise that point on their behalf again.

Dr. Archer: Right. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr. Brown. We will certainly take it into account as we proceed with our deliberations.

Dr. Brown: Thank you very much.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is the Hon. Ray Danyluk, MLA for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

The Chair: Good morning, Mr. Danyluk.

Mr. Danyluk: Hi. How are you today?

The Chair: I'm well.

For *Hansard* if you would be so kind as to give your name and the riding that you represent.

Ray Danyluk, MLA
Lac La Biche-St. Paul

Mr. Danyluk: Ray Danyluk, Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

Good morning. I will say that it's indeed a pleasure to be here today as the Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul. My request. I did send on a letter that's very simple. I just think that I need to expand on it a little bit. I am here to talk about two agenda items, the first one being the constituency boundaries and the second one being a name change.

First of all, I have, as all, received the commission's report, and I would like to express my support for keeping the electoral boundaries of Lac La Biche-St. Paul the same as was suggested by yourselves. I would also like to state for the record that many of my constituents have conveyed to me their wish to keep the boundaries the same. I will further elaborate to suggest to you that as recently as two weeks ago I did hold what I call breakfast meetings and town hall meetings, and that was one of the topics. It was a unanimous decision and direction from those groups that that should take place.

There is no doubt that this constituency is certainly diverse in its landscape and in its people. It covers a vast geographic area, but my constituents do share common interests and values. We are all part of a large community that I would say works very well together. We have combined interests, of course, whether it be agriculture or industry or the people that we serve. We are tied together by Portage College, that serves the area. I can say that the northeast area has 13 satellites in two different communities. We do have a combined school board, which is, if I can for the record say to you, a unique system because it is the only system that has a separate and a public school board working together under one board, serving schools which encompass the St. Paul north area as well as the Two Hills area.

When we look at the population base, which is slightly below average, I do want to say to you that to me and to you that should not be a concern. The development of the SAGD operation just north of Lac La Biche is very much contributing to an enhanced population. In fact, as late as last week I met with two prominent companies – well, really three – that are changing their headquarters from areas in Fort McMurray and are hoping to settle their headquarters in Lac La Biche. The development, I would say to you, is very pronounced and continuing.

The southern end of the constituency, which is the Two Hills area, has had very high growth in regard to the Mennonite community. I say to you "high growth." In rural Alberta we consider this high growth when you have a school that has approximately 200 separate students in the last approximately seven to eight years and enrolment has increased from probably 20 to 30 kids to over 400 kids of Mennonites moving in. I want to say to you that the growth in the industry is very much developing in the south.

I don't need to quote statistics such as 27,000 square kilometres, but I will say that it does take me four to five hours to travel from one end of my constituency to the other. I would say that when we do have discussions, I would rather talk. Instead of equal representation, equitable representation because it is a challenge for me to have equitable representation when individuals have to travel such a distance in order to have a visitation or to see their MLA. Presently I have an office in St. Paul that's a full-time office. I have a part-time office in Lac La Biche and am looking for a part-time office in Two Hills. There is just no space that's really available that's conducive at this time.

Although this is a large amount of time and is certainly a very different scenario from urban MLAs, I believe that it's still manageable, and the constituents feel the same. I do this, and I'm able to,

I believe, effectively serve my constituents. As I said before, this is a challenge not only for me, but it is a challenge for all of rural Alberta. Distance is a challenge. Yes, we do have the luxury of new technology, of course, the SuperNet and things of that nature, but that's not available to everybody, not available to communities but also not available to groups.

The next point that I'd like to talk about is the name change. I want to raise the importance of changing the name of the constituency from Lac La Biche-St. Paul to Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills. With the changes that took place in the 2004 election, the county and the town and the communities of Two Hills formed part of the Lac La Biche-St. Paul constituency. I want to say to you that prior to that, when the St. Paul regional division was formed – and I guess I have some blame for that because the name was called St. Paul regional division 1 – we were recognized as division 1 for us gathering together first, which included Two Hills, which very much in a lot of people's minds ostracized them.

9:55

I have to stress to you that the economic, the trading area, the recreation area, if I can use this just for half a second, all went to the Vegreville area – Vegreville is right here – to the Fort Saskatchewan area. It didn't go back. There is a river that is in between that is a natural boundary. You used the natural boundary between Athabasca, Redwater, Vegreville, Fort Saskatchewan. The river is a natural boundary. This also has a river as a natural boundary, but the previous Electoral Boundaries Commission felt it was important to add them into the jurisdiction.

People have lived with it. They've gotten used to it and accept it, but they are definitely after identity. It has been a common discussion and a common comment from people of that area. As I said, the river provides not only a boundary of economics but a natural boundary because there are only so many places that you can cross. This makes it difficult for the Two Hills community to identify with the constituency of Lac La Biche-St. Paul because it is to the north. I think it's very important that all people of a constituency have some sort of identity.

Please also understand that we are encompassed by three major counties: the Lac La Biche county, the St. Paul county, and the Two Hills county. Those two communities are recognized but not the third. You may ask me, "Well, why not Elk Point?" because Elk Point is a prominent community in the area as well. Elk Point is within the county of St. Paul. Even though they are a bigger community, a bigger urban community of Elk Point over Two Hills, I still very much hold true that it is about communities, it is about cultures, it is about identity.

I guess I probably would open up more opportunity for questions, but I want to thank you for this opportunity. Our constituency received changes to the boundaries during, as I said before, the last electoral review. Having it remain the same would provide stability to the residents and to the constituency. I just think it's very necessary to change the name. This is something that's been asked for over and over during elections, during conversations, during town hall meetings by communities in the southern part of the constituency.

The Chair: Thank you. You will probably be happy to know that the mayor of Lac La Biche thinks the name should be Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Danyluk: Well, I'm glad to hear that. I think that attests, too, that we do recognize and appreciate ourselves as one community but appreciating the identity of each other as well.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks, Minister Danyluk. Those were really useful and helpful comments. We always appreciate when people say we did a good job the first round, so I appreciate that.

You were talking a bit about the population within the proposed constituency and being a bit under. I guess my response to that would be that a population of 5.8 per cent under the provincial average is very consistent with ridings within many of the urban centres, so I don't think a variance of that level provides concern for the commission generally. What might be more of a concern is if we look at Bonnyville-Cold Lake and see a population that's a bit more than 15 per cent under. I think that once you start getting to that level of population size, it becomes a bit more problematic. Certainly, in our process this round we're living with a number of constituencies that have variances 15 per cent under the provincial average. That will be one of the issues, I think – it's not going to go away – in Alberta and I suspect will be a focus of the attention of the next commission as well.

One of the issues I was going to ask you about because we haven't heard too much from people in Fort McMurray, and since that area borders on yours, perhaps you would have some comment on that. Of course, we introduced a pretty substantial change in the Fort McMurray area, introducing a new riding and then providing a split to the community, which, you know, any time you split a community, you provide opportunities for discussion and assessment of whether you split it at the right place. I just wonder if you would have any comments for us on the two Fort McMurray ridings.

Mr. Danyluk: Okay. Well, first of all, can I comment on Lac La Biche-St. Paul and Bonnyville-Cold Lake? Then I'll comment on Fort McMurray.

First of all, Lac La Biche-St. Paul. Please note that both Lac La Biche-St. Paul and Bonnyville-Cold Lake encompass the boundary of the rural municipality, and I think that's important to maintain that, just a little added to the 5 point something per cent under as far as my constituency is concerned. There's also one other factor that we'll add. We have a high number of aboriginal communities in our area as well as Bonnyville-Cold Lake, and I think the population shows that in those communities the population is growing faster than in other areas. But mostly on that point I'd like to see them stay the same because of the rural boundaries.

When I was in Fort McMurray – and I've been there, you know, a couple, three times since the report came out – I heard maybe as many comments that everybody agrees that there needs to be two representatives, and I agree. Should it be this way, or should it be this way? I mean, where the boundaries should be: there's definitely a lot of discussion. There are probably as many people that have comments and rationale why it should be horizontal as have the same comments on why it should be vertical.

The one case, if you're asking my opinion, that I would rather see it horizontal is that if there's a fluctuation that has to go north and south in the future, you have more ability to do it when you're going south than if you're going this way. Do you understand what I'm saying? If you're going vertical, you have fewer options because you're going to the Saskatchewan border: no population. You're going into the area where it's, you know, a no-population zone. To the west, you don't have. If you had to change population numbers in the future, you could change them north and south more readily. Is that a reason? Maybe not, but I would say that's something that has come to my attention and has some rationale.

Dr. Archer: Thanks. Appreciate that. That's all I have.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Danyluk. Just to confirm that we did have a presentation by the mayor of Lac La Biche county, who supported the recommendations we had made.

My question relates to, I guess, the naming protocols. We have been informed by a number of MLAs and associations that we have to be careful about changing names because we don't want to lose some familiarity. When we get a direct request to add a name, it's much easier for us to respond. In your case a protocol that I think makes sense is to have names that describe the geographic area, so adding Two Hills makes a lot of sense to me. Alternatively, not changing the name of a constituency in Calgary when there's some historic familiarity or in Edmonton-Calder, for example, this morning, makes a lot of sense as well. Again, there's a cost associated with changing the name. That's for all the constituency associations. But I agree.

Anecdotally, we see a lot of the Mennonite families from Two Hills coming to the Vegreville area, and there's certainly a population boom. We see lots of them and lots of young ones, so I agree with your proposition that it's likely that your constituency will continue to grow.

10:05

Mr. Danyluk: I think you of all people very much understand that the recreation, economic travel patterns are to Vegreville – right? – for major business.

Mr. Dobbie: Well, that's where the excellent lawyers are.

Mr. Danyluk: True.

Anyway, you know, that was the pattern. The patterns were to Lamont and to Fort Saskatchewan. To have people go against their natural patterns, they lose identity. If it was to the natural patterns, they don't resist as much, but going against their natural travel patterns, they do. That's why that identity is so important in this particular situation. As I said before, it basically acknowledges three rural municipalities and three communities. I think it's critical, so I thank you for your words.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. Danyluk. I don't have any questions for you this morning, but thank you again for the presentation.

I want to echo some remarks that have been made by others that the name change sounds very reasonable. We have heard as well from the mayor that they would support that. I'm glad we're not being asked to call it Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills-Elk Point. That might challenge Mr. Kowalski when he calls upon the MLA.

Thank you again for speaking to us about what you think we've done right. That's always good and helps us as we go into the next round, so thank you again.

Mr. Danyluk: Well, on a humorous note, my assistant in St. Paul is the only one that says: oh, no, a longer name.

I am surprised because I know that the Two Hills community was going to make a presentation. I'm not sure what happened. But they do view me, from the meetings that I did have, as doing the presentation for them, so thank you.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Minister, for your presentation and your comments and your suggestions. I just have one question, and that's on the north end of the constituency, in Conklin, which is going to see considerable growth in the future. Do you see that growth connecting to Lac La Biche, or do you see it connecting up to Fort McMurray? What's more logical?

Mr. Danyluk: Most of this is going to Lac La Biche.

Mr. Evans: Lac La Biche. So that's, again, a fairly substantial growth opportunity, and I guess that's where the population is expected.

Mr. Danyluk: Well, right in here is Jackfish and the major SAGD. Even going up into this area is the major SAGD, and they're going into Lac La Biche. That's what the industry is telling me. In fact, when we were in Fort McMurray, some of the concern of, let's say, the Fort McMurray Chamber of Commerce is that there is that discussion of moving south. I mean, can I say yes? All of the decisions are going to be made. All I can tell you are the observations that I hear and the comments that I hear, but this is natural. I can say that they are building a new recreation centre in Lac La Biche, and these oil companies right here I believe have contributed in the neighbourhood of \$2.7 million towards that recreation centre, supporting in this direction.

Mr. Evans: Okay. So is there some logic to moving that constituency boundary north? Would it have much of an impact on the current population?

Mr. Danyluk: Well, I was very surprised that this line was not across here in the first place, the last time, because that makes logical sense as far as traffic patterns go, you know, that we see. But I do understand the logic of keeping this municipality of Lac La Biche up here as one. So it's kind of your decision. Does it make sense here? Yes, as far as traffic patterns go. Does it make sense as far as identity? From my perspective and from the people I talked to, yes. But then I have the conflict of philosophy, if you want to call it that, about keeping municipalities together, especially the rural municipalities because rural municipalities are identified with the identity of the community. Conklin is sort of off to itself, but the business does come this way.

Mr. Evans: Is that another county, or is it an ID?

Mr. Danyluk: No. That's in Wood Buffalo. You know, Wood Buffalo . . .

Mr. Evans: Is huge.

Mr. Danyluk: Yeah. It amalgamated with Fort McMurray. I don't have it up here, but Wood Buffalo is monstrous, if I can say that. There are only pockets of development in Wood Buffalo, but this is one pocket. Of course, Fort Chip, I believe, and areas like that are other pockets, but it's mostly Fort McMurray. This pocket just happens to be in the trading area of Lac La Biche. How I say trading: it's wherever you can receive the trade. There's a lot of connection in that direction.

Mr. Evans: The population of Janvier and that area all the way down to Conklin, what would you think that would be?

Mr. Danyluk: It's not major except for the camps.

Mr. Evans: It's all temporary.

Mr. Danyluk: I mean, the camps that take place, the temporary residence, whether it be on-site of some of the development that's taking place, they are fairly large.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thanks very much. I appreciate it.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Danyluk. I'd just point out one small thing. When we're speaking of Fort McMurray and whether it's vertical or horizontal, in looking at the boundaries in Fort McMurray, it is such that there is a horizontal boundary there, so there can be growth accommodated to the north and to the south.

Mr. Danyluk: I agree. I'm just saying that there was a discussion in both directions. I see the rationale, when you talk about growth, to have it in that direction. I mean, if you looked at pre-2004, in my constituency the river was basically a natural boundary, right? But the powers that be felt that it was important to maintain the municipality as the natural boundary, against traffic patterns. As you know, Peter, against traffic patterns. But it's done. I would say: don't change it back; leave it as it is, but identify it.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much. We'll certainly take all of this under consideration. It was a pleasure seeing you.

Mr. Danyluk: Did you want me to send another, like, full-blown – because I do have it, which I didn't follow very well.

The Chair: If you leave it with the staff, we'll get copies of it.

Mr. Danyluk: It could be scary to leave my informational notes, but I can.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Danyluk: I wrote notes as we were going.
Thank you very much for the opportunity.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Mr. Gary Racich, president of Glenwood Community League.

The Chair: Good morning. Since we are being recorded by *Hansard*, if you'd be so kind as to give them your name and the group that you're representing.

Mr. Racich: My name is Gary Racich. I'm president of Glenwood Community League. We're located in I believe it's area 37, Edmonton-La Perle.

The Chair: Go ahead.

**Gary Racich, President
Glenwood Community League**

Mr. Racich: Why I'm here today is mostly to try to address the concerns of the new riding. The new riding seems to be more of a north-south riding than the old Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Over the past 20 years that I've been president of Glenwood Community League, most of our concerns and interests have always been to an east-west transition more than a north-south. I put in a few maps, some of the history of Jasper Place. The town of Jasper Place, which Glenwood was part of originally, in 1964 was amalgamated with the city of Edmonton. It was 149th Street to 170th Street and bordered 118th Avenue to the river valley. That's always sort of maintained the growth, and any communities that we've dealt with have always been along that east-west area.

10:15

The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. We through the federation have made area councils. These area councils tried to group communities that have common interests, common concerns to have their separate meetings so that everybody can address the same sort of ideas or problems that we're having. There is a map just highlighting the area council which was formed by the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. There again the furthest boundary seems to stop at 111th Avenue and then south to, usually, the river valley or 87th Avenue, east and west. A lot of the communities are older communities and have been sort of in business or around – Glenwood has been a community for 70 years last year. So there's a tie-in with the communities that already exist.

Whitemud West Hockey. There again Stony Plain Road is a boundary going south to the river valley and west. All the children who are playing hockey are bound by those boundaries to stay together.

The Edmonton separate school board uses Stony Plain Road as a boundary, there again going, I believe, to 142nd Street and going west.

Some of the Stony Plain Road revitalization is a different group. The city sort of associated a BRZ and a community initiative. This got the communities involved with the BRZ to help with input on bringing the types of businesses, things like that, as well as addressing concerns of the communities. This ran from 142nd Street to 170th Street along Stony Plain Road, which is north and south, you know, pretty much to 107th Avenue and then 95th Avenue again.

LRT. LRT has been an issue. Probably the only contested LRT route was the west Edmonton route, down Stony Plain Road to 87th Avenue to Lewis Estates. That brought a lot of communities together. Different agendas a little bit, some of them, but there was still the tie-in that that's the tie from west Edmonton.

I think my main concern here is the natural boundaries. I think we're more an east-west. When I saw the new riding, I just didn't find any of the north part, you know, especially Yellowhead Trail – all that doesn't concern us. We've never had to deal with it. For 20 years I've never been past 111th Avenue, really, dealing with anything on a community basis. Being industrial, I'm not sure of the criteria of using up the space, whether population growth is a concern or we're just trying to limit it. I'm sure your job is easy.

I think that bottom, the northern area, could be connected with the northern communities of Edmonton, and maybe we can be extended further west or something like that. I think it will make it easier for an elected official to accommodate the needs of the people that he or she is representing, you know, so that they don't have to split up because I don't think there is any commonality at all between the two areas.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much. If you don't mind, I'm sure we have a few questions.

Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Mr. Racich. You've obviously been involved in your community for many years.

Edmonton and Alberta are better for that kind of community involvement, so thank you for that.

What is really helpful to us is when we get presentations that suggest realignments. I'm not sure whether you are saying that we should stay pretty much with the Edmonton-Meadowlark constituency boundaries the way that they were and that you're happy with that or whether you have some other kind of an alignment that you could superimpose on Edmonton-La Perle that would give us, you know, specifics as to where you'd like us to go and that would give us the opportunity to consider population as well.

Mr. Racich: Well, that's where I'm not sure with the population of all the areas on how you're going to have to – because your criteria of the 40,000 people is going to limit you to a point, too. I'm just thinking, you know, that if it's got to be realigned, I think the east-west realignment is a better fit to represent the people. The Edmonton-Meadowlark one was a good constituency, I believe, but with the criteria, it may have to be expanded or reduced or whatever it has to do to fit.

Mr. Evans: Well, maybe a better question that might help you out a bit and that would certainly help us would be: if you take a look at our proposed Edmonton-La Perle, can you identify any communities that are broken up by that alignment, particularly any of those that were in Edmonton-Meadowlark as it currently now stands? We are, as you know, trying to keep communities together and respect like-community issues.

Mr. Racich: Our community of Glenwood is broken up. I believe this is 163rd Street. The Glenwood community is 156 Street to 170th Street and Stony Plain Road to 95th Avenue. The existing Edmonton-Meadowlark constituency still cuts out a small portion of it as well.

Mr. Evans: Well, we do have some additional time. Rather than, you know, trying to dissect this now, I would encourage you, if you can, to try to give us some additional information about those communities that might be further dissected and any population numbers that you can give us as well. We do have a breakdown of all of the communities in Edmonton, and I can certainly give you this to be a starting point for you.

Mr. Racich: I looked at some of the historic stuff from the city of Edmonton, and all of the populations weren't in there. So that's why I was sort of trying to put – I don't know because each one is going to affect the next one, so I know it's not a simple: let's change the lines.

Mr. Evans: Yeah. There is a domino effect, and I'm glad you recognize that.

These community populations are as current as we can get them. They're from Edmonton census from last year, so hopefully that will help you. Thank you again for your presentation.

Mr. Racich: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: If I could just add something in that respect. If you are able to put something together on the boundaries, et cetera, that would preserve the community associations, we'd have to have it in about a week to 10 days. Thank you.

Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Racich, for coming this morning and providing your input. I would just echo Mr. Evans' remarks that it is helpful for us to have an alternative boundary. I certainly took down the information that you provided about Glenwood. We do try not to break up communities. But in terms of looking at natural boundaries, I think we heard this morning from the proposed constituency to the north some favour of having Yellowhead Trail as the northern boundary. It doesn't mean that it can't be revisited, but if you can provide us with some input as to what some of the, you know, appropriate boundaries would be because in looking at your maps with respect to the separate school boundaries and the community league, it looks like it does follow Whitemud sometimes but also falls a bit south. Some assistance in that regard would be helpful to us as we go forward.

Other than that, thank you very much. I have nothing further, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.
Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Gary, for the comments. It's very helpful to get community comments as opposed to constituency comments because the interests in your case are directly related to the community as opposed to any political issues. Generally speaking, though, you would like to see the east boundary be the North Saskatchewan River?

Mr. Racich: Well, there again, like I said, I'm not sure with the numbers on how far it can go, but these communities have common interests, and a lot of those are older communities.

Mr. Dobbie: But just, generally speaking, 111th Avenue in your view is about the top of the natural boundary?

Mr. Racich: Yes.

Mr. Dobbie: The south would be the river and the Whitemud freeway?

Mr. Racich: Yes.

10:25

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. And then as far west. So those are the general parameters.

The challenge we have with the proposed map we're looking at really comes down to which view you take of the Edmonton-Riverview constituency. When that was created to span the river, it kind of created the problem for you, so it is helpful to hear the challenges from a community member. I certainly understand here. If you look at the LRT, one argument might be that one MLA can be of assistance in dealing with it. A counter-argument could be that if you had a couple of MLAs that were affiliated with the route, it may give you more bargaining power. That's the kind of trade-off we're facing here. Do we substantially change Edmonton-Riverview to accommodate the kinds of concerns you've raised, or do we live with what's here and work forward? We will try to take that into account.

But, again, the general parameters, 111th on the north end makes the most sense to you.

Mr. Racich: Yes.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Racich. My view differs a bit from Peter on this. I actually don't see this largely as an issue of what we do with Edmonton-Riverview. As I look at the set of maps that you've provided with the highlighting of the different communities of interest, and if I lay those against the current boundaries – that is, you know, the boundaries that existed before our proposal – there are some instances in which those communities of interest are included within three constituencies; for example, Meadowlark, Riverview, Glenora. In some instances they're within four constituencies: Calder, Meadowlark, Glenora, Riverview. The communities of interest you've identified don't always overlap perfectly on one another. The reality of life in complex urban centres is that there are a variety of communities of interest and that they don't always overlap so perfectly.

The communities that you've identified I suspect at the present time work with two or three or in some cases four MLAs, and the changes that we've proposed in our interim report have probably reduced that in the communities you've identified to no more than three MLAs, La Perle being a larger group, although there may be some that extend down to the Callingwood area. Again, because there's this imperfect overlay between these communities of interest, I just don't see how we would ever be able to include them all within a single constituency even if one is running east and west.

Mr. Racich: Yeah. I know we're never going to get everybody happy; otherwise, nobody would be at these meetings. But certain areas that seem to have no interest or no attachment, maybe they can be encompassed into another one. You know, being industrial, really, like I say, past the Yellowhead, anything like that, we have nothing to deal with them. If that's going to pull away support from our representative – maybe there is an issue there, and we have another issue. To work on two: I think that if you can spend more time on one common issue, it would be better representation for us.

Dr. Archer: Thanks. That's all I have.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. We'll look forward to any further information you can get to us.

At this point we're just going to take a short five-minute adjournment, and we'll reconvene.

[The hearing adjourned from 10:29 a.m. to 10:41 a.m.]

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Miss Muriel Stanleyvenne.

The Chair: Welcome. If you'd be so kind for the benefit of *Hansard* to give your name and if there's a group you're representing, that also.

Muriel Stanleyvenne

Miss Stanleyvenne: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, commissioners. My name is Muriel Stanleyvenne, as you know. I'm here as a private citizen although I am vice-president of the Métis Nation of Alberta. I'm also the president and founder of the Institute for the Advancement of Aboriginal Women and also the chair of the Aboriginal Commission on Human Rights and Justice. I mention that because my presentation is going to not be about boundaries and not be about moving things around. It is to bring to your attention a piece of the history of Alberta which I would like you to honour.

I was one of the first of the seven members appointed by Premier Lougheed to the Alberta Human Rights Commission many years ago. I was born here. I was actually born in Lamont and grew up at

Whitford. My purpose is twofold, to see first how the commission works and what they look at and the jurisdiction of the commission and so on but also to advocate as strongly as I can for a change of name from Dunvegan-Central Peace to honour Grant Notley in that area. As you know, Grant Notley was at times a lone member of the New Democratic Party in this province and was highly respected by Albertans and by his colleagues in the Legislature. I think it is fitting that this area, Dunvegan-Central Peace, be named in his name.

As I said, it was quite a number of years ago that I was appointed. I'm thinking that even as we sit here, there are many young people that don't realize the history of our province and the important contributions that were made to the democratic system. After all, you can't have a democracy if you don't have an opposition.

I just feel very strongly about this. I certainly knew Grant. The tragedy of his death hit me very hard because, unfortunately, that weekend, on the Friday the plane was missing, and then the word came that he had died, and on the Saturday my brother died in a car accident, so I had two deaths to cope with.

But that's circumstance. I'm really here to advocate. There have been precedents in naming constituencies after well-known politicians, and in this case I would really, sincerely like you to consider this as a way of honouring a man who really, as I said, at times, certainly in the early days, was a one-man show. When he died, of course, there was the recognition by all Albertans of how tragic that was and of how much he had contributed with very little resources to go ahead. I thought I would lend whatever influence I have. I do have the Order of Canada, and I have been honoured with the Lois Hole lifetime achievement award and so on. I thought so highly of Grant, and I would just add my voice and hope that you would consider that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, Miss Stanleyvenne. I appreciate you coming here and sharing that today. We've received quite a few written submissions to this effect as well.

One of the issues that I'm sure will come up in our discussions is the view of people in a particular constituency towards naming that constituency versus the view of a broader grouping across Alberta. My sense is that many of the letters that we've received are from people outside of the Dunvegan-Central Peace constituency, and that leaves open the question for us as to whether input from people outside of a constituency should be weighed as strongly as input from within the constituency over a variety of issues, including the naming of a constituency.

Now, I know that this riding has been identified because it was the riding that Mr. Notley represented. Is there a view that you have or that others you've spoken with on this have about whether other constituencies exist as a potential for naming in honour of Mr. Notley, or really is the issue centred on the Dunvegan area?

Miss Stanleyvenne: Just as you were speaking, I was thinking of Laurence Decore and his contribution to the province of Alberta. I was wondering whether perhaps the criteria for some of the naming of the constituencies might be added in, if it's not there now, so that you could take on this recognition and historical point of view.

You know, Laurence Decore was also important in this province. I have to tell you this story. I was going to the mayor's breakfast when Laurence was the mayor of Edmonton. I told my mother that, and my mother said: well, tell him that papa voted for his dad.

Whereas I know you have to make very precise decisions, there is an emotional and an historical side to this province which I would like to bring into your deliberations, your considerations. That was important, too.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks for coming and providing us with that perspective. I appreciate it.

Miss Stanleyvenne: Thank you. You don't have to deal with boundaries.

I'd just add that, actually, I just came to observe and then found that there was time on the agenda, so I thought that I would speak to you. I realize what a task you have. I mean, this is quite an onerous task that you've taken on, and I wish you well. You know, good luck to you all.

Thanks.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Sure. Again, thank you for the submission. I think it's important that you've suggested that we address the issue of naming protocols. Just so you know, the legislation is not very directive at all on that. I think it's something that we should certainly raise in our report to the Legislature, to suggest that there be some direction given, because frankly I feel torn as to which way to go on these things. But capturing your thought there, I think, will be helpful for future commissions.

Miss Stanleyvenne: I thank you for that very much because I couldn't find it either, that there was any significance.

10:50

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much. I would just echo the comments from Peter Dobbie that it is helpful for us to perhaps indicate in the report that some protocol for naming should be included or considered. It's all one thing to say that we're going to name 87 ridings, but I'm sure that if we gave them all names out of the baby book, we'd be in trouble, too.

Also, just on another note, I'm certainly aware of the submissions we've had to honour Grant Notley, and I can certainly say that his contributions resonate even for some of us who came to Alberta after that tragic plane crash.

Thank you very much for coming here today.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks very much for the presentation. I don't have any questions. I just want to thank you for your presentation and thank you for your continuing contribution to our province.

Miss Stanleyvenne: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, and it was a pleasure hearing from you.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Mr. John Dodds, Edmonton-McClung Liberal Constituency Association.

The Chair: Mr. Dodds, good morning. Since we're being recorded on *Hansard*, if you could give them your name and the position you're presenting from. Thank you.

John Dodds

Mr. Dodds: Good morning. My name is John Dodds, and I'm actually presenting as a private citizen, but I felt I should indicate my capacity with the constituency association. I'm only relatively new in that role, and I haven't had an opportunity to vet my comments with the constituency association, so I present them purely as a private citizen.

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Dodds: I have a number of concerns about the proposed realignment of the provincial electoral boundaries, especially as it relates to the current riding of Edmonton-McClung and the proposed new ridings of Edmonton-McClung and Edmonton-Callingwood. In my presentation I do have a proposal to make some changes and realignments. If for no other reason I hope you consider these seriously because the unfortunate profile of the proposed Edmonton-Callingwood riding looks nothing so much like a limp male reproductive organ. You may want to change it for no other reason than that.

The concern I have with respect to Edmonton-McClung is that what is proposed does a number of things. It slices up the natural communities of interest, doesn't respect natural boundaries such as rivers, ravines, or major roadways, and lumps areas together which have very little in common.

The main issue as I see it is that the boundaries proposed in the interim report will divide communities that over time have shared common interests, linkages, and history. Similarly, the boundary realignment, in my view, should try to preserve historical and geographic relationships among communities. This is useful because the public, I believe, becomes confused about where they vote and in which constituency they vote, and it's useful, I think, to try to minimize changes, especially to existing ridings, as you try to grapple with this issue. The scope and scale of any change I believe should be minimized as much as possible, and this doesn't appear to be the case in southwest Edmonton. The proposed boundaries link communities that don't share common interests, linkages, and history and link older areas of no or slow growth with much newer areas experiencing very rapid growth.

There's a fairly extensive section there on the history. I won't go through all of it, but suffice it to say that the communities and neighbourhoods bounded by 170th Street in the east, Anthony Henday freeway in the west, Stony Plain Road to the north, and the North Saskatchewan River and Wedgewood ravine to the south over about a 20-year period evolved pretty much simultaneously. As a result, a lot of linkages and relationships and history were developed over time at the community league level, at the political level, for that matter, and in terms of lobbying various levels of government for infrastructure, recreation centres, schools, libraries, et cetera. These areas are now, relatively speaking, fairly mature areas with minimal growth going on. There's a bit of infill activity such as the final phase in Hawkstone towards the southern part of that area.

The area I've just described is primarily one that was encompassed by the existing ridings of Edmonton-Meadowlark and Edmonton-McClung and will now be split between three different ridings. I think one of your earlier presenters alluded to that fact. These areas now have most of the infrastructure and amenities that you would expect in those areas, so the interests and needs of those communities are pretty much similar from north to south.

This contrasts with the communities to the south of Stony Plain Road but west of the Anthony Henday, which creates quite a distinct dividing line between communities, and to the east all the way to

Gateway Boulevard and Calgary Trail. Most of the communities in this area have developed over just the last few years and will continue to grow rapidly for many years to come. The oldest community in this area is Lewis Estates, where development started in the mid- to late-1990s, and significant new development continues in that area to the west and to the north of the River Cree casino.

The area to the south of the river and east to Gateway Boulevard consists of newly developing and rapidly expanding neighbourhoods such as Windermere, MacEwan, Rutherford as well as some older country residential, and on both sides of the river there are large expanses of undeveloped land. The issues that present to those communities will be quite different than the ones that present to the older communities. They need to manage growth, develop infrastructure and amenities, and establish neighbourhood organizations and all the linkages that go with that. The needs and interests of those communities will be quite different than those in those more mature communities.

This history seems to have been to some degree ignored in developing the current set of recommendations. The proposed Edmonton-Callingwood riding combines substantial parts of the current Edmonton-McClung and parts of Edmonton-Meadowlark, most notably Lewis Estates, with which there has not been a historical link in the past with the rest of the current Edmonton-McClung riding. The proposed new Edmonton-McClung contains an older area of existing Edmonton-McClung, the area bounded by Callingwood Road, 170th Street, Anthony Henday freeway, 45th Avenue, and the river, in combination with newly developing areas which extend more than 15 kilometres all the way to Calgary Trail. There has been no historical link with those areas. In addition, it's my view that the geographic extent of that riding is untenable in an urban setting.

I believe an alternate proposal and a more logical arrangement would be to maintain the existing Edmonton-McClung boundaries to the east and north of Anthony Henday freeway, retaining the Edmonton-McClung name, that has historically been associated with this area. The areas to the west of the Anthony Henday, including Lewis Estates, could then be combined with the newly developing communities south of the river and west of Gateway Boulevard, Calgary Trail, with the name to be determined.

11:00

I would like to at this point reiterate my own support for the previous presenter's proposal of naming a riding after Grant Notley. I would suggest that it doesn't necessarily have to be in northern Alberta as Grant Notley was very widely and well regarded in Edmonton, and one of these southwestern areas could easily be named after him, I think, without much objection from anybody.

Moving on beyond that, this proposal would effectively link communities that have common interests. It will facilitate future electoral boundary adjustments with minimal impact on adjacent ridings. With the anticipated fairly substantial growth that those areas will see, I can foresee a day when that proposed Edmonton-McClung riding would have to be split in two, most likely at the river. I believe that what I am proposing would just facilitate that and make it as painless as possible for existing ridings. I'd like to just reinforce the thought that making minimal changes to existing ridings is important because with the poor turnout we've had in the last election or two, I think that changing the ridings frequently doesn't assist in that.

The proposal would preserve and respect historical relationships in older areas and maintain common interests, linkages, and shared history. Older neighbourhoods of no or slow growth would be grouped together in one constituency while much newer areas

experiencing very rapid growth would be in another. Thus, newer communities with similar growth-related issues would be more likely to work co-operatively with one another.

I'll end my presentation on that score. I've also provided a second document, that addresses the issue of voting parity versus effective representation. I know that what I suggest in this document is beyond the scope of your commission mandate, but I'd like to just raise the issues anyhow. Firstly, I question the need to add an additional four seats in the Legislature. I'm sure you've had many people say this and give all kinds of reasons, which I won't repeat. The bottom line is that I don't accept the premise that voting parity, or one person, one vote, must be compromised to ensure effective representation for large and sparsely populated rural areas.

Clearly, urban and rural Albertans have differing expectations and opinions about what constitutes effective representation. This suggests a need to more clearly define what effective representation means and how big a constituency must be, both in terms of population and geographic extent, before it becomes unmanageable from a representational effectiveness perspective. I don't see the need to trade off voting equality for the concept of effective representation.

There's a simple and no-cost solution to this problem, and the solution is vote weighting. It's just a mathematical exercise. The concept is to weight the political voting power of each MLA to reflect the population size in the electoral district they represent. There is an example outlined there of how such a relative weighting system would work. The benefits of this approach are that it effectively restores and preserves the one person, one vote principle without impairing effective representation. There can be as many electoral districts or MLAs as are required to ensure effective representation. The weighting system would simply even out those inequities. To a certain extent the electoral district boundaries would become less important, or we could perhaps take a completely different take on how they're established.

That concludes my presentation. I thank you very much for allowing me to come and speak to you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks, Mr. Dodds. In the interests of time I'm just going to ask questions about your first presentation. One thing that we have heard is that because the Anthony Henday is relatively new, it doesn't at this point in its history create such a dividing line between the east and the west of the Henday. I take it that you take a different view of that. You see it as a significant dividing line. It seems to me that you're saying that everything west and south could be this new constituency and that everything to the east could form the new Edmonton-McClung and move up into what we call Callingwood. Is that correct?

Mr. Dodds: That's correct.

Mr. Evans: Okay. We've also heard that the river is not seen as a dividing line up in what we have proposed in Edmonton-Riverview, but we've had some comments that in Edmonton-McClung it is a dividing line. I'd be curious about your comments on that as well and just any general comments you might have about the North Saskatchewan River being a dividing line between constituencies, recognizing, as I'm sure you do, that in the Edmonton-Gold Bar area we had some of Edmonton-Gold Bar that was on the north side. It was in what we're now calling the Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly constituency. We've changed that in our draft report and moved

everything south of the river into Edmonton-Gold Bar. Any comments you might have on that would be helpful as well.

Mr. Dodds: Well, I do believe that any major physical barrier like that really does impede any kind of interchange between communities on either side of the river. It's a pretty fair hike to get to the nearest community on the south side of the river from even the most southerly portion of the existing Edmonton-McClung riding. Even the part of the existing Edmonton-McClung that is on the north side of the river, the Cameron Heights area, is pretty much isolated from everything to the north of it by the Wedgewood ravine.

Wedgewood ravine, actually, probably could arguably be considered as a reasonable boundary for the Edmonton-McClung riding. The Cameron Heights area is only accessible via the Anthony Henday. It is not accessible via any other road coming from the north. You must go on the Anthony Henday. It's unlikely that, for example, kids playing soccer are going to walk to the Callingwood fields. They're likely going to have someone drive them there or ride a bicycle along the freeway to get there.

It's my view that major roadways like the Whitemud, like the Anthony Henday do create a significant barrier to interchange back and forth. You know, with the volume of traffic on those there are only a limited number of places where you can cross safely.

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

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to continue a little bit on that theme with respect to the river as a dividing line. If I'm understanding you correctly – and please correct me if I'm not – the river is a divide, but you also have this distance and lack of community interest, so it's a bit of a combination of those that makes the proposed Edmonton-McClung, in your view, less than ideal. Would that be fair?

Mr. Dodds: Yes.

Ms Jeffs: So not only are you crossing the river, but you're travelling a fair distance, and there isn't a natural link. Thank you for that.

I was scribbling notes here that even I can't read, so I'm going to ask you to just remind me again of the boundaries. Your alternative proposal was to maintain the current Edmonton-McClung boundaries east and west of the Henday.

11:10

Mr. Dodds: If you look at the map . . .

Mr. Dobbie: Sir, there's a laser pointer. It should be on the desk there. That would be helpful.

Mr. Dodds: Okay. This area right here is 170th Street. That's Callingwood Road, and that's the Henday. Down here is Cameron Heights, which I referred to earlier, and right there is the Wedgewood ravine. You can see that although there's a road that runs down into Wedgewood ravine, it does not go through into Cameron Heights. It's this area here that I would propose be left with this area up here and that Lewis Estates, which is up there somewhere, be incorporated into this whole area, that this portion here be incorporated along with the Hamptons and the Grange and these areas here. These areas have far more in common.

As you can see, this area right in here is undergoing very rapid development. Probably the oldest area on that side of the Henday is right in here, but it developed from the mid-90s onward. It makes more sense, to my mind, to lump these areas together. It's still an unwieldy kind of a riding, but at least down the road, when you get to the stage where you have to split this unwieldy thing, the impact on this area over here would be minimal.

This is the area that you've currently proposed for the new Edmonton-McClung. What I'm suggesting is that this area be incorporated with that part of the old Edmonton-McClung and that the whole thing still be named Edmonton-McClung since that's historically what it has been for at least probably the last 20 years.

I would just comment that these areas right here, the Patricia Heights and Rio Terrace areas and Quesnell Heights, are currently part of Edmonton-McClung. That dividing line is the Patricia ravine, right there. That, again, makes a very natural boundary. Again, to get to that area from the rest of Edmonton-McClung, you have to get on the Whitemud freeway. There's no natural link. There's a walking path, but that's it. Perhaps it makes sense to put that area in Edmonton-Riverview. The links between the rest of Edmonton-Riverview and that area are better, certainly, than they are between Edmonton-McClung and that area.

That would be my proposal.

Ms Jeffs: I take it that we will have to take a look at the population on that. Are you aware of what that might be?

Mr. Dodds: No, I'm not. I've been trying to find some population data but have so far been unsuccessful.

Ms Jeffs: That's fine. I appreciate that, and I appreciate your clarification. That's all that I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you again for coming this morning.

The Chair: Thank you.

Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Mr. Dodds. Our assistants at the back can give you a copy of the Edmonton neighbourhood population data.

Mr. Dodds: Oh, okay. That would be great.

Mr. Dobbie: I appreciate your approach that was part B of your presentation. I don't know who it was that said: for every complex problem there is a solution that is simple, elegant, and wrong. I'm not sure if yours is wrong, but it's a challenge. You are aware that we are mandated, though, by legislation to consider the population and the ranges. It would be very helpful if you can give us even the names of those neighbourhoods so that we can take a look at the numbers. Again, we are really grappling with weighing these competing objectives of constituency size, natural boundaries, and communities of interest. We appear in some cases to have not been able to accommodate all three.

Mr. Dodds: In terms of the neighbourhoods these are the Donsdale, Jamieson, Hawkstone, Wedgewood, and Lessard areas in here. Let's see; that's part of Lessard as well right there. Up here is all Lewis Estates. Those are the main neighbourhoods in that area and Donsdale Estates and Cameron Heights, which are down there.

Mr. Dobbie: Good. Thanks for bringing your comments to us today.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Dodds. I'm just actually going through the population data that we have for communities. I know you can see Lewis Estates. It looks like we're going to have more work to do once we leave here. As I understand the proposal, north of what you're suggesting to us should be the Edmonton-McClung constituency – the northern boundary: is it Whitemud?

Mr. Dodds: Yes.

Dr. Archer: The challenge for us there is going to be that the Edmonton-La Perle riding that we've created already is well above the average constituency size. I'm not sure how large Lewis Estates is, but if there's a substantial population there, and it looks like there is, that change is going to have a ripple effect probably throughout all of northwestern Edmonton and southwestern Edmonton. It's one of these issues in which I appreciate your initial comment, which was: try not to change constituencies very much if you don't have to. But once we made the decision to assign one more seat to Edmonton, for better or worse that's had the impact of ensuring that just about every constituency in the city is affected.

Mr. Dodds: Understood.

Another proposal could be to extend this boundary right here along 170th over to 87th Avenue and incorporate that into the remnants of the existing Edmonton-McClung. I suspect the population in here would be similar to the population that has been removed from Edmonton-McClung in that area there, which is proposed to be part of Edmonton-Riverview.

Dr. Archer: Right. One final question. Someone had made the suggestion to us earlier that even if the changes we make are fairly minor in this part of the city, the name Edmonton-McClung should probably be associated with what we've called Edmonton-Callingwood rather than the southwestern portion of the city. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Dodds: That would be my suggestion, yeah, because this whole area here and currently this area right in here, this new area to the west of the Henday, all of this pretty much down to the river and down to the city boundaries, a fair ways down, out in rural parts of the city has always been Edmonton-McClung. To me to just take this little vestigial bit of Edmonton-McClung, stick it in this area that runs right across the southern boundary of the city all the way to Calgary Trail, and call that Edmonton-McClung really doesn't make much sense. The people in those new areas on the other side of the river and out to Calgary Trail have no history with Edmonton-McClung whereas everybody who lives in this area understands what Edmonton-McClung is and why it's called McClung.

Dr. Archer: Great. Thanks. That's all I have.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Dodds, for your presentation. We'll certainly consider it with all of the other submissions we've received. Thank you again.

Mr. Dodds: Thank you for the opportunity.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Mr. Nathan Black with the Secord community.

Mr. Black: Good morning, commissioners.

The Chair: Mr. Black, since we are on *Hansard*, we need you to give your name and who you are representing for the record.

Nathan Black

Mr. Black: My name is Nathan Black. I am a resident of the Secord community. That's in west Edmonton across from Lewis Estates on 215th Street, on the west side of the street.

I guess what I'd like to talk to the commission about today is that I want to thank you for providing me the opportunity to address you, and I'd like to point out that my opinion is that certain communities belong together for a number of reasons. Many of the existing communities of the area that I'm in now would be Edmonton-Meadowlark. Under your new configuration it would become Edmonton-Callingwood. I'm going to address why I believe that the Secord community needs to stay in that Edmonton-Meadowlark area and not be connected to the Edmonton-Callingwood riding as proposed.

11:20

At the present time the Edmonton-Meadowlark riding is contained between Stony Plain Road and the Whitemud freeway. These seem like good north-south boundaries. They make sense. Obviously, to the west is the city limits. They make sense. I understand that because of population and sizes of ridings it's going to have to expand or change. I have a proposal for that at the end of my presentation, but at this time it makes sense because, I believe, the city deals in an east-west nature. Traffic flows, the schools, the infrastructure are east-west. They haven't been built in a north-south fashion.

You know, from time to time as I talk to the people in Secord, we almost exclusively all travel downtown the same way. We almost all travel through Edmonton-Meadowlark. We don't drift north of Stony Plain Road that often. We do to shop occasionally with some of the retail merchants on 170th Street. We don't that often drift south of the Whitemud freeway other than, perhaps, to access the Lois Hole library. We have very much an east-west orientation about where we're at.

I understand that when we were lumped together, Secord with Edmonton-Callingwood, probably the concept was that it was felt that we had a lot in common with the new developments west of the Henday. I'm going to bring a little bit of my experience now to the table. I've had the opportunity to bang on thousands of doors in that area west of the Henday during an election and listen to the concerns that those people have. I've also had the opportunity to bang on doors up in the area around Secord and Lewis Estates and listen to their concerns. For two areas that are so close together, none of the concerns are the same. The concerns of the Edmonton-Callingwood people more reflect those issues south of the Anthony Henday, and Secord represents more of what Meadowlark is interested in. I'm going to go over some of those with you now.

When I knocked on doors in Edmonton-McClung, the number one issue there was noise from the Anthony Henday, and that's caused by a type of retarder brake the trucks use. Now, I had the opportunity the other day to be at a social event with the MLA from Edmonton-McClung, who told me that's still the number one issue that he hears about, the noise from the Anthony Henday highway. The other issue was their lack of overpasses. You see, the lack of overpasses on the Anthony Henday causes great consternation for the good people of Edmonton-McClung.

In my case, the only time I have to go down the Anthony Henday in that direction is when I'm going to the International Airport. I sympathize with their concerns. I think the worst 20 seconds of my life was sitting at one of those stoplights, but it's not something that motivates me every day and gets me cranked up. It certainly gets the people of Edmonton-McClung cranked up.

The other problem that they have is that there are no schools. They have no schools west of the Henday, and they're whining to the province about building schools. They also have a problem because they have to get their children across the Anthony Henday highway to get them to schools. Now it either requires a parent to do it or school busing. Those are the issues that the people in Edmonton-McClung have.

Now, a little bit about the Secord community. We can't hear the Anthony Henday. Neither can the people in Lewis Estates. So that's not an issue for us. You know, as I said about the overpasses, that's not a driving issue for us. They don't have any schools. We have a school directly outside of the gates to our subdivision on 215th Street. They have an issue with getting their kids across the street to get to the schools. Our big issue is that every morning and every afternoon the Edmonton Police Service graciously sits out there to enforce the 30-kilometre speed limit in a school zone. It's an extremely safe crossing for the kids from the Secord area. Basically, our issues are very, very different, the Secord issues.

The other thing is that we have been built as a planned community. We're just an extension of existing communities that have infrastructure. West of the Henday, that's a brand new development that has been put up with absolutely no existing infrastructure there at the time, so we really don't have a lot in common between the two communities to be lumped together.

Now, on a very personal note and pragmatic note I think that the people of Secord and Lewis Estates may not be well served by being members of Edmonton-Callingwood. We would represent such a small percentage of the population that our concerns may always get shuffled to the bottom of the deck when it comes to dealing with elected officials. When they have 85 per cent of the people, who are worried about noise, and our 10 or 12 or 15 per cent of the people, who have other issues, we have to realistically wonder if we're going to receive the best possible representation.

The other matter is that Edmonton-McClung recently has had in the last year unprecedented investment by this government. They've committed to build overpasses. They've committed to build schools. They've committed to put huge, huge resources into the Edmonton-McClung area. For us from Secord now to be taken out of Edmonton-Meadowlark and put into Edmonton-McClung, I get the feeling we're going to be put into an area that's probably not going to receive any substantial funding for a great number of years based on the unprecedented amounts of money and investment this government has made.

I don't necessarily believe that's fair to those people who, you know, purchased houses. We purchased them in a particular area for a particular reason. Now we're getting lumped in with a group that has had this unprecedented investment, which really doesn't improve our quality of life in a substantive way. I mean, it's great that they've got their schools. It's great that they've got their overpasses. But it doesn't really benefit the people of Secord or Lewis Estates in any substantial way.

My suggestion is that if we make the Whitemud freeway the southern boundary and move up to the Yellowhead highway and encompass mobile home parks and that housing development up there in the north – I've gone up there and talked to some of the people; they, too, travel downtown in the same way we do, and they, too, do go to the same commercial areas as we do – it seems like a much more natural fit than including south of the Anthony Henday.

Now, when I went through and did the numbers and tried to crunch the numbers – and I hope I'm correct here – I ended up with about 42,500 residents once I redid the numbers from the available numbers. That's what this new Edmonton-Meadowlark riding would look like.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.
Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Black. Secord has a fairly small population. According to the data that I have, it's just under 300 people, but I don't have any data for Lewis Estates. Do you know how big of a community that is?

Mr. Black: I understand it's about 2,700.

Dr. Archer: Okay. We'd be moving about 3,000 people, about 8 per cent of a standard constituency size at 40,000, out of Edmonton-Callingwood. Do you have any suggestions for what you would recommend with respect to the Edmonton-Callingwood riding, then, and areas south and east from there? This is one of those instances in which a change in one riding is going to have a ripple effect throughout quite a few constituencies.

11:30

Mr. Black: Well, I can tell you from my experience in Edmonton-McClung that they get most of their volunteers for any organization in that area from the Westridge-Wolf Willow area. That area would greatly benefit by having those areas included: very civic-minded people that get involved in just about every cause, every charity, every opportunity to help the community. Edmonton-Callingwood would probably be very well served if they could retain those people of Westridge-Wolf Willow.

Dr. Archer: Right. Okay. Thanks. I have no further questions.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Mr. Black. I'm flipping through. I don't recall seeing a submission from you posted on our website. Had you made a written submission already?

Mr. Black: I haven't myself, no.

Mr. Dobbie: I see that you have a drawing that you've brought. It would be very helpful if you would leave a copy so we can ensure that that's captured.

Mr. Black: Absolutely.

Mr. Dobbie: The boundaries that you're proposing are all outlined on there, and the total population is very close to the quotient in what you're suggesting. Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much, Mr. Black, for coming. I don't think I have any questions. I'm looking forward to looking at the diagram as well just to clarify a little bit, and we will have to look at those populations. This is clearly an area – I think you were in a little earlier this morning – that we're going to have to do a little more thinking about. So I very much appreciate you coming today.

Thank you.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Mr. Black. Two questions. The first is just in relation to your comment that you feel that both Secord and Lewis Estates would have a greater voice in

what is now Edmonton-Meadowlark and what we're proposing to be Edmonton-La Perle. You know, with the population in those two areas and the demographics of Edmonton-Meadowlark, Edmonton-La Perle and the demographics of Edmonton-McClung, it would seem to me that you'd have more voice in Edmonton-McClung, which is mostly residential. What am I missing there?

Mr. Black: Okay. Well, I think the issue is that in my experience with Edmonton-McClung – and it was quite substantial; I banged on an awful lot of doors, thousands and thousands of doors – they have a universal problem. If you have 85 per cent of your constituency all in agreement on what the top four issues are, and then you have a small little group that's 8 or 10 per cent of the total size of the constituency, I think their problems would get pushed to the bottom.

Now, in the Edmonton-Meadowlark scheme of things the big issue here going forward is going to be the LRT. The way the LRT is being planned for expansion, we would have one MLA speaking on it, the Edmonton-Meadowlark MLA. Under this plan we would now have two MLAs. We would have the Edmonton-Meadowlark MLA for almost 90 per cent of the new proposed line and the Edmonton-Callingwood MLA worrying about the small number of constituents in Lewis Estates and Secord that would be affected by this LRT. There's a case where, you know: can we reasonably expect the MLA from Edmonton-Callingwood to take this small issue and carry it forward for a small group of people? But if we're lumped together with Edmonton-Meadowlark, in which the whole constituency would be affected by the LRT, we may have a bigger voice with our MLA.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. The second question. I believe I heard you say that the north boundary of Edmonton-La Perle, Edmonton-Meadowlark as it is now, should not go beyond the Yellowhead Trail. That leaves some industrial area to the north. Am I correct, then, in taking that you would suggest that that be added to what we're now calling Edmonton-North West?

Mr. Black: Edmonton-North West, I think, was your old Edmonton-Calder? Yeah. I mean, when I talked to the people at Secord – and I talked to about 150 people when I went door to door and asked them for input – not a single one of them uses the services at the north end of the proposed riding at 137th Avenue. I couldn't find a single person who said that they regularly do any commercial business on 137th Avenue. We all use Stony Plain Road. We all use 170th Street. But not a single person goes as far north there. It's just so far out of the way and inconvenient based on the east-west flow of the way we all do business: commercial, education, transportation, getting to and from work.

Some of us do, though, and I found a number of people will go up 215th Street to the Yellowhead and access the east end of the city if we're going to hockey games or things like that. So maybe that could be a new boundary that's a natural boundary for this particular constituency.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you. Those are all my questions. I appreciate your time.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Black. That was most helpful, and we'll certainly take it into account. If you'd be so kind as to leave your map at the back, we'll make some copies of it.

Mr. Black: I will. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Mr. David Coutts.

The Chair: Good morning.

Mr. Coutts: Good morning, Your Honour, ladies and gentlemen of the commission.

The Chair: Since we're on *Hansard*, would you give them your name? Thank you.

David Coutts

Mr. Coutts: You bet. My name is Dave Coutts. I presently reside in Edmonton, coming out of retirement of being the representative of the constituency of Livingstone-MacLeod since 1993. I was born and raised in Fort MacLeod. I had my businesses there, and I raised my family there and was proud to be a contributing member of that community for a number of years and then had the honour and pleasure of serving as their MLA for 14 and a half years in the Legislature.

I want to thank you very much for this opportunity. What you're doing here is just so, so important. It is the very basis of our democracy, and I congratulate you for taking up this challenge. It is a challenge.

I tend to be a bit of a history buff, and some of my comments this morning are going to talk a little bit about history and how important it is. What you are going through right now is not unlike what Sir Frederick Haultain went through when he was the Premier of the Northwest Territories. He had a very sparse population, and he had convinced Ottawa that we should be in control of our own destiny in the western part of this nation.

He had to deal with three major factors. First of all, how do you represent such a large area with such few people in it, pockets of small settlements setting up, et cetera? Some would eventually turn into cities, and that's what we're given today. You're dealing with the same problems that he had back in the formation of the Northwest Territories. The other issue that he had to deal with, which is interesting that we're still dealing with it today, is representation for and how to fund schools in a large area with so limited funds.

My appeal to you today is going to be for the Livingstone-MacLeod constituency. I think I'm the last presenter here, and I did that on purpose because I did not want to take the time up of the people from Edmonton who had concerns as well about some of the results of the interim report. So that's why I came just before lunch, and I'm the only thing between you and lunch, so I plan, Your Honour, on being brief.

The name of MacLeod is synonymous with history. The name MacLeod for the constituency MacLeod is named not after the town of Fort MacLeod but after the person of James Farquharson MacLeod, who was a major in the North West Mounted Police, came out here on the trek to establish law and order. During the trek he gained the respect of his men, the people that served under him, but he also gained the respect of Commissioner French, who was leading the trek west to establish law and order. When the trek ran into difficulty, they looked to James Farquharson MacLeod to solve their problems, to get horses and food to make the final stretch to go to Fort Whoop-Up to get rid of the whisky traders. He was up to that challenge.

11:40

He and he alone had the leadership to establish law and order in an untamed land. He was an honest and good communicator with his men. He recognized that he needed to have treaties with the native folks of the Blackfoot tribes. He was instrumental in making sure that those treaties, which are still in effect today, were signed.

Upon decommissioning from the North West Mounted Police, he was made colonel, and he became a magistrate. The records show that he had a very firm hand but a very soft heart. In 1905 as a magistrate he sat in the first Legislature of the province of Alberta as an ex officio member. I believe that that was the respect that the founding fathers of our province had for a man who established law and order and stood for good government in our province.

The constituency name of Macleod is named after the person, not the town, and you will note that that's the second time I've said that. That's what I want to leave you with.

The constituency of Macleod was one of the first constituencies in the province. In the interim report I've noticed that you have changed the name to suggest that the name become High River-Crowsnest. I understand the reason for that. What you've done is included High River into the constituency that's already existing as Livingstone-Macleod. In doing so, I think what you wanted to do was to make sure that the folks in High River were included as well as bringing in the folks in the Crowsnest Pass as part of the constituency.

In 1993 the constituency name was Pincher Creek-Macleod. There was a boundary review in 1997, and we changed the name to Livingstone-Macleod because we had difficulty between 1993 and 1997 with communities because they felt that their name was excluded from the 1993 report and should be included. So in 1997, when we had the boundary review, all of those communities agreed that maybe we should do it on a historical factor.

The name of Macleod was maintained in 1997 in order to provide historical continuity. There is a range of mountains that is between the Crowsnest Pass and Pincher Creek. It's called the Livingstone Range, and it's named after Sam Livingstone, who I believe – I could stand be corrected on this – was a park ranger in Banff national park. There is a trout hatchery named after Sam Livingstone. This row of mountains that extends from Nanton all the way down to Lundbreck, Alberta, is the eastern face of the Rocky Mountains. So we kept the historical integrity of that name and combined it with the historical integrity of the Macleod name and came up with more of a historical name for the constituency and called it Livingstone-Macleod. It kept all the towns and the cities quite happy in terms of the fact that at least they had a row of mountains that they could look at and say: this is part of our identity.

I'm going to ask one simple thing here today. The reason I'm doing it from Edmonton is because I now live here. I have retired here, but my heart is in my constituency of Macleod. I'm asking you to maintain the integrity of that constituency. Please keep the Macleod family name on that constituency, on the constituency that he built, a constituency that he was proud of. I am going to ask you to please keep the name Livingstone in that constituency as well.

I'd also like to just take another minute and talk to you briefly about my adopted constituency of Edmonton-Meadowlark, which under your interim report is now Edmonton-La Perle. I want to talk briefly about the name change again. Edmonton-Meadowlark, from my 18 months of living here, is synonymous with the community. There is a road named Meadowlark Road. I did not know about the community of La Perle until your interim report came out, and it made me do some research. I just think it's an unfamiliar name, so I implore you to consider the name Edmonton-Meadowlark again.

I've noticed in my 18 months here that the traffic in Edmonton-Meadowlark as it presently exists is east-west. The folks live on the west there somewhere on the west side of Anthony Henday, and they travel east-west to their schools, to their churches, to their jobs downtown. The north-west traffic on 170th Street all the way up and beyond to the Yellowhead is commercial traffic. The interests of the MLA are with the people, not so much with the commercialization,

so I'm looking at the east-west traffic as what should be the guide for your decisions in the future.

I really think that upon analyzing the poll map in Edmonton-Meadowlark, if you're looking for growth and looking for more population in the future, poll 63: there's potential building and population growth there. So at some point in time if your decision at this particular boundary review is to go north and increase the population, at some time in the future as the city expands out to that western boundary between Anthony Henday and the city limits and poll 63, you're going to have to rejig the northern boundary to almost come back to what it is presently anyway. That's just my observation.

Thank you very much for your time. I do not believe that you need any more paper. I did not prepare anything other than what's in my own mind and in my own heart. I know you have lots of paper, and I did not want to have to leave anything with you. I just really hope that you will revisit my comments in *Hansard* and take them into consideration in the difficult job that you have in forming the new boundaries for this wonderful province of ours.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

The Chair: Thank you.

Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, David. I don't think I've ever called you Mr. Coutts, so I don't think I'm going to start now. Thank you very much for your presentation both with respect to your constituency of Livingstone-Macleod and also Meadowlark-La Perle.

A couple of questions on Livingstone-Macleod. You did recognize that we've attached, if you will, High River to the new constituency, and I hear you loud and clear about Sam Livingstone and Colonel Macleod. Are you suggesting that we not include the name High River because that would create other issues for other towns within that constituency?

Mr. Coutts: Actually, I've given a lot of thought to that and how you include High River into that. High River, of course, is synonymous with ranching. It's synonymous with the establishment of our province. I believe that the people in High River will endorse the Macleod name because Colonel Macleod was a magistrate in Calgary as well, and his name is very, very well known in southern Alberta. They've known it. The Macleod riding is a federal riding as well. They are in the federal riding of Macleod. So in that consideration I thought that adding the name High River might confuse the issue. When I say "confuse the issue," you might then take the tendency of wanting to go back to naming of towns and communities along the way.

I think the people of High River know the Macleod name very, very well, and I think they know the meaning of the Macleod name. It's not after the town of Fort Macleod; it's after the man.

11:50

Mr. Evans: I don't assume there would be any difficulty with leaving the name Macleod. I agree with you there. I think it still requires some work on our part to determine whether or not the people of High River and the elected officials in the communities there would feel left out if their community's name was not included in the constituency.

One question that I'd appreciate your comments on is in terms of the size of the constituency as we have proposed it to be. Some people in the High River area have said: boy, that's a very large constituency. The counterargument to that is an excellent road

system from the north to the south, and that would not create any undue hardship for the MLA. With your experience I'd appreciate your comments on that.

Mr. Coutts: Oh, Brian, where do we begin? How much time have you got? As an MLA I would spend, between travel from the constituency to Edmonton and then back to the constituency from Edmonton and then around the constituency every week, under the old boundaries approximately 15 to 20 hours a week in my car. I think having a good road system where the communities are tied into it really, really helps. If the communities were spread all over, I know I would have been spending more time in the car. But even at up to 20 hours a week in my car, I thought it was a lot of wasted time even though you did make a lot of phone calls, et cetera, while you were in the car. Of course, I always did it with hands-off kinds of devices and that type of thing because I recognized the danger that it was not only to my life but to other people's lives. You can do work in the car, but it's taxing on your time and on your body. Really, it is.

I think there's another issue that really needs to be addressed here in terms of representation other than by population. I know you're controlled by the plus or minus 25 per cent. I know that. It's not only the amount of area you have to cover but the issues that are in that area. The constituencies of Livingstone-Macleod, Highwood, and Banff-Cochrane are difficult constituencies to represent in terms of the number of issues that you have to deal with. You're dealing with everything from public land, green zone, resource base, to water management. You get to all the recreation areas and the people that feel that they're entitled to go out onto the public land, and how do they do it? The camping and the recreation issues and all those types of things and the conflicts on the land: all of that takes a tremendous amount of an MLA's time. The larger you make that area, the more difficult it is for that MLA to get to those areas and effectively get a sense of what's happening there and take it back to the appropriate committees and the appropriate ministers, et cetera. So I think making the area bigger just for the sake of population is a mistake given the issues that are out there.

The other thing. Once you get to the prairie, after you go through the foothills and the ranching and that type of thing, huge agriculture component of grain and water management and dealing with the watersheds and all of that type of thing, it makes it very, very complicated. Then you get into the communities like Claresholm, that has a hospital, and a very good hospital, but attached to that is a care centre for schizophrenia, mental health, et cetera, et cetera. And it goes on and on and on. You go into the Crownsnest Pass. You've got mining issues. You've got transportation issues in the Crownsnest Pass. Again, if you add all of those together and you add on another part of the constituency, like the town of High River, with no disrespect to those folks, I think you've stretched an MLA way too far. I think it would be difficult for that MLA, either him or her, to represent that area with that kind of population with all of the issues that they have.

Sorry to take so long with that explanation, but having lived it for 14 and a half years, each time that we had a boundary review, we added more onto that constituency. I just found that every time we added more on, there was just a little bit less time taken in the other towns and communities, and there were some rural communities I could not get to but maybe once a year. The more you add on just because of population, the less opportunity you have to really represent the people.

Mr. Evans: Well, that's very good advice for us and very helpful for us in our deliberations. It's not necessarily making them easier, but it's certainly important advice to have. Thank you for that.

Mr. Coutts: Thank you, Brian.

Mr. Evans: Those are my questions.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Coutts, for your presentation. I don't actually have any – well, I guess, I might have one question. My first degree was in history, so I very much appreciated learning a little bit about that southern area of the province that I didn't know. Some of the names were certainly familiar, but always good to hear a little bit from someone who is passionate and knowledgeable.

Just one question. Am I to take it from your presentation that you have had an opportunity to talk to people in your former constituency about the name since our report came out, or is this really, you know, coming from your long-standing sense of how the area is attached to that name?

Mr. Coutts: I have made a number of calls to former constituents who, I'm proud to say, are still friends, and I've asked them. You heard me say: my heart is still there. I've asked them to get involved, and I've asked them to make presentations, so when you go down to Lethbridge I believe next week, I'm just hoping that they're lined up to give you more of what I just gave you. Yes, I've talked to a number of them, and I get a sense that there was some concern about losing the name.

Ms Jeffs: About losing the Livingstone-Macleod name?

Mr. Coutts: About losing the Livingstone-Macleod name and going back to the cities or the towns. As one person said to me: "They're picking winners and losers again. We went through that back in 1997." He didn't want to go through that again, so I encouraged him to make a representation.

Thank you for sharing the passion of our history. I believe our history is something that we should never forget. I don't think we have to dwell on it forever, but it's something that always should be there and that we can always point to and say: this is how we became a province. Thank you for sharing that passion. I'd love to talk to you about it sometime.

Ms Jeffs: Well, thank you. I hope we have an opportunity at some point.

Thank you again for that. We will be listening for those presentations when we are down south next week. Certainly, it was a very creative solution back in '97 to avoid the picking of winners and losers, so I appreciate that as well.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you.

Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Coutts, again, thank you for the suggestion. You'll be pleased to hear that we heard from Muriel Stanleyvenne earlier, who is a prominent Albertan, and she gave us some advice on names. I'm hoping that in our final report we will be providing some commentary to the Legislature to set some direction with respect to names. We're given a blank slate.

Again, your comments on picking winners and losers is certainly not what was intended, but one of the things about changing a name is that it provokes some response and debate, which is why we're here. Thank you for all of that.

12:00

Mr. Coutts: You're welcome. Thank you very much. Thanks for those comments. I appreciate that, and thanks for the contact. I'll be looking at *Hansard* to see what she said.

The Chair: Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Mr. Coutts, as everyone else has said, thanks so much for your presentation. You know, I see electoral boundary map-making as an ongoing conversation. Each of the boundary commissions comes in halfway through that conversation, and we're presented with a set of decisions that have already been made by previous commissions and then try to establish some principles for going forward.

I guess you recognize from our report that, in general, our approach has been to use geographical markers rather than historical figures in identifying constituency names. I think your passionate intervention today will certainly provide an opportunity for us to revisit that not only for this riding but also for some other ridings as well. It's one of the issues that generated lots of input to the boundaries commission, particularly with respect to the Grant Notley heritage or legacy and the possibility of recognizing that as well. As

I say, it's an ongoing conversation and dialogue, and I think your comments will help move that discussion forward as we reconvene after our public session and revisit this issue.

Mr. Coutts: Thank you very much for that comment and the other comments. It's reassuring to people that they have been listened to. And good luck. It's a daunting task you have, but it's a necessary one; it really, really is. Good luck.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Coutts. Your comments have been very much appreciated and give us an even broader perspective to look into the issues we have to deal with. I very much appreciate it.

Mr. Coutts: Thank you, Your Honour.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard?

There being none, we will proceed to our plane to Peace River.

[The hearing adjourned at 12:02 p.m.]

