

PUBLIC HEARING HELD AT THE TELUS CONVENTION CENTRE, CALGARY
22 OCTOBER 2002

INDEX OF PRESENTERS - CALGARY 2:00 PM

NO.	NAME OF PRESENTER	PAGE
1	REBECCA AIZENMAN	5 - 15
2	MIKE LINKLETTER	16 - 22
3	TRUPER MCBRIDE	22 - 26
4	JUDY STEWART	26 - 33
5	MILES PALMER	34 - 36
6	DARREN CUNNINGHAM	37 - 44
7	JACK BEAKMAN	44 - 49
8	DAVID FULTON	49 - 54
9	ROGER GIBBONS	54 - 70

INDEX OF PRESENTERS - CALGARY 7:30 PM

1	ALLAN KIERNAN	76 - 87
2	BRUCE MCDONALD	87 - 92
3	BARRY RUST	92 - 100
4	TUDOR BEATTIE	100 - 109
5	JIM STEVENSON	109 - 117

1 Public Hearing held at The Telus Convention Centre, Calgary
2 22 October, 2002, commencing at 2 P.M.

3

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the Calgary Public
5 Hearing of the Federal Electoral Boundaries
6 Commission.

7 My name is MacCallum. I'm a Judge of the Court
8 of Queen's Bench in Edmonton. I was appointed by the
9 Chief Justice of Alberta. On my right is
10 Ms. Ritu Khullar, a practising Lawyer in Edmonton, and
11 on my left, Donald J. Barry, a Political Scientist
12 from the University of Calgary. Both of my colleagues
13 were appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

14 Now the rest of our staff, on our immediate right
15 is Miranda Petryshyn, the Commission Secretary. To
16 her right, Olga Koval, the Reporter, and Dawn Mathews
17 is on our left. She is our Geography Specialist.

18 We are an independent Commission, operating under
19 the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act of 1985. We
20 are intended to be and we are completely independent
21 of any political or administrative influence.

22 Our purpose here today is to consider the
23 proposal which we have developed and which looks like
24 this. Copies of it are available, if you don't have
25 one. The object of the exercise today, ladies and
26 gentlemen, is electoral boundary redistribution. It
27 is not the allocation of seats amongst the various

1 Provinces, which is a matter fixed by the operation of
2 law. Due to the interest in this last subject
3 however, I can just briefly explain how it comes about
4 but apart from that, the subject is not open for
5 discussion today.

6 One starts with the 282 seats that were present
7 in the House of Commons in 1985. Subtract 3 seats for
8 the northern Territories, Nunavut, Northwest
9 Territories and Yukon, that leaves you 279. You
10 divide that number into the population of Canada as
11 fixed at this recent Census, 2001, and that gives you
12 the national quotient. Then you divide that national
13 quotient into the population of the 10 Provinces of
14 Canada and you come up with a figure for each
15 Province.

16 Alberta has 28 seats and British Columbia and
17 Ontario's allocation of seats is fixed by this simple
18 arithmetic as well. The other Provinces get more
19 seats than they would otherwise have been entitled to
20 by reason of the operation of two clauses, the
21 Senatorial exemption in 1915, which decrees that no
22 Province shall have fewer seats in the House of
23 Commons than it had Senators in 1915; and also the
24 Grandfather clause which states that no Province shall
25 have fewer seats than it had in the 33rd Parliament in
26 1976 . So 7 of the 10 Provinces profit from the
27 operation of those two exempting clauses.

1 All we have to remember for today's purposes is
2 that Alberta has 2.9 million people. It will have 28
3 seats in the next Parliament, whereas it now has 26.

4 The provincial quota for -- or the average
5 riding, if you like, population is 106,243 -- I think,
6 yes, that's right.

7 So the process that we are going through now is
8 really the second stage. We developed this proposal
9 which I showed you and which, by the way, is available
10 on the Website over here, and it came out in summary
11 form in the newspapers. If you are interested any
12 more, by the way, in that representational formula and
13 the history of the matter, pick up one of these
14 booklets as you leave. It's called Representation in
15 the House of Commons of Canada.

16 We've held most of our public hearings now.
17 We'll finish this week, God willing, and then we go on
18 to revise our proposal as a result of what we've heard
19 from the public hearings and from various written
20 submissions which have been made to us.

21 Our revised report will go to the Speaker of the
22 House of Commons by the 15th of December next and from
23 there to a Committee of the House of Commons where
24 Members of Parliament will examine and critique it.
25 It will come back to us then for preparation of
26 possible revision and preparation of the final report,
27 which must be in by July of 2003.

1 It will not be operational for an election before
2 July of 2004, so if an election is called before July
3 next year, it will be contested on the basis of the
4 ridings as they now exist.

5 The rules for today, ladies and gentlemen, are
6 these: There will be 15 minutes allocated to each
7 presenter. The presenter is asked to come forward and
8 speak into the microphone. The entire proceeding is
9 being taken down verbatim for the production of a
10 transcript, which we will use later in revising our
11 earlier work. I will have to enforce relevancy.
12 There are many matters people like to talk about
13 connected with electoral boundaries, but not
14 everything is relevant to today's proceedings. We are
15 only concerned with the redistribution of the
16 boundaries. The presenters may ask us questions
17 during the course of their submissions if they want.
18 We won't answer them right on the spot, but if they
19 leave us some time between the conclusion of their
20 remarks and the 15 minutes, we'll try to answer them
21 then. If we can't, we will do it -- at least we will
22 consider the matter later.

23 Everybody should understand that we can't promise
24 you action on your particular point of view because we
25 have to take a general view of this matter and balance
26 competing interests, of course, but every submission
27 will receive the attention it deserves. There will be

1 no opportunity, I'm afraid, for questions or
2 presentations from the floor. We are here to listen
3 to registered presenters.

4 The first of these appears to be Ms. Rebecca
5 Aizenman from Calgary.

6 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
7 Members of the Commission for the opportunity to
8 present to you a point of view regarding the
9 redistribution, particularly of the most westerly
10 section of Calgary East.

11 My concerns are in the area that by community
12 name is known as Britannia, Riverdale, Bel-Aire,
13 Mayfair, Meadowlark Park, Windsor Park, and Elboya.

14 Sir, I would have used Census track numbers for
15 the convenience of the Commission to refer to this
16 area but as late as yesterday afternoon I could not
17 obtain these from any Website, starting with Stats
18 Canada or Elections Canada, so I must do it
19 descriptively.

20 I know the area extremely well because that area,
21 if I may digress for a moment, is a considerable
22 section of the Provincial constituency of Calgary
23 Elbow. I know the area from top to bottom because I
24 have worked at least three elections in that site.
25 According to the guidelines found in the Election
26 Boundaries Readjustment Act, R.S. 1985, C.E.-3, the
27 readjustment exercise -- and I'm quoting: "Is not

1 simply a mathematical computation but rather a
2 delicate balancing act that must take into account
3 human interest as well as geographic characteristics,
4 but in fixing the electoral district boundaries, the
5 Commission must take into account or must consider the
6 community of interest or community of identity in the
7 historical pattern of an electoral district." I quote
8 from page 12, A History of the Vote in Canada,
9 published in 1997 by the Minister of Public Works and
10 Government Services. This information is also
11 available in pamphlet form.

12 I will emphasize the historical pattern of the
13 district and before the end of the week, sir, I will
14 make available to the Commission a written submission,
15 with electoral maps, which I have managed to piece
16 together from the excellent files, the clipping file
17 of the Calgary Public Library. I was able to show the
18 progression of electoral districts in Calgary from the
19 days of one seat, to where we are today, and my
20 argument, particularly to you Dr. Barry, lends itself
21 better to an examination of the maps on site and I
22 will have those presented to you.

23 MS. KHULLAR: Excuse me, Ms. Aizenman, if
24 it's of assistance, there is an electronic pointer on
25 the podium. If you want to point to anything on the
26 map, just push down the light, if that is helpful at
27 all.

1 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: At one point it may be.

2 Thank you, madam secretary.

3 In 1986, the Commission chaired by the Honourable
4 William Sinclair -- he chaired a Commission which
5 looked also at the boundaries of Alberta and there was
6 concern expressed about the name of Edmonton
7 Strathcona. The argument was made, and I quote, that
8 Edmonton Strathcona should be retained, page 8. I use
9 this as case precedence.

10 In selecting names for proposed districts in
11 Edmonton and in Alberta, the Commission considers
12 that, with one exception, reference to geographic
13 directions are more easily recognized by the public --
14 page 8 of the back page of the handout that was part
15 of the insert in the newspapers at that time.

16 Accordingly, I have a great deal of difficulty
17 trying to accept the fact that the area from the right
18 bank of the Elbow River, as defined in your
19 description -- from the right bank of the Elbow River,
20 to at least MacLeod Trail, down to Glenmore Trail, has
21 been placed in Calgary East.

22 Historically, sir, and Members of the Commission,
23 I was able to trace the location of this area,
24 starting in 1952 with the newly created seat of
25 Calgary South. Various parts of this constituency
26 were always part of Calgary South and more recent
27 years, Calgary Southwest, and as of 1993, part of the

1 constituency, the boundary line being at 50th Avenue,
2 became part of Calgary Centre. The progression shows
3 up much better in a series of geographic or historical
4 maps.

5 I have to be -- I am going to be very strong in
6 my next comment. I can understand why the river bank
7 was chosen because supposedly it is an easy,
8 identifiable landmark, but I would point out to
9 Members of the Commission that in Calgary we use a
10 geographic grid of coordinates that date back to the
11 time when the CPR did the land survey for Calgary.

12 Centre Street marks the division between east and
13 west. Centre Street on the map that was published in
14 this insert -- and it is easy to identify it -- Centre
15 Street begins, literally, in the centre of Calgary at
16 that time, extends itself south, and on a grid, Centre
17 Street becomes Fairmont Drive. By the same survey
18 system, the Bow River in the north was used as the
19 coordinate for dividing Calgary into north and south,
20 it was very simple. If you lived north of the river,
21 you were north; if you lived south of the river, you
22 were south.

23 The CPR tracks were used as a mindset for
24 defining Calgary east, small letters, or east Calgary.
25 In the imagery of the City -- and I went to some urban
26 planning material with which I have some
27 familiarity -- the CPR tracks, in the history of

1 Calgary and the mind of Calgarians, when this was
2 still a city of 2, 300,000 people, it was always east
3 of the tracks. So east of the tracks was east. It
4 was a defining landmark in the geographic imagery and
5 the geography and the politics of Calgary.

6 The river bank that you have chosen is a
7 wonderful natural feature -- not as strong as the Bow
8 River but nowhere in the establishment of electoral
9 boundaries for Calgary has such a large piece of the
10 river been used. It is a great natural landmark and I
11 can see why you chose it because it is easy to
12 identify with, but historically, Members of the
13 Commission, that part of Calgary East has always been,
14 at least to the MacLeod Trail, it has always been part
15 of Calgary South starting in 1952, or Calgary
16 Southwest or Calgary Centre. To put it into Calgary
17 East defies geography. I can understand why perhaps
18 you did it without having the individual Census tract
19 information available because even as of yesterday, we
20 could not locate a key so I could pull these tracts
21 out by number. I understand the numbers are available
22 to you with your assistance.

23 Calgary East is a constituency where the rate of
24 growth since 1996 has only been by one percent.
25 Calgary Nosehill in the past five years has grown by
26 at least 35 percent, according to figures from Census
27 Canada, so I tried to rationalize why you would put,

1 historically, a part of Calgary Centre and a part of
2 Calgary Southwest into Calgary East unless it was
3 strictly for convenience, strictly because of number
4 crunching.

5 Historically, geographically, socially and
6 culturally, the area that I'm concerned about has its
7 own community of interest. Its children go basically
8 to the same schools, east and west of Elbow Drive.
9 The community would tend to shop either at a place
10 called Britannia Shopping Centre, 50th Avenue and
11 Elbow Drive, which is one of the markers between
12 Calgary Centre and Calgary Southwest. The community
13 would tend to shop further downstream, if I may use
14 the name of the mini supermarket at Elbow Drive and
15 4th Street. The geography and the road pattern
16 normally take people in that direction.

17 I'm not going to go into the economic aspects or
18 economic data, but socially and culturally, it is very
19 difficult to see a similarity between this part of the
20 constituency and the rest of Calgary East. In my
21 knowledge of Calgary -- and I do know a little bit
22 about the City -- there is a tremendous gap between
23 this part of Calgary East and the rest of Calgary
24 East, which is to the far east. This area has much
25 more in common with the areas I've already stated.

26 I did some checking of the electoral turnout, at
27 least for the provincial election in 1997, with which

1 I have a great deal familiarity. The turnout in this
2 area was considerably higher than in any other polls,
3 and I use the provincial figures. This is an area
4 that has a very highly educated population, a very
5 professional education, professional background, and
6 the voter turnout is extremely high. I averaged it
7 roughly to about 65 percent, which is a very good
8 turnout for Calgary because in the last election,
9 according to a clipping by John Ibbitson in
10 yesterday's Globe, Alberta had the lowest turnout in
11 Alberta in the election of 2000.

12 I'm going to argue and I will choose my words
13 very carefully. Should the present boundaries be
14 maintained where what was traditionally part of
15 Calgary Centre and/or part of Calgary Southwest, be
16 added to the far -- and I say the far east -- to the
17 east of the river, it may affect voter turnout, people
18 of the Commission. We have enough difficulty in
19 Canada as it is getting people out to vote because
20 people feel they can no longer effect the system. I
21 refer to yesterday's article, which I will include
22 with my submission. We have to do everything we can
23 to get people out to vote and as last night's
24 headlines indicated, somebody is going to attempt to
25 make things more accountable and maybe that will help
26 bring more people out to vote.

27 I just think that -- the other argument I want to

1 make, people, is that when you have a southwest
2 address -- and I read the maps, Landsdowne Avenue,
3 Riverdale Avenue, Britannia Drive, Coronation Drive --
4 virtually every avenue with a descriptive name in this
5 affected area, and two thirds of the street and avenue
6 numbers by the grid system, have the coordinate
7 southwest. How can you live in the affected part --
8 which I've already referred to descriptively -- how
9 can you have a southwest address and be part of an
10 electoral district called Calgary East? I'm sorry,
11 people, it defies my sense of geographic logic and
12 I've had to teach geography in the past too, so we
13 began with coordinates. If I have a southwest address
14 and my postal codes -- which I checked very quickly
15 yesterday -- match to the south or the southwest, I
16 think it is going to be very difficult to educate --
17 to indicate to people when the next election comes,
18 oh, you have been moved into Calgary East and people
19 will just shake their heads because my argument,
20 Members of the Commission, rests on the fact that from
21 1952 forward, this part was part of Calgary South. As
22 a matter of fact -- and I will submit this in print to
23 you -- I found three polling stations to go with the
24 map, where the polling stations -- one was for
25 Britannia, which had just appeared as a suburb in
26 Calgary in 1952 -- two polling stations were for
27 Windsor Park and at that time the newly created seat

1 of Calgary South had just appeared on the map.

2 I traced the historical progression of
3 communities in the affected area and these areas also
4 begin to develop in the 50s, the 60s, the 70s.
5 Manchester, which is part of the area, had been a
6 light industrial suburb when the boundaries of
7 Calgary, I think, extended as far as 50th Avenue or as
8 far south, at the most, to Glenmore Trail.

9 I would respectfully request that the Commission
10 look at the numbers for the affected Census tracts.
11 I believe adjustments can be made, and as I quoted
12 before from two sources, one has to take into account
13 the historical identity, the historical context, and
14 the historical background and placement of
15 constituencies when you devise the electoral
16 boundaries.

17 I may have further comments, which would be of
18 particular interest to Dr. Barry, regarding the
19 availability of sources when you are doing this kind
20 of research, but I'll deal with it another matter.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you would be kind
22 enough to give us written submissions, ma'am.

23 Would you put that revised one up, please.

24 MS. DAWN MATHEWS: Sure.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Aizenman, am I saying
26 your name correctly?

27 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: Aizenman, please. It doesn't

1 matter, whichever you're more comfortable with, sir.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. That
3 was a most authoritative presentation and we
4 appreciate it. We have anticipated -- more
5 specifically, Dr. Barry has anticipated you to some
6 degree, in response to written submissions which have
7 been made to us, and we, as you can see, are working
8 on something there that will answer some of your
9 concerns.

10 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: May I just add one point and
11 perhaps end on a note of levity.

12 If you live in Calgary, there are two major
13 nodes, two major geographic economic features, which
14 are the Chinook Centre, which everybody knows.
15 Chinook Centre is integral to the lifestyle of the
16 district that I have just described. I can't fathom
17 Chinook Centre in Calgary East and the new name of the
18 constituency, which is Calgary South Centre, if I
19 may -- and I think as an educator you would appreciate
20 this remark, Dr. Barry -- my students would say does
21 that mean we go to South Centre to vote because South
22 Centre is another major, major shopping economic
23 aspect of the south end of the City of Calgary. But,
24 South Centre, do I vote there?

25 Thank you gentlemen and Madam Secretary -- or I'm
26 sorry, Madam Commissioner, excuse me.

27 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions?

1 MS. KHULLAR: No, I don't.

2 DR. BARRY: I don't know whether you've
3 had a chance to look at the revised map, but we have
4 come up with something that runs along the railway
5 tracks on the east side and follows Glenmore Trail
6 along the south.

7 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: That would be --

8 DR. BARRY: So, I'm wondering how that --
9 if that solves some of the issues that you've raised
10 with us.

11 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: I believe it would,
12 Dr. Barry, because again, Glenmore is a definitive
13 node. It is a man-made, physical marker that is a
14 natural line at which to draw the boundaries of a
15 particular -- this particular electoral district, as
16 is. I think the CPR -- if that is the line along the
17 far east -- I can't see the print.

18 DR. BARRY: CPR line is the one --

19 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: That is a very natural,
20 definitive node that would solve the problem, as far
21 as I can see the lines from here.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Ms. Aizenman.

23 MS. REBECCA AIZENMAN: Thank you.

24 And Madam Commissioner, I didn't mean to mix-up
25 your position. I'm sorry.

26 MS. KHULLAR: That's fine. It's not
27 important.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mike Linkletter?

2 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: Good afternoon. I would like
3 to thank the Commission for letting me come and speak
4 here. I'm going to actually -- it is going to be a
5 little bit difficult here on two points. I do have my
6 written submission coming. It's not here right now,
7 so I'm going straight from memory. That's the one.
8 The second item is there is some things that I
9 necessarily disagree with the previous presenter, but
10 I'll make sure to keep that out of it since that's not
11 really too relevant either but there are some things
12 that historically that I'm not quite in agreement
13 with.

14 The first thing is the Calgary East PC
15 Association -- this is the Federal Association that
16 I'm talking on behalf of and myself -- actually find
17 the boundaries right now, with the changes, fine. We
18 see no difficulty in them. We see them as being very
19 geographic by using the Elbow River. That has been
20 traditionally, going back when Calgary was Fort
21 Calgary, the defining line for Calgary East was right
22 at that point there, the Elbow River and the Bow
23 River. So we see that actually is -- no problem for
24 that.

25 But we do see another problem which is our main
26 concern and that is with the name of Calgary East.
27 Calgary East, as the previous presenter has said, is

1 now taking part of Calgary Southeast and Centre. So
2 we can see quite a problem with people not being quite
3 sure where they are supposed to vote. As Canadians,
4 as she also mentioned, you know, we would like to
5 encourage more people to vote, and if they do have
6 confusions -- and this has happened before in the
7 past -- if an elector goes into a station and finds
8 that they aren't sure where to vote, or they've gone
9 into the wrong one, chances are they are going to
10 return home without voting, and we think we should
11 give that opportunity to everybody. So that is one
12 reason is because we are changing the boundary, so
13 instead of just changing the boundaries, perhaps we
14 should change the name.

15 Another one is the same thing. Different
16 Calgarians who you talk to define Calgary east, west,
17 north and south as different locations, and this also
18 causes confusions with people. They are not sure
19 where exactly east really starts, or where it ends, or
20 where actually north starts, or how big centre really
21 is. So this just -- just the general view of
22 Calgarians, it doesn't set that border as well for
23 them either.

24 The third point that I have with it is we also
25 have provincially Calgary East. It's a constituency.
26 Now, the old border of Calgary East does contain most
27 of, if not all of, Calgary East now. However, the

1 changed borders, under the new provincial guidelines,
2 Calgary East will be farther north. There will be a
3 very small portion that actually will be Calgary East
4 provincially and Calgary East federally. So we can
5 see this also causing a number of problems in it.

6 So what we have done is we have looked at it as
7 an association and thought about perhaps changing the
8 name from Calgary East. That is what we would like to
9 do. We do have two suggestions.

10 One being more, I guess you could say, sort of
11 geographically speaking, is to use the name Blackfoot.
12 Blackfoot Trail starts approximately at the top of the
13 new riding and runs right through it. Plus we have
14 another reason that we like Blackfoot. The native
15 culture of Calgary has been important historically.
16 So we feel that by making it Blackfoot that we can
17 emphasize that culture and we feel that would be a
18 very good name. Instead of Calgary East, we could
19 have Calgary Blackfoot.

20 This also would have another impact. It would
21 help separate northeast and southeast. You wouldn't
22 have that. You would have something that was totally
23 different. It would help eliminate any confusion for
24 other people that are in the northeast. They are
25 saying, well, am I part of the east now or am I --
26 where am I? This would do it.

27 We did have another suggestion as well for

1 another name and that is actually using the first
2 Calgarian settler and rancher, which was Sam
3 Livingston -- using the name Livingston, Calgary
4 Livingston. Now that, originally when they settled in
5 Calgary, actually his first settlement house was at
6 Fort Calgary itself. He was asked to move and he
7 moved up to the Glenmore Reservoir, where the Glenmore
8 Reservoir is now. So that follows that geographic
9 river again, to use that as part of the name.

10 So I'm going to be very short here. We don't
11 have a problem with the proposed boundary changes. We
12 would like to see a name change and we would like to
13 see something that does have some kind of geographic
14 and/or historical reference. So that is what we are
15 proposing, that instead of having it as Calgary East,
16 that you have Calgary Blackfoot or possibly Calgary
17 Livingston.

18 That is it, unless you have any questions?

19 DR. BARRY: You saw that we have --

20 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: I had not seen the other map
21 until just right now.

22 MS. KHULLAR: No one else has.

23 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: Actually, I was on the
24 Website yesterday to download it and that was part of
25 the part that I'm supposed to have with me.

26 DR. BARRY: No, you wouldn't have seen
27 this on the Website. We've just been working on it.

1 If we were to go with this configuration, what would
2 your reaction be to moving Calgary East a bit south?

3 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: What I would have to do is I
4 would have to look also at the changes in the
5 population that that MP would be representing because
6 that makes it -- does make a difference. And I did
7 notice, and we did notice, that that is one of the
8 things that the Commission had done. They worked to
9 get the distribution per voter or per person in every
10 riding close and we thought that was very good because
11 there is a lot of work involved with the MPs and the
12 better they distribute the amount of people that are
13 in their ridings, the better they can represent them.
14 So I would have to actually have a closer look at that
15 myself, exactly where the change, how much farther
16 south it went, and to get a better idea for it, to
17 really give you a comment. I would also take it back
18 to my Association and get their input as well.

19 MS. KHULLAR: I just have one question with
20 respect to your second proposed name, Livingston. I'm
21 not as familiar with Calgary history. Is that -- I
22 can see the logic between proposing the Blackfoot --
23 you have got a geographic marker going down the
24 proposed riding. Is Livingston -- is that something
25 that people would associate with the east part of
26 Calgary? I mean, I realize you say that --

27 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: Well, now, now, right now,

1 there are a number of other buildings, or there is a
2 government building, Sam Livingston Building downtown,
3 actually it is downtown. There is also the Sam
4 Livingston Fish Hatchery, which is in the new area for
5 Calgary East. It is part of Calgary East, so that is
6 Sam Livingston Fish Hatchery is within there. So
7 that's -- as I say, that was a name more of a historic
8 value to Calgary, to bring that forward as another
9 suggestion.

10 MS. KHULLAR: Okay, thank you very much.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Linkletter,
12 that was very helpful.

13 MR. MIKE LINKLETTER: Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: And Mr. McBride? Would you
15 say your first name for me? Is it Truper or Trupper?

16 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Truper.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Truper? Okay, thank you.

18 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: My name is Truper McBride,
19 I'm a Councillor with the Town of Cochrane. About a
20 month ago, I brought this issue before Council and we
21 had a debate and we passed a resolution from Council
22 to support this position paper.

23 In general, the Town feels that we share very
24 strong social and economic ties to the City of Calgary
25 in particular, as opposed to those in rural areas,
26 which right now the Banff Cochrane riding does lump us
27 primarily with -- along with the current Wildrose

1 riding, we are again, lumped again, with a bunch of
2 rural centres. The Town of Cochrane believes it is
3 much more of an urban centre and belongs with much
4 more of a Calgary regional riding, along with such
5 Towns as Okotoks, Black Diamond, Turner Valley,
6 Canmore, Banff, High River, Airdrie and so on.

7 The map I provided you -- I don't know if you
8 have that in front of you or not --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: We do, thank you.

10 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: -- but the provincial riding
11 map. We drew a tentative boundary of just where we
12 thought a Calgary regional riding boundary may come
13 in.

14 The total population of the Calgary Regional
15 Partnership, which again is an organization, social,
16 economic development organization for the region, has
17 a population of 117,000 which is over the limit for a
18 riding. So we would suggest using Highway 2 as a
19 boundary to help bring us back within the variance.

20 Again, with the Calgary Regional Partnership, we
21 noticed that -- sorry, Edmonton does have regional
22 partnership in place and that is accurately Alberta
23 Capital Regional Alliance, and we have noticed that
24 they, the City of Edmonton, has been granted regional
25 ridings and we feel that the same should be granted
26 for Calgary.

27 Right now you have the Calgary area divided into

1 three major ridings with all of the Calgary regional
2 communities being separated from one another, when we
3 are trying to work very hard together. And we feel
4 that a riding of that nature would be very beneficial
5 to us both socially and economically.

6 So basically, in summary, the Town of Cochrane
7 does not want to be put with major agricultural
8 centres. We would like to be grouped with other small
9 urban centres. And we also do want to be part of any
10 riding that includes the City of Calgary. So we
11 definitely want to be a regional riding.

12 Again, the name -- the name, I have to agree with
13 Mr. Linkletter. The name of the ridings, I think we
14 need to get a little bit more creative than just using
15 names of municipalities. One suggestion I would throw
16 out for this -- for a Calgary regional riding, would
17 be Bow Valley, so that would be a suggestion that we
18 would have for that as well.

19 So are there any questions?

20 MS. KHULLAR: Just one. On your proposed
21 map here, is that -- does that represent the whole
22 area of the Calgary Regional Partnership that you said
23 was the -- with a population of 117,000 or is that a
24 smaller --

25 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Yes, the whole highlighted
26 area there includes Strathmore and the areas to the
27 east, that does include the entire municipal --

1 regional partnership. That is why we suggested that
2 we condense the riding into more of a western nature
3 with Highway 2 as a boundary and that would bring us
4 into variance with Chestermere and -- Chestermere Lake
5 and Strathmore have a population combined of, I'd say,
6 around 25,000.

7 MS. KHULLAR: So your proposed riding is
8 cut it off, let Strathmore and Chestermere Lake go --

9 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Right. But again, we are
10 flexible on that. The main idea is we would like a
11 Calgary regional riding.

12 DR. BARRY: You are not the first person
13 to address the issue of constituency names and one
14 constraint we have -- although it is not the law -- is
15 the preference of the Geographical Names Board of
16 Canada, which recommends that we give -- use names
17 that give a sense of the Province, and if possible,
18 the region, or part of the Province in which they are
19 located. So that is why we have used names like
20 northwest, northeast, and all the rest of them.

21 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Yes. No, I had read that but
22 I thought -- I suppose that is out of your hands
23 perhaps but --

24 DR. BARRY: No. No, no, but it is useful
25 to have this information. Thank you.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: It explains, in some way, the
27 reason why we have been so prosaic in choosing names

1 because they immediately give a sense of the area to
2 which they refer. That's the objective stated by the
3 Geographical Names Board.

4 Now, Mr. McBride, I want to thank you for that.
5 That's a very interesting concept. You have
6 identified a general area which undoubtedly has a
7 close community of interest around Calgary, without
8 getting into the city itself. It does have this
9 drawback, I must say, sir. The area west of Calgary
10 is, as everyone knows, subject to explosive growth and
11 we must beware of creating a riding which is at or too
12 close -- even too close to the provincial quotient
13 because we know for sure that it is going to be well
14 beyond it before the next Census takes place.

15 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Yes. We are aware Cochrane
16 is -- I believe it is the fastest growing community in
17 Canada. We are aware of that but -- and that is one
18 of the reasons why we didn't set out exact lines in
19 our suggested riding, but we would like some sort
20 of -- some way to look at a regional riding, even
21 though we are exposing explosive growth. Edmonton is
22 growing quickly too and Edmonton has been given
23 regional ridings. This is what we would like for
24 Calgary.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we proposed hybrid
26 ridings in Edmonton, which would include some of the
27 outlying towns plus part of the City. That is quite

1 another matter. I don't think that is what you had in
2 mind?

3 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: No.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Will we see you in Cochrane
5 again tomorrow morning?

6 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: You're coming to Cochrane?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.

8 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: We didn't know that when we
9 would meet with our submission. We were not aware you
10 were coming to Cochrane.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's just fine. It
12 doesn't matter. You're not registered to speak in
13 Cochrane --

14 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: No.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks again.

16 MR. TRUPER MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. KHULLAR: If you want to attend, we'll
18 be there at 10:00 a.m. at the Super 8.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Ten o'clock.

20 Ms. Judy Stewart?

21 MS. JUDY STEWART: Hello. I am the Mayor of
22 Cochrane and I'm very delighted that you got to hear
23 from our Councillor, Truper McBride, first.

24 Councillor McBride and I are considered a
25 Committee to make presentations to you and I'm here
26 more to just substantiate a few of the comments that
27 Councillor McBride has made and to add to them, and

1 clarify some of the issues from the point of view of
2 some of the residents who have spoken to me.

3 First, the growth issue is of utmost importance
4 and we caution the Commission to recognize that we do
5 expect to continue to grow in that area and in the
6 region, between 8 to 10 percent. That's a sustainable
7 rate, and given certain communities coming on quickly,
8 that could explode up to 22 percent. That includes
9 the M.D. of Rockyview as well.

10 The M.D. of Rockyview are our close rural
11 neighbors and unfortunately Councillor McBride said
12 that he's not interested in being in a riding with
13 rurals, and I'm here to tell you that's not exactly
14 the case. The M.D. of Rockyview is very urbanized and
15 it's boundaries to the north and the south would make
16 a very good riding in the regional basis that would
17 include the area of Airdrie -- I'm talking west of
18 Highway 2 as well. It would include the City of
19 Airdrie and it would include the Town of Cochrane. It
20 would not, however, include the Stony Nation, nor
21 would it include Banff Cochrane. I would suggest to
22 the Commission that Banff and Canmore do not have
23 anything in common with the Town of Cochrane, except
24 that they are in an explosive growth corridor along
25 with us.

26 Canmore has taken on a significant role in
27 providing a service and population residential base

1 for Banff as a result of the closed door policy on
2 their development and that has led to explosions in
3 growth in the Bighorn region as well. And you can
4 expect to see major changes in the population base
5 there in the next few years.

6 We are more aligned with Okotoks, High River and
7 all the areas in that, sort of, little horseshoe
8 shape.

9 I just want to talk a little bit about the
10 regional community, regional services. All of our
11 health related services are provided from Calgary, as
12 are Airdrie and this Municipal District of Rockyview;
13 our schools are all associated with Airdrie and the
14 Rockyview area; and so are our trade routes. All of
15 our citizens use east -- they go east for trade. They
16 do not go north. One of the major objections that
17 citizens have talked to me about is that we are lumped
18 in, and I shouldn't say -- it's not meant in a
19 negative way at all -- with towns like Sundre, Olds,
20 Crossfield, we have nothing in common with those
21 communities at all -- no schools, no health, nothing.
22 We don't trade with them.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: But what about Airdrie?

24 MS. JUDY STEWART: Airdrie, no. We have none --
25 except for the regional partnership, we really don't
26 do much with them. Now, on the other hand, Airdrie is
27 in our health region and Airdrie does have the same

1 School Board, but it is a very similar kind of
2 community because of its close association with
3 Calgary. As well, all their water and sewer goes to
4 Calgary. Our sewer is piped to Calgary as well.
5 Rockyview's sewer is piped to Calgary, so there's a --
6 depending on where your water and sewage goes, that is
7 where your region is these days.

8 The other natural feature I want you to be most
9 concerned about is the river. More and more of our
10 work economically and politically is concerning water.
11 There is a very definite shortage of water and the
12 watershed is of major concern to us in that region.
13 The Bow River is -- right now the boundary shows Bow
14 River as a boundary. I would suggest that the Bow
15 River is part of a major regional concern and we would
16 like that to be considered as well. We have more in
17 common with the citizens south of the Bow and south of
18 Cochrane than we do with people in Canmore, for
19 example. We have a lot more in common with people
20 south of the Bow, in those ranching communities, than
21 we do with people in Sundre or Olds.

22 Last year I was invited to a trade show in Sundre
23 and half my council said they had never been there. A
24 lot of people in the Town of Cochrane said they had
25 never been to Olds or Sundre and I think -- we are in
26 a riding with them.

27 Population again, as Councillor McBride

1 indicated, if you look at the regional group, if you
2 take out the City of Calgary, it's 117,000 and I would
3 suggest that if you took Canmore Banff out of the
4 riding, that that regional grouping with the M.D. of
5 Rockyview would give you the numbers you are looking
6 for.

7 It is a matter of looking where do we have
8 similar kind of services? What are our issues? Water
9 is a huge one and the Bow River is important to us all
10 in that region.

11 I guess in closing I would like to say the Banff
12 Cochrane name is very confusing with our provincial
13 jurisdiction -- sorry, our provincial riding. Our
14 provincial riding has -- is undergoing change as well
15 and this would cause a great deal of difficulty during
16 the election because people would say Banff Cochrane,
17 oh, I know where that is because it is the same name
18 exactly as what we use provincially. And I would
19 suggest -- I'm not really -- I really don't care. I
20 don't have that same kind of magnitude of concern over
21 a name, but let's not confuse the voters either.

22 Councillor McBride and I are a Committee to go
23 back to the Provincial Riding Commission and ask them
24 to consider putting Cochrane in with our region
25 instead of putting us in with Banff and Canmore
26 because we are very passionate that we need to be in
27 with our region instead of in a, sort of a -- just

1 because historically Cochrane was with Banff, in name
2 and in representation, it doesn't mean we should be
3 there. So I would make the same plea here.

4 I don't have anything else.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything to ask?

6 DR. BARRY: No, I don't.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, but in the map which
8 your colleague submitted, Banff is in fact in that
9 area and Canmore as well.

10 MS. JUDY STEWART: I understand he's left it in
11 there but I'm talking more from the perspective of the
12 people who have talked to me. They are suggesting
13 that it is more appropriate for people to be -- the
14 M.D. of Rockyview and for the Town of Cochrane to be
15 in a similar riding rather than Canmore Banff. So if
16 you are looking at changing numbers and moving numbers
17 in or out, I would suggest that the M.D. of Rockyview
18 boundary south to the M.D. of Foothills would be a
19 good -- would encompass most of what we are talking
20 about, plus this City of Okotoks, High River, Turner
21 Valley, those are in the Calgary region.

22 And the City of Canmore and Banff -- and I'm
23 calling them cities because we could be cities. All
24 we have to do is apply for the status -- and with
25 Rocky Mountain House and the other mountain-like
26 communities running on the north, south kind of
27 parallel.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Rocky Mountain
2 constituency has been tried and found wanting in years
3 past because it was so difficult to represent all the
4 way down through Jasper National Park and Banff
5 National Park. There simply isn't -- aren't the lines
6 of communication in that area, apart from the ice
7 fields highway, which is not very reliable during the
8 winter. So I doubt that we'll go back to that but
9 these -- I can assure you that the division, the
10 Highway 2 -- the number 2 Highway Towns, for example,
11 are presenting a great problem. You say you don't
12 want them. They want to be together, so they are
13 either going to go west or east, because they can't
14 form a riding all by themselves.

15 MS. JUDY STEWART: No. The highway, if
16 they're -- you mean between --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Between Airdrie and Bowden,
18 for example.

19 MS. JUDY STEWART: It's not that we do not want
20 them. It's that we have nothing in common.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, yes. They share a
22 close community of interest amongst themselves and
23 although they are fairly populous, they by no means
24 make a riding, so you're going to find them on one
25 side of the -- one riding or the other.

26 Thank you very much. I'm so pleased that you
27 came because unfortunately we haven't heard from as

1 many Municipal officials and town and city people as
2 we might have expected, Mrs. Stewart. So you have a
3 unique point of view to present and we thank you
4 again. Perhaps you'll sit in on Cochrane's hearing
5 tomorrow?

6 MS. JUDY STEWART: Well, that's what I wanted to
7 ask you. Where is it, sir?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Super 8.

9 MS. JUDY STEWART: Super 8 Motel.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Ten o'clock.

11 MS. JUDY STEWART: Oh, my. We're not available,
12 but I'm sorry that I'm not there to welcome you. I
13 would have enjoyed that.

14 So welcome to Cochrane in my absence and I would
15 like to tell you that it's very -- the reason why
16 Councillor McBride and I are so interested is because
17 we sit on completely different spectrums of the
18 political hemisphere, I guess you'd say, and we are
19 very interested in politics, but we're working
20 together on the same Town Council and it has been very
21 delightful. So whenever there is something that comes
22 up that's of interest to us politically, we end up
23 being on the same Committee and it's so nice to work
24 with someone who is so young for a change, I must say.
25 So thank you.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Bye.

27 Mr. Miles Palmer?

1 MR. MILES PALMER: Hello. Well, thank you for
2 letting me speak. I'm going to bring our focus back
3 into central Calgary. I represent a small community
4 of Rideau Roxboro, who is located pretty well in the
5 centre of Calgary. I'm going to just quickly read
6 through a letter that we have submitted to the
7 Commission.

8 The community of Rideau Roxboro is objecting to
9 the change of the electoral boundaries that places it
10 in the Federal riding of Calgary East. We are
11 presently in the Calgary Centre riding which will be
12 split into two, a Calgary North Centre and a Calgary
13 South Centre riding. We should be in the Calgary
14 South Centre riding, not Calgary East. The Elbow
15 River is an arbitrary boundary between the proposed
16 Calgary South Centre riding and Calgary East that does
17 not reflect the make-up of the communities along it.
18 MacLeod Trail would be a more logical boundary.

19 Rideau Roxboro is a small, well-established,
20 inner city, residential area of 300 homes, located in
21 Calgary at 4th Street and 30th Avenue Southwest. The
22 area to the east, in the Calgary East riding, is mixed
23 commercial, industrial, and suburban residential.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if you could use
25 that handy little pointer and show us on the big map?

26 MR. MILES PALMER: I'd love to. You've got that
27 map up. We are right there. You get the curves of

1 the river mixed up. We are right there. That's the
2 Rideau Roxboro community. It's just in there. We're
3 quite small.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Under the revision which was
5 suggested a moment ago, you would be, in fact, where
6 you want to be.

7 MR. MILES PALMER: And having not seen that map
8 before, we are in full agreement with that.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. So that is not an
10 official part of our proposal obviously, but we work
11 on these things on a continuing basis. We would like
12 everybody to know that we are responsive to what we
13 hear from people and we've heard plenty from people
14 before this meeting even started.

15 MR. MILES PALMER: I think we had suggested
16 MacLeod Trail which is there. I think your boundary
17 probably is even more logical than our suggestion.

18 I don't need to spend a lot of time really going
19 over what Ms. Rebecca Aizenman said, but I'm in full
20 agreement with her presentation. Historically, Rideau
21 Roxboro has been in the Calgary Centre since its
22 inception, creation, 70 years ago, and now we are
23 going to be split out into an area that is completely
24 different from us. Our interests lie in the inner
25 city communities, not in the communities to the east
26 of us.

27 On a municipal level, for example, we are

1 constantly dealing with traffic issues that involve
2 those inner city communities, not the suburban
3 communities to the east of us.

4 I presented this letter to our Executive last
5 week and it was unanimously approved by the Executive.
6 We did a quick survey through our community, and of
7 the 90 people that responded to the survey, all 90
8 were in favour of us being in the Calgary South Centre
9 riding and not in the Calgary East riding.

10 So, in summary, the Executive request that Rideau
11 Roxboro be placed in the proposed riding of Calgary
12 South Centre and not in Calgary East.

13 My short presentation should get us back on the
14 time track. If you have any questions, I could answer
15 them now.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Palmer, no. You've
17 made your point very clearly. Thank you for doing
18 that. And as I said, we are certainly sensitive to
19 suggested changes and we appreciate them as well when
20 they come from well-meaning and constructive sources
21 like we've heard so far. Thank you.

22 MR. MILES PALMER: Your new suggested boundary
23 too, certainly from my perspective, makes a lot more
24 sense. Thank you.

25 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gary Bobroff?

27 Does anyone know him? He is the President of the

1 Windsor Park Community Association.

2 Well, if he comes in, we will hear him.

3 Mr. Darren Cunningham? You just walked in on
4 your speech.

5 Mr. Cunningham, I won't go through all of our
6 introductory remarks again with the exception of one.
7 You have 15 minutes and you will get a 3 minute
8 warning.

9 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: I'm actually going to be a
10 lot more brief than that. Sorry for being late. I
11 sort of -- getting started right into things here.
12 But that's great.

13 Basically, we had put in two submissions from the
14 Progressive Conservative Association of Calgary
15 Centre. The first one regarding the proposed name of
16 the new South Centre. We were hoping and would beg
17 your indulgence in perhaps looking at that and keeping
18 that name as Calgary Centre. We had no problem
19 keeping North Centre as is, but just in terms of
20 continuity sake, we believe that in terms of not
21 confusing voters, keeping some sort of continuity with
22 that name would certainly be of value for that
23 respect.

24 Also, I think the history behind this riding in
25 Calgary, some of the past and current Members of
26 Parliament from Calgary Centre certainly are notable
27 in wiping that riding off the map would, I think,

1 certainly erase some of that history. We are looking
2 at Members such as Douglas Harkness, Harvey Andre,
3 right up to the current, you know, Right Honourable
4 Joe Clarke. So I think that it does have some merit
5 in keeping that name. Our riding association is 100
6 percent behind proposing to keep that name.

7 Other than that, I believe there are going to be
8 some presentations later today in terms of the
9 proposed boundary change for South Centre. Just
10 looking at the map right now, am I right to assume --
11 are we looking at current boundaries or are we looking
12 at proposed?

13 MS. KHULLAR: The yellow is the current.

14 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: The purple is the proposed
15 Calgary South Centre? Okay.

16 Two basic things. I think also for, first off,
17 for geography sake, I have noticed that some of our --
18 the riding association, Calgary Centre CA Riding
19 Association, was going to be looking at perhaps
20 cutting the boundaries off at Glenmore Trail as a
21 south boundary rather than going south of -- at around
22 the reservoir. And maybe to keep the -- what am I
23 looking for here -- the population quotient, quota in
24 check, pushing things to MacLeod Trail as an eastern
25 boundary.

26 One of the reasons that I would support this and
27 I bounced it off of my elections team and that we

1 would support this, is that we believe that there is
2 going to be extended growth in the downtown core, in
3 the east village of the downtown core, as well as west
4 of Eau Claire on the south side of the river. So we
5 do believe that that population will make up anything
6 that is lost by cutting things at Glenmore Trail as a
7 south boundary would certainly make up by readmitting
8 the parts -- areas such as Britannia, Rideau Roxboro,
9 and with any of the growing areas that will be
10 encompassing South Centre as well.

11 So, I know that down the pipe, if it hasn't
12 already been talked about today, like I say, the CA
13 Association of Calgary Centre as well as the Calgary
14 Southwest PC Association will be making presentations
15 along those lines and we would be supportive of that
16 as well.

17 DR. BARRY: We had been working with a
18 revised map, which I guess you didn't see because you
19 just arrived --

20 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: I'm sorry, yes, I did. I've
21 actually just driven in from Claresholm this morning.

22 DR. BARRY: We've had a number of
23 representations from the area of Calgary South Centre,
24 East and Southwest. So we have been looking at an
25 alternative map, one that extends the eastern boundary
26 of Calgary South Centre to the CPR tracks and moves
27 the southern boundary up to Glenmore Trail, which is

1 somewhere in the regions of what you've suggested. I
2 know you suggested MacLeod Trail but --

3 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: We only suggested MacLeod
4 Trail for ease. No, we would be supportive of that.

5 DR. BARRY: That gives you a variance of
6 roughly 10 percent above the quota in Calgary South
7 Centre. It would require adjustments though in
8 Calgary East and South --

9 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: The proposed Calgary East? I
10 believe the current boundaries for Calgary Centre go
11 to the railway tracks, do they not?

12 DR. BARRY: Yes, they do.

13 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Yes. Okay. No, I would be
14 supportive of this proposal right here.

15 MS. KHULLAR: I just have one question.
16 You mentioned the growth you expected in the downtown
17 core, the east village and west of Eau Claire. I'm
18 not as familiar with downtown Calgary. Do you have a
19 sense of how much growth is happening? I take it
20 those are highrises going up. Do you know how many
21 units are going in there?

22 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Approximately, the last
23 number I saw and Trudy could probably back me up on
24 this a little bit more accurately, is that we are
25 probably looking -- I think it was close to 20,000
26 units.

27 MS. TRUDY HUGHES: Well, there's 10,600 as sort

1 of earmarked for east village when it goes in and
2 there's currently six highrises that are going in just
3 on the west side of Eau Claire there.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So you mean filling all the
5 green area up with highrises in Eau Claire?

6 MS. TRUDY HUGHES: No, we are going over by the
7 railroad tracks and we're really going to upgrade
8 that. I mean, that's -- it is proposed for 10,600
9 population.

10 MS. KHULLAR: Can you just use your
11 pointer. There is an electronic pointer on the
12 podium. I need the visuals of the map.

13 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: East village would be right
14 here.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, south of the Bow?

16 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Yes, south of the Bow. All
17 this is south of the Bow. So it is still considered
18 Calgary South Centre. Right in there. I believe that
19 blank area, that's actually Fort Calgary, so we are
20 right about there.

21 What is happening is there is actually some
22 residential and some commercial in there currently
23 that have been knocked down and re-zoned for highrise
24 use.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh.

26 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Also, down in this part,
27 right in here, we have had, I believe, six or seven

1 new buildings come up. Earlier in the year, I
2 attended a meeting with Trudy Hughes here, talking
3 about this new development so, I believe it would
4 certainly catch up to the population quota that you're
5 looking for, if it's not -- if it wouldn't currently
6 be right on with this, the new proposal.

7 MS. KHULLAR: So the number of 10,600 units
8 was just for one of those developments?

9 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: That's for this, that's over
10 here.

11 MS. KHULLAR: For the east village?

12 DR. BARRY: And that's all in the
13 downtown core, or does that stretch over into Calgary
14 East?

15 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: It's in the core.

16 DR. BARRY: And what's the time frame for
17 the 10,000 units? Is this a long range plan or is
18 this something we are looking at in the next ten
19 years?

20 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Arguably, a couple of years.
21 I mean if you -- in the east village, they're looking
22 at 2004. We are looking at most of the units over
23 here currently developed with, I believe, in my last
24 count, about two that are still under development, but
25 most of it is currently developed.

26 So already it would be overburdening our current
27 Calgary Centre to the point where we would be putting

1 polling stations right in each of these highrise
2 apartments because they couldn't fit into a regular
3 poll.

4 So basically what we are looking at here is about
5 25,000 units and I think primarily the demographic you
6 are looking on this is a younger urban, 30 to 50 type
7 range, certainly voting range, certainly -- you know,
8 these are people we are going to have to count in, for
9 sure. This isn't young -- this isn't single unit
10 family housing.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a hard copy of
12 your presentation, sir?

13 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: No, actually, I do not. I'm
14 sorry.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to submit
16 something in writing to us, we would pleased to have
17 it but before the end of this month, if you would.

18 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Yes, certainly. I did see
19 the October 31st deadline and I apologize. I did have
20 a hard copy I wanted to submit today and I noticed in
21 the parking lot that I just didn't have it with me.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: What you say is of great
23 interest to us, Mr. Cunningham. We are keenly
24 interested in projections because we want to avoid
25 creating a riding which will soon be far too big, as
26 compared with the provincial quotient of 106,240.

27 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: Exactly.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: So, we have to look a little
2 bit ahead into future. Thank you.

3 MR. DARREN CUNNINGHAM: All right. Thank you.

4 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you very much.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Roger Gibbons? Not
6 here yet?
7 Mr. Jack Beakman?

8 MR. JACK BEAKMAN: Members of the Commission, I
9 hope that you will indulge me. I made a second sober
10 thought on my first written presentation and I have an
11 addendum to it, which is attached to the existing.
12 And also, I give you for your edification, my map,
13 which you will keep and attach to my submission, if
14 you will, please?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

16 MR. JACK BEAKMAN: As I said, my name is
17 Jack Beakman, I'm -- I came to Calgary in 1954 and I
18 have been a resident of Calgary Centre for the past
19 five years, so naturally I am very interested in what
20 is happening to Calgary Centre and the proposal to
21 divide us into two ridings.
22 First of all, let me commend the Commission on
23 the boundaries that you have presented to us for the
24 proposed Calgary North riding. My confederates and I,
25 and my friends, and the people that I've talked to in
26 the communities, and so on, think that it is an
27 admirable boundary. We have no quarrel with it

1 whatsoever. In fact, we compliment you on providing
2 those communities that were divided previously by
3 ridings, that is, the residential communities were
4 actually divided by ridings, are now back together
5 again in one riding or another. Now, that is a real
6 plus. So I have -- we have nothing but praise to say
7 for Calgary North Centre.

8 However, with respect to Calgary South Centre, I
9 am going to indicate that the only problem we have
10 with that is the boundary at the south end of the
11 proposed riding and also the east boundary. Now, you,
12 Commission, you have taken the wind out of my sails
13 with respect to your suggestion of the boundary on the
14 east side be either MacLeod Trail or the railroad.
15 And I commend you on that because that was going to be
16 my number one complaint about the fact that that
17 residential area is completely divorced from the rest
18 of Calgary East. There is a lot of commercial work in
19 areas in-between there which would really divorce them
20 from the east Calgary community. So, I would
21 certainly commend you with respect to that boundary.

22 Now, the only thing that I had different was that
23 I had -- other than the one that you had proposed, and
24 that is that we would take out the boundary here that
25 you have indicated, and you were going down, I
26 believe, the Glenmore Trail, is that it there? I had
27 included Lakeview here, within that boundary, because

1 I thought it is together in this whole area. It's
2 easy to handle. But I think that probably the numbers
3 that we -- if we had Lakeview included in there, I
4 came up with -- if I had that included in my proposal,
5 that it would be about 120,000 people, and I can only
6 assume, from what I've heard, that that's more people
7 than you would want in a centre.

8 So if that being the case then, having the
9 boundary stay along Glenmore Trail and Lakeview again,
10 going back to Calgary Southwest, would be, I think
11 amenable.

12 I just would like to mention one thing about the
13 previous speaker talking about the number of people
14 who are moving into Calgary, into the Calgary area,
15 downtown, particularly with respect to the highrises
16 and so on. A lot of those people, of course, are not
17 just going to come bounding into Calgary from outside
18 the Province. They already live in Calgary. A lot of
19 them are living in apartments downtown and they are
20 up-scaling into condominiums and moving from, perhaps
21 from some -- from the suburbs, but I don't think all
22 that much. So it may not be the huge increase in
23 population that we are talking about here. Certainly,
24 it is increasing the population base in the centre of
25 Calgary and that is a given but it may not be all that
26 much coming in to the riding from outside the riding.
27 I would just like you to sort of keep that in mind.

1 The only other thing I have to say is that I have
2 been a long time volunteer with a Federal political
3 party in Calgary Centre and I joined the last two
4 election campaigns. I did -- volunteered full time
5 for my candidate and I -- one of the reasons that I
6 like the idea of a cohesive riding, such as you are
7 proposing here now, is it makes it very, very much
8 easier to campaign, to get to people, to organize and
9 work and get the communities working together on what
10 you are proposing to do. So I, from that point of
11 view, I think that the suggestion that you have here
12 is admirable.

13 I only have one other thing to say and that is
14 that with respect to the names, I've assumed all along
15 that the Calgary North Centre, Calgary South Centre
16 was given merely for the purpose of identifying, that
17 that's not cast in stone. I talked to a lot of my
18 friends and confederates and we are recommending that
19 Calgary North Centre be simply called Calgary North.
20 Now, this is in keeping with the points of the compass
21 which heretofore we've had throughout Calgary, with
22 the exception of Calgary Nosehill, and for Calgary
23 South Centre again, just simply Calgary Centre,
24 because it is in the centre of the City, surrounded by
25 every other riding and I don't know how you could be
26 more descriptive than that.

27 Thank you gentlemen. That's the end of my

1 presentation. Any questions?

2 DR. BARRY: No, I don't have any.

3 MR. JACK BEAKMAN: Okay, thanks very much.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Beakman, thank you. That
5 was most helpful. You make an interesting point about
6 population movement and not all the movement we see
7 represents new population, of course. They are taking
8 away from one riding and giving it to another and that
9 is true, of course, of Canada as a whole. Although,
10 in the 1991 Census, the population finally struggled
11 over 30 million, it's expected to go down from now on
12 unless something drastic happens in terms of our birth
13 rate or immigration policies, so --

14 MR. JACK BEAKMAN: Well, we felt reinforcing
15 Calgary being the centre of all the great financial
16 activity that goes on in western Canada, anticipate
17 that, you know, that our population will be increased
18 by those upwardly mobile people who are interested in
19 that kind of commerce.

20 MS. KHULLAR: Excuse me, Mr. Beakman. You
21 have to come to the mike if you're going to speak, so
22 our reporter can --

23 THE CHAIRMAN: He was just making a joke.

24 MS. KHULLAR: Oh, it was a joke, okay.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Have you given any thought to
26 annexing Edmonton by the way?

27 MR. JACK BEAKMAN: Never.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. David Fulton?

2 Mr. Fulton, I believe you were on for tonight and
3 you would like to speak this afternoon? I just have
4 to check with the reporter. Would you like a break
5 first? You okay?

6 MR. DAVID FULTON: I will be very brief. I was
7 originally scheduled to be on this afternoon and I
8 made arrangements to speak this evening, due to a
9 conflicting engagement, and I am now back and I thank
10 the Commissioners for their indulgence.

11 I too am speaking about Calgary Centre and the
12 proposed boundary alignment; as well, I'm going to
13 speak about the name of the proposed riding in Calgary
14 South Centre.

15 I was born outside the City but I've been raised
16 in the City since Jack Beakman arrived in Calgary. I
17 grew up in the riding of Calgary South Centre, what is
18 proposed to be Calgary South Centre. I attended
19 kindergarten, elementary school, and junior high
20 school in the current Calgary Centre riding. I also
21 have attended various churches within the riding over
22 the years. So I have a long association, getting
23 longer every day.

24 The interesting thing is I concur with most of
25 the previous presentations insofar as the choice of
26 the Elbow River as a boundary, in that portion of
27 Calgary Centre, Calgary South Centre that demarks

1 Rideau Roxboro and those communities, Parkhill,
2 Britannia, Elboya, and so on.

3 I lived and grew up in Elbow Park and attended
4 junior high school at Rideau Park which is across the
5 river. Many of my co-students came from Riverdale and
6 Britannia into that -- the river was not much of a
7 boundary is what I was getting at. And that there is
8 a sense of community, particularly within the
9 educational institutions and within the church
10 organizations there. Christ Church has many
11 parishioners from those -- that draws from that same
12 area. So I think that that is important.

13 As well, my observation has been that MacLeod
14 Trail makes a better boundary for two reasons, than
15 your proposed one that you have been working with.
16 Perhaps I could have that one brought up, and I will
17 speak to it.

18 The railway -- using the railway which represents
19 the current alignment of the boundary here, brings in
20 the communities of Inglewood and Ramsay, and they have
21 much less in common with the areas, the inner city
22 areas across the river. In fact, Inglewood Ramsay
23 kind of have a close association, these two
24 communities and they're across a riding boundary
25 arbitrarily by the CPR tracks.

26 So my recommendation would be to use the bank of
27 the river, down to MacLeod Trail, and thence along to

1 Glenmore. Presumably that would free up some
2 population as well. These areas are largely
3 industrial and commercial in nature along here, so I
4 don't think there's too much population impact but it
5 makes more sense to me to include Lakeview -- where am
6 I here -- down there, into the new Calgary South
7 Centre riding, for the same reasons as it makes sense
8 to not have Calgary South Centre include the community
9 of Pump Hill and -- or not Pump Hill but Bayview and
10 Eagle Ridge, being on the south side of this rather
11 large geographic barrier and natural barrier, the
12 Reservoir itself. Traffic reports indicate, every
13 morning there is a lot of traffic in this area that
14 separates these folk and most of these people tend to
15 commute downtown from Lakeview naturally. If they do
16 make the rare shopping trip, it's over to Chinook
17 Centre which is over there so there's a very natural
18 alignment with the folks who live in Lakeview with the
19 people in this area, as opposed to having to go and
20 visit their Member of Parliament on the other side of
21 the reservoir.

22 So that would be the extent of my comments to the
23 boundary. Other than that, I commend the work of the
24 Commissioners on this proposal. I do hope that you
25 might consider inclusion of Lakeview and use of
26 Glenmore as the -- to the Elbow River as the easterly
27 boundary for the rationales that I've expressed.

1 Secondly and briefly, I will speak to the name.
2 My reading of history and understanding of history is
3 that we have claim to a former Prime Minister from
4 this neck of the woods, R.B. Bennett, during the dirty
5 '30s, hailed from this area and in fact my
6 understanding is he resided within the Calgary Centre
7 riding. For a time he -- considerable length of time
8 he was -- his residence was at the Palliser Hotel
9 which is in the heart of downtown Calgary. His
10 successor law firm, of which carries his name, Bennett
11 Jones, is headquartered here in Calgary. So there is
12 significant historical sense to perhaps consider the
13 name of Calgary Bennett as an alternative.

14 My sense is that South Centre reminds me of a
15 shopping centre that's not in the riding. It's
16 somewhere down in Calgary Southeast currently. And I
17 think the name Calgary Bennett might instill in
18 electors a sense of history and engagement with the
19 political process.

20 So with that I will conclude and defer to any
21 questions.

22 MS. KHULLAR: I just have one comment, when
23 you were suggest naming the riding after a former
24 Prime Minister, I thought you were going to say
25 Calgary Clark or something like that.

26 MR. DAVID FULTON: A much more former Prime
27 Minister. With apologies to Mr. Cunningham.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well Mr. Fulton, thanks. I should
2 just pause to remark that under the provisions of the
3 Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Section 15,
4 voter equality is our first concern. It is very true
5 that there are other factors such as history, and
6 community of interest, and so on and representational
7 difficulties to take into account, but we are obliged
8 by law to strive to create constituencies which
9 conform as closely as reasonably possible to the
10 provincial quota, and that is 106,000.

11 So we get letters from some people, for example,
12 who say there isn't one solitary reason in the world
13 why you shouldn't have eight absolutely equal ridings
14 in the City of Calgary and you know, it is a rather
15 unsophisticated view, it may -- it certainly is
16 arguable but it is not that easy to create sensibly
17 shaped geographical ridings which observe such things
18 as natural boundaries and artificial ones and so on in
19 an urban centre because you have got parks, and you
20 have got industrial pockets, and you've got all kinds
21 of things which affect the population. Although we
22 strive to come close to the quota, we can't always
23 make it and we have to leave allowances, as we pointed
24 out a little earlier, for expansion in different
25 areas. It is fine to create a riding in a stable
26 area, that is stable in terms of population changes,
27 which is close to the quotient, but it is quite

1 another matter to do that in Calgary Southeast, for
2 example, which we know is going to keep moving and
3 moving and moving.

4 MR. DAVID FULTON: And I do appreciate that and
5 that is why I suggested MacLeod Trail and the
6 trade-off with Inglewood Ramsay in favour of Lakeview.
7 That's the only comment I would make.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: That's very nice of you to
9 come and leave us those thoughts, as well as your
10 written material, and we'll certainly take it into
11 account.

12 MR. DAVID FULTON: Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, ladies and gentlemen, I
14 think it is probably time for a 15 minute break and we
15 see that Mr. Roger Gibbons has just come in and we
16 will, if he has time to compose himself between now
17 and the end of 15 minutes, we'll call on him next.

18 (ADJOURNMENT)

19 THE CHAIRMAN: I am remiss, I did not ask
20 people to be careful about the speed at which they
21 spoke because what you say is being taken down
22 verbatim and it's very hard on the reporter if we
23 speak too quickly, if not impossible.

24 So Mr. Roger Gibbons, please?

25 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: Well, thanks for the
26 opportunity. I think I'm here because I did a similar
27 presentation for the Alberta Provincial Electoral

1 Boundaries Commission and in that case I was concerned
2 about a particular issue and that was to make sure
3 that the new urban reality of Alberta was effectively
4 reflected in the decisions of the Alberta Provincial
5 Commission. I suspect that your concerns today are a
6 little bit different from that and so what I will do
7 is just pick out six or seven things which I think may
8 be of great irrelevance to your own deliberations and
9 then I would be happy to take any questions that you
10 might have. I won't go on at any length then about
11 the -- this new urban reality except to underscore its
12 importance in understanding the future of the Province
13 and in fact, the existing demographic reality of the
14 Province.

15 In the past -- I think this is a fair
16 statement -- Electoral Boundary Commissions seemed to
17 play a more defensive role in terms of protecting
18 rural communities from the onslaught of urbanization.
19 And I guess the most general point I would like to
20 make is that I think this is doing or has done some
21 damage to the representation of the urban vote and the
22 urban vote has simply become so much more important,
23 given the dominant roles of cities within the new
24 economy.

25 The second point I would make is that in the
26 past, the argument was made that rural representation
27 was a more demanding exercise on Members of Parliament

1 than was representing urban ridings. We put a lot of
2 emphasis on the size of rural ridings and a lot of
3 emphasis on the difficulty that MPs had in interacting
4 with their constituents. My suspicion here is that
5 reality is now reversed and that urban ridings are now
6 in fact as difficult, if not more difficult to
7 represent than rural ridings. The problem is not one
8 of geography; the problem is one of social complexity.
9 Urban ridings simply represent a far more complex
10 demographic ethnic racial linguistic situation for
11 Members of Parliament than do rural ridings, and that
12 the challenges faced by MPs in trying to speak for an
13 urban constituency, the problems are really very
14 acute, and I think now the representational task for
15 urban MPs is if anything greater than the
16 representational task of rural MPs who speak for a
17 more homogeneous constituency.

18 The third point is that in the past we assumed
19 that urban and rural voters brought to the ballot
20 quite a different set of values, aspirations,
21 political interests. It is becoming increasingly
22 difficult to find significant differences in values,
23 in attitudes, in whatever, between urban and rural
24 voters. We are simply facing a more, in an
25 attitudinal sense, a more homogeneous electorate, and
26 certainly when we look at urban regions such as the
27 area around Calgary or the area around Edmonton, it

1 gets very difficult to argue convincingly that there
2 are fundamentally different interests between those
3 people living within municipal boundaries and those
4 people living outside. This is, I say, particularly
5 the case when you look at the Calgary environment and
6 you look at satellite communities outside Calgary.
7 Those communities are so thoroughly integrated into
8 the economic and social life of metropolitan Calgary
9 that the distinction, in this case between an urban
10 and rural voter, is becoming, at least in my view,
11 more and more difficult to defend.

12 I should also point out here, just as a sort of
13 demographic side-bar, that the regional community in
14 Calgary is quite different from the regional community
15 in Edmonton. The City of Edmonton makes up only about
16 two thirds of the greater metropolitan population of
17 Edmonton. The City of Calgary makes up close to 90
18 percent of the greater metropolitan region of Calgary.
19 This means that Calgary dominates the landscape to a
20 far greater extent than the City of Edmonton does and
21 Calgary has a very different relationship with the
22 surrounding communities than does the City of
23 Edmonton. To this point, it has been a somewhat more
24 congenial, although weary relationship, and the City
25 of Calgary and the surrounding communities are engaged
26 now in a highly productive attempt to find an
27 effective regional partnership and that regional

1 partnership is based on the assumption that there are
2 no fundamentally different values separating the
3 smaller communities from the City of Calgary.

4 Three last quick points. If you look at the
5 political debate that is taking place now about the
6 nature of -- or the importance of cities, we find that
7 the terminology that is being used is that of an urban
8 region. It's used extensively in not only public
9 policy discussion but in political discourse. People
10 talk about an urban region and the reason that that
11 terminology is used is that there is a growing
12 awareness that municipal boundaries as such, don't
13 count for a great deal in terms of how people organize
14 their own social, cultural or political worlds. That
15 urban regions are not coterminous in any sense with
16 municipal boundaries. So the Calgary urban region
17 probably extends not only as far as Airdrie but
18 probably extends out to Banff National Park in some
19 respects, which is a sort of urban park for the City
20 of Calgary. This means then that as far as, sort of,
21 the lines on the maps, the argument is that municipal
22 boundaries are important for the delivery of services
23 but even there, they're becoming less important as
24 people try to organize larger urban regions.

25 Second last point, this is probably a more
26 contentious one, but I suspect that for most citizens,
27 apart from party activists, the actual boundaries that

1 are established for urban ridings are of little
2 relevance. Most urban residents do not live in real
3 constituencies. I may live in Calgary West or in
4 Calgary Northwest but that's a meaningful constituency
5 only at the time that I vote. It is not a real
6 constituency in terms of how I organize my life. I
7 don't want to in any way discredit the very particular
8 interest that political activists bring to the drawing
9 of boundaries. I think that's a legitimate and
10 serious interest, but it has to be kept in mind that
11 for most people urban boundaries, constituency
12 boundaries, are next to irrelevant in terms of how we
13 organize our political life. In a normal day, I will
14 spend a good part of my life in three different urban
15 constituencies and it's only on election day itself
16 that these come into bear -- or come into play.

17 My last point is that when you look at drawing
18 lines for regional community like Calgary -- and I can
19 certainly talk about other regional communities -- I
20 think there is an argument to be made for a
21 distribution format that is more pie-shaped than
22 doughnut-shaped. By this I mean, to me it is more
23 rational to think about constituencies that reach
24 outward from the city centre to bring in parts of the
25 larger metropolitan region than it does to try to
26 think of an outskirts constituency that kind of wraps
27 itself around the metropolitan heartland. The reason

1 I argue this is because there is, in fact, a
2 commonality of interest between people living in
3 satellite communities and people living in the city
4 core. In many respects they are the same people or at
5 least they -- they commute, they work across the same
6 economic and social space. And therefore to me it
7 makes sense to have ridings that go -- that reach
8 outward, if you want, from the city core rather than
9 try to wrap themselves around that city core.

10 The thing to note here, however -- and this is, I
11 guess, my last comment -- is that when the Alberta
12 Legislature adopted the strategy, not in the current
13 redistribution but in the recent past, it was the
14 source of a great deal of controversy in the Province
15 because it was seen as an attempt to diminish the
16 power of the urban vote, rather than to enhance the
17 power of the urban vote. That has been the Provincial
18 legacy. So the combination of combined urban and
19 rural ridings was seen as a strategy for nibbling away
20 the electoral strength of the cities and therefore
21 contributing to a rural dominance of the Provincial
22 Legislature.

23 For better or for worse, that's the legacy that I
24 think any future Electoral Boundary Commission
25 confronts and it is something that has to be
26 confronted head on. So that the argument that this
27 kind of more pie-shape model is one of enhancing the

1 urban electorate is not one that fits neatly with the
2 experience that Albertans have had in the recent past
3 through the distribution of provincial constituencies.

4 I think that's all I have to say and I would be
5 happy to answer any questions you might have.

6 MS. KHULLAR: As you may be aware,
7 Professor Gibbons, we had -- we have created some
8 hybrid ridings in the Edmonton region, what we call
9 urban, urban ridings, and at the Edmonton hearings
10 heard quite a bit about how unhappy many people were
11 with that concept because people were focusing on the
12 municipal boundaries.

13 One of the comments or themes that came up quite
14 often was drawing a distinction between an urban and a
15 suburban voter. I'm wondering if -- with the premise,
16 I guess, being if you live outside the city limits
17 you're a suburban voter and not a truly urban voter,
18 and I've been trying to grapple with that distinction
19 and I'm wondering if you could comment on that kind of
20 distinction at all?

21 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: There is certainly a lot of
22 contemporary policy discussion about the difference
23 between people who live in high density urban
24 environments and people who live in suburban
25 environments. They bring to politics and to economics
26 a somewhat different set of values. However, the
27 reality of Canadian cities, particularly Canadian

1 prairie cities, is that the great majority of the
2 population is in fact a suburban population. Suburbia
3 begins pretty close to the city cores in areas like
4 Calgary and Edmonton and extends well beyond the city
5 boundaries. So to me it is a bit puzzling that one
6 would want to draw a line reflecting the municipal
7 boundary because I'm not sure that it, at this point,
8 represents any real difference in the kinds of
9 lifestyle, or political values, or economic interests
10 that people have. I suspect part of what animates
11 this debate in Edmonton is that the communities
12 outside Edmonton have a greater demographic weight,
13 history to them perhaps, than the surrounding areas,
14 constituencies might outside -- or the surrounding
15 communities might outside Calgary -- where the
16 communities are of sufficiently small size that they
17 can't logically see themselves as the, kind of, the
18 foundation or the anchor for a Federal riding. So I
19 guess I find the argument a little bit difficult to
20 grasp and I'm not aware of anything in the literature,
21 which is not a huge literature, that would suggest
22 that when you draw a line at the municipal boundary,
23 you make a real distinction between people on one side
24 of the boundary and one on the other side. The
25 difference is really between, kind of, the high
26 density core and people living outside the core, but
27 an awful lot of people live outside that core and

1 still the municipal boundaries.

2 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you very much.

3 DR. BARRY: One of the arguments we heard
4 in Edmonton was that if we created eight hybrid
5 constituencies there, it would make it more difficult
6 for the Edmonton region to advance an agenda that
7 reflected, in particular, the interests of the City of
8 Edmonton.

9 Do you see the interests of the City and that of
10 the surrounding communities as being that different,
11 that this would cause a serious problem?

12 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: I don't believe the
13 differences are that great. In fact, there are a set
14 of interests which I think span the two sets of
15 communities quite well. There's a common set of
16 transportation interest. There's certainly a common
17 interest in the application of Federal policies to the
18 region. It seems to me that -- and this is a matter
19 of particular concern for voters in a Federal
20 election -- that Federal policies seldom apply in a
21 way that draw sharp distinctions at, municipal
22 boundaries. To my mind -- and this may seem like a
23 kind of a silly point -- but what counts a lot are the
24 names one applies to the ridings. If one takes the
25 hybrid ridings and calls them Edmonton something, you
26 are in effect, expanding the perceptual scope or
27 political power of Edmonton. If you take those hybrid

1 ridings and name them after the rural hybrid part, you
2 perceptually appear to be diminishing the electoral
3 weight or power of Edmonton. My guess is if you had a
4 riding that was, you know, Edmonton - St. Paul, most
5 people would think of that as a riding that was part
6 of the larger metropolitan community which is --

7 MS. KHULLAR: The regional -- I can't
8 remember the name of the group, the Calgary regional
9 area, and I guess from your comments I would take it
10 that you wouldn't support that type of doughnut type
11 of riding which would take in Cochrane, go down south
12 to Okotoks and Airdrie to the north?

13 MR. ROGER GIBBONS: I guess I make the following
14 point. Take two communities like Cochrane and
15 Okotoks. They both have a very complex and important
16 relationship with the City of Calgary, in terms of
17 population mobility, in terms of service delivery, in
18 terms of the transportation linkages, and so that
19 relationship is a very important one but it's
20 primarily a bilateral relationship between Cochrane
21 and Calgary, between Okotoks and Calgary. And Okotoks
22 and Cochrane may share, to some degree, a sort of a
23 common set of problems but really the relationship
24 between those two communities is not -- pales beside
25 the relationship they have with the City of Calgary.
26 So my intuitive sense is that Members of Parliament
27 that were forced by the nature of the riding to

1 represent both parts of suburban Calgary and Okotoks,
2 or parts of suburban Calgary and Cochrane, would be in
3 a better position to represent this complex bilateral
4 relationship than would an MP who is charged with
5 representing kind of the surrounding -- the
6 surrounding doughnut. So I understand the argument
7 for the doughnut representation but to me it doesn't
8 go to the core of those very important bilateral
9 relationships that are all around the City. And so
10 having an MP who is able to straddle that
11 relationship, I think, would make more intuitive sense
12 to me than an MP who had to, sort of, circle around
13 that metropolitan centre.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibbons, speaking of MPs
15 straddling relationships, we hear from time to time, a
16 rather disquieting argument -- at least it is
17 disquieting to me because it raises the spectre of
18 ghettoization, if you like -- with \$400,000 houses as
19 well as my poor people, to put it in the vernacular.
20 I don't have a very charitable reaction to that
21 frankly but I would be interested in hearing what you
22 say?

23 MR. ROGER GIBBONS: I don't have a very clear
24 response but let me try and back into one. There is
25 no question that Alberta cities, and probably prairie
26 cities as a whole, have distinct pockets of high and
27 low income residents. Fortunately, however, those

1 pockets are almost never of an order of magnitude that
2 would be reflected in a Federal electoral district.
3 We've developed, I think to our credit, a style of
4 residential development that tends to mix incomes to
5 some degree. I understand and have some sympathy with
6 the argument that the political voice of low income
7 families might be reduced in some way if the riding
8 also incorporates upper income families which are
9 endowed with other kinds of political resources that
10 are pretty important. But I guess fundamentally I
11 fall back on the belief that the pattern of housing is
12 sufficiently diverse within Federal constituencies and
13 that again, I would prefer a situation -- and this is
14 a preference not an empirical fact -- I would prefer a
15 situation where Members of Parliament had to come to
16 grips with social diversity within their ridings,
17 rather than having that social diversity reflected in
18 competition among MPs within the House of Commons. I
19 can understand how people would argue different ways
20 but I just prefer bringing that diversity into play
21 within the internals of the mental world of Members of
22 Parliament.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: And for the same reason, I
24 suppose, you would prefer that the Mayor of St. Albert
25 would be obliged to cooperate with his counterpart in
26 the City of Edmonton when it comes to obtaining
27 Federal funds for transportation links between his

1 much smaller city and the City of Edmonton. They are,
2 after all, facing the same reality and it's one of
3 money for transportation.

4 MR. ROGER GIBBONS: I would hate to speak for the
5 Mayor of St. Albert but --

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I just use that as an
7 example.

8 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: I appreciate that. My guess
9 here is that it will be the large urban centers that
10 will drive the Federal engagement, at least over the
11 next decade, with the cities, if we are going to see a
12 greater Federal engagement. And if I was representing
13 a smaller community on the edge of Edmonton or the
14 edge of Calgary, I think I would prefer to ride the
15 coattails of Calgary or Edmonton, rather than try to
16 establish my own more effective -- my own bilateral
17 relationship with the Federal Government. So I guess
18 I would -- I find it difficult to believe that in
19 negotiations or relationships with the Federal
20 government that smaller communities would somehow lose
21 out by being forced into the -- sort of, into the arms
22 of the larger municipalities. I don't think that's
23 the case.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: What about the contrary, does
25 the city have anything to lose?

26 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: I don't believe so. I'm a
27 little bit hesitant here because if you work through a

1 whole set of issues, you may find some in which the
2 political scales sort of shuffle -- adjust a little
3 bit. For example, the issue of homelessness is an
4 issue that affects inner cities to a larger extent
5 than it does the satellite communities that surround
6 them. So you might expect that large cities might
7 place more emphasis on homelessness. They might place
8 more emphasis on an urban aboriginal agenda. They
9 might place more of an emphasis on public housing. So
10 then the question is, would that emphasis be watered
11 down to some extent by hybrid ridings or by
12 surrounding constituencies?

13 Yeah, yeah, to a degree. To a degree it might,
14 but I'm relatively comfortable with the political
15 weight and capacity of the municipal governments to
16 carry that agenda, and if they are able to add in the
17 demographic weight of the surrounding communities, I
18 don't think that undercuts their political weight. So
19 if I was the Mayor of Calgary and I was able to speak
20 for 1.1 million people as opposed to 900,000, I don't
21 think that would hurt. But again, you could find
22 issues on which you could make either argument, but on
23 balance, I don't see it as something that shifts the
24 balance of power significantly.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, just for the benefit of
26 the audience who might not be familiar with what we're
27 referring to in Edmonton, Edmonton is surrounded by

1 eight sizeable communities, some very sizeable ones,
2 within very close proximity, which have a population
3 in total of exceeding 180,000 so there is two ridings
4 there. And so, you know, the question is whether you
5 create a couple of, sort of, wrap-around ridings --
6 and that's been done, by the way, and found wanting in
7 Edmonton. They used to have a riding that wrapped
8 around the north side of it and that's been done away
9 with so that was just the context, ladies and
10 gentlemen, of the discussion -- and so whether you try
11 to make discreet ridings out of those satellite places
12 or you try to incorporate them into the City of
13 Edmonton, in the Federal sense. We've been accused of
14 promoting creeping annexation in Edmonton and so on --
15 an accusation which completely ignores the fact that
16 the Federal Government doesn't have any jurisdiction
17 in the field of annexation so --

18 MS. KHULLAR: And just to expand on that, I
19 mean, we haven't done that in Calgary thus far, just
20 precisely because of the point of the way the
21 population is primarily within the municipal
22 boundaries in Calgary, but who knows what 10 years
23 will bring.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed, who knows? We hear
25 about Balzac being annexed and what next, Airdrie?

26 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: Well, there is no question
27 that the history of municipal regional governments in

1 Edmonton and Calgary has been very different, and
2 Calgary has pursued a policy of annexation that
3 Edmonton hasn't, and the recent attempts to establish
4 a regional -- kind of, a regional government system in
5 Edmonton have not progressed very smoothly. So it's
6 not -- doesn't surprise me that your own deliberations
7 are caught up in these very different histories. I
8 think that is unavoidable and understandable.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: I, for one, am very grateful
10 for your attendance today, sir, and I'm sure my
11 colleagues will join me in thanking you for bringing
12 to us a very informed and expert point of view. I
13 hope that you'll perhaps continue with helping us
14 throughout the rest of our labours.

15 MR. ROGER GIBBINS: I would be pleased to do so.
16 Thank you very much for the opportunity.

17 DR. BARRY: Thank you.

18 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you very much.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks. I'm going to call on
20 the name of Mr. Gary Bobroff, who was scheduled as
21 speaker number six but didn't respond?

22 And that brings us then, ladies and gentlemen, to
23 the end of our program. I want to thank you very,
24 very for coming today. You are a sophisticated
25 audience and you have left us with many excellent
26 suggestions. We are reconvening tonight at 7:30 to
27 hear more of the same -- well, not exactly the same.

1 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:30 P.M.)

2 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENE AT 7:30 P.M.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening everyone.

4 Welcome please to our -- this Calgary Public Hearing
5 of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission. The
6 purpose of our meeting here tonight is to consider the
7 proposal which we have published in this form and a
8 copy of which you probably have; if you don't have,
9 you can get one from our staff. It also came out in
10 summary form in the major newspapers in this handout
11 and I also recommend to your reading a booklet called
12 Representation in the House of Commons, which the
13 secretary has available for your use, if you want it.
14 We -- the proposal is on the Web. The address is up
15 there.

16 Let me introduce the Commission. My name is
17 McCallum. I'm a judge of the Court Of Queen's Bench
18 of Alberta in Edmonton. To my right is Ritu Khullar,
19 a practicing Lawyer in Edmonton; and to my left,
20 Donald Barry, who is a Political Scientist teaching at
21 the University of Calgary. Miranda Petryshyn is the
22 Commission Secretary, the first lady on the left, and
23 next to her is Olga Koval, our reporter. And
24 Dawn Mathews is our Geography Expert from Ottawa. You
25 can tell that because she has her nose in a book full
26 of maps.

27 The process is as follows. We are an independent

1 Commission acting under the authority of the Federal
2 Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act of 1985. We are
3 free from political influence or administrative
4 influence of any kind. We are expected to interpret
5 and apply the law and to serve the public interest and
6 we do so necessarily by competing and deciding between
7 competing interests. So it follows that we can't make
8 everybody happy. We take the general context of
9 things, the big picture, so if a particular point of
10 view which you advance is not adopted by us, please
11 understand that we can't please everyone.

12 Each submission that is made to us, however, you
13 may rest assured, will be evaluated carefully and will
14 receive the attention which it deserves.

15 The final word is ours in the process but the
16 process is consultative. We must follow the legal
17 guidelines set out under Section 15 of the Act in
18 producing our proposal. We have done this, and as I
19 said, that is it.

20 We hold public hearings next, of which this is
21 one. We are almost finished our work. We will be
22 through our public hearings by Thursday of this week.

23 We change our proposal naturally, if we deem it
24 advisable in view of what we have heard, and then we
25 prepare our report, which is sent to the Speaker of
26 the House of Commons. He transmits it then to the
27 Committee of the House for consideration by the

1 Members of Parliament. As a result of their input, we
2 can again revise our report.

3 The final report which we make is sent to the
4 Chief Electoral Officer, who drafts a Representation
5 Order, and it then goes for proclamation to the
6 Governor in Council.

7 This is all to be done by July of 2003. If an
8 election is called before then, it will be -- before
9 July of 2004, it will be argued on the basis of the
10 existing boundaries. So there is a year after the
11 proposal becomes law before it can be -- the new
12 boundaries can be used in an election.

13 The object of the submissions today ladies and
14 gentlemen is electoral boundary readjustment and it is
15 not the redistribution formula, which allocates the
16 number of seats to each Province.

17 There is widespread interest in this subject
18 naturally, and we have received many submissions on
19 that account, so for that reason only, I will explain
20 the matter briefly to you, but I must say that it is
21 not open for discussion at this meeting.

22 If you have reference to that little book that I
23 referred you to, this one here, it describes the
24 history of the redistribution formula in full and it
25 is most interesting.

26 What they do is start with 282 seats which
27 existed in 1985. From that is taken the 3 northern

1 seats of Nunavut, the Northwest Territories, and the
2 Yukon, leaving you 279. That number is divided into
3 the population of Canada as at the last Census, 2001,
4 and it gives you a national quotient, which is then
5 divided into the provincial -- population of each
6 Province, to give you the number of seats, the
7 theoretical number of seats.

8 There are two clauses which might modify that.
9 The first is the Senatorial clause of 1915, which says
10 that any Province shall have no fewer seats than it
11 had Senators in 1915.

12 And the second one is the Grandfather clause
13 which says that no Province shall have fewer seats in
14 the House of Commons than it had in 1976, during the
15 33rd Parliament.

16 For our purposes, we need only remember that
17 Alberta has a population of 2.9 million, it has 26
18 seats now, it is entitled to 28 in the next
19 Parliament. The provincial quotient, which is the
20 average per riding, is 106,243 people.

21 Under Section 15 of the Act we are required to
22 create electoral districts which come as reasonably
23 close as possible to that provincial quotient, that is
24 the primary objective. It's the equality of the vote,
25 is the primary objective. As well, we must consider
26 factors like the community of interest, community of
27 identity, the history of the riding, things like that.

1 The historical pattern must be taken into account, but
2 in the end, of course, and barring unusual
3 circumstances, our ridings should conform as close as
4 possible to that amount -- that number of people.

5 During -- the hearing procedure for this evening
6 will be this: Each speaker will be entitled to 15
7 minutes time limit and when there is 3 minutes to go,
8 the Secretary will hold up a sheet of paper warning
9 you that time is about to expire. We can intervene in
10 your presentation at anytime for clarification
11 purposes but we will try to leave you make your
12 presentation without interruption, if possible.

13 If you leave us time between the end of your
14 remarks and 15 minutes, you can ask us questions which
15 we'll try to answer at that time. If we can't answer
16 them, we will simply take them into consideration.

17 I will have to enforce relevancy. There is many
18 topics surrounding this matter which people like to
19 bring up but they're not necessarily our business, so
20 we will just have to stick to our own business this
21 evening.

22 Again, I refer you to page one of our proposal
23 which really describes what our work is in summary
24 form.

25 We can't take any questions or representations
26 from the floor.

27 And our first speaker this evening is -- and

1 please speak slowly enough so that the reporter can
2 get everything you say, otherwise it is very difficult
3 for her and if the speakers will approach the podium,
4 please, and speak into the microphones.

5 Now, if I can find my agenda, I'll tell who is up
6 first.

7 Mr. Allan Kiernan?

8 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
9 Commission Members, for the opportunity to address the
10 Commission on the matter of Federal electoral
11 boundaries. Since I have prepared quite a detailed
12 written submission, I wonder if it be appropriate if I
13 just highlight the pertinent points in it --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed it would.

15 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: -- rather than read the
16 submission.

17 Basically, my submission has three major points
18 that I would like to make with the Commission.

19 Firstly, to urge the Commission to strive for a
20 closer tolerance in the population of ridings in
21 Alberta than is in the proposal that's been put
22 forward.

23 Secondly, to ask the Commission to consider
24 deviating from a strict adherence to the municipal
25 boundaries for the City of Calgary in order to give
26 the residents of Calgary more equitable
27 representation.

1 And thirdly, to offer some specific suggestions
2 for the boundary adjustments in Calgary Southwest
3 where I am resident.

4 Our Federal Census was taken about a year ago and
5 it must -- the results of this Commission must prevail
6 for another 10 or more years. I believe that the
7 Commission should try and narrow the gap now, since
8 population does change and probably grow. I think
9 right now -- plus or minus 5 percent tolerance would
10 be a good target and I've attached a table here that
11 indicates that 14 of the 28 proposed ridings exceed
12 plus or minus 5 percent. I think it would be
13 certainly theoretically possible to take the map of
14 Alberta and split it up into 28 geographical areas
15 with almost exactly 106,000 population in each one.
16 Deviating too much from that undermines one of the
17 basic tenets of democracy which is representation by
18 population.

19 In particular, on a broad scale, I would like to
20 draw your attention to the Grande Prairie - Peace
21 River riding proposed, which has approximately 115
22 percent of the provincial average, compared with
23 Athabasca - Fort McMurray, which has only 83 percent.
24 These two ridings are really quite similar. They're
25 huge ridings in northern Alberta. One city dominates
26 the population of each of those ridings. There is not
27 a tremendous difference between the two and yet the

1 proposal means the voter in the Grande Prairie - Peace
2 River district would only have 73 percent of the
3 voting power of the person in the Fort McMurray
4 district. I don't think that that's, in my view,
5 close enough.

6 As you are no doubt aware, the population of
7 Alberta increased by about 17 percent since the last
8 Census, and while it may not continue at that rapid
9 growth, it might be wise to try and design the
10 boundaries to maintain some equity over the lifespan
11 of the boundaries rather than have them start out out
12 of whack and then grow even further out of whack.

13 And I've attached a table that shows by this
14 point in time, we have ridings that are 10 percent
15 below where they should be and other ridings which are
16 30 percent above. So that gives again, a huge, in the
17 later life of the boundaries, gives a huge divergence.

18 We know that inner city ridings are not going to
19 grow appreciably, whereas the boundaries of the cities
20 and the urban areas are where the growth and
21 population occurs.

22 So, in summary, my first suggestion is that, just
23 that we should try and reexamine some of the less
24 populated ridings and some of the more populated
25 ridings and try and get them a little closer.

26 Secondly, I would like to address the overall
27 representation of the City of Calgary. I've attached

1 a table which indicates that Calgary is under
2 represented by an average of about 3 or 4 percent.
3 Edmonton seems to be, sort of, bang on, and the rest
4 of the Province is over represented by 3 or 4 percent.
5 I also note that in Calgary, the Commission seems to
6 honour a strict adherence to the municipal boundaries
7 of the City of Calgary, whereas in Edmonton there
8 doesn't seem to be any such predisposition towards
9 drawing the boundaries. If that restriction was
10 removed in Calgary and some of the boundaries included
11 some of outlying areas that border the City, it would
12 be possible to give Calgary voters more equal
13 representation. It can't be done within the City of
14 Calgary because if you add one more seat in Calgary,
15 that would put Calgary far under the representation.
16 So the only way it can be done is to bring in some
17 outlying areas such as is done in Edmonton.

18 Finally, I've got some specific recommendations
19 with regard to my own constituency, Calgary Southwest,
20 and they are in the written material. I think the
21 northern boundary of the constituency should be
22 adjusted to follow the north shore of the Elbow River
23 and Glenmore Reservoir in the westerly part. This
24 would bring the district of Bayview back into Calgary
25 Southwest where it has always been. With any luck
26 that would be this area just right in here. The
27 boundary now follows down here and right up the middle

1 of the Reservoir and the proposal cuts these, oh, 150
2 houses or so out of Calgary Southwest. And they
3 actually -- the Community Association is called
4 Palliser, Bayview, Pump Hill, so they -- all these
5 three communities are in the same Community
6 Association, same schools, churches, etcetera, serve
7 them.

8 The second change I would suggest is that the
9 area, again, of Eagle Ridge in here, Chinook Park and
10 Kelvin Grove be brought back into Calgary Southwest.
11 Again, they have been there for some -- historically.

12 And my third major suggestion is that MacLeod
13 Trail be used as the -- if I could pick it out here --
14 as the boundary right through the riding. I believe
15 it goes right down here. That would take this part,
16 Fairview, and put it back into Calgary Southeast.

17 Those three suggestions are all based on local
18 knowledge and local Community Associations and
19 relationships within the community. Now, they would
20 add some to the population of Calgary Southwest and
21 put it even slightly more over the provincial quotient
22 and my earlier suggestion of incorporating some rural
23 areas into the ridings would overcome that. The
24 riding could be moved up from the southern City of
25 Calgary boundary.

26 That, in a nutshell, summarizes my feelings on
27 it. I would be pleased to answer any questions or --

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Kiernan, thank you
2 very much. That is very good work, I must say, and it
3 will prove to be most useful to us, I think. I'm
4 going to ask my colleagues to speak to some of the
5 specific matters that you raised concerning the City
6 of Calgary but speaking of Grande Prairie - Peace
7 River and Athabasca - Fort McMurray, it is obvious to
8 anyone the great disparity and the relatively large
9 deviation present in those ridings, but you will know
10 from reading the Statute that up to 25 percent is
11 permitted without invoking any extraordinary
12 circumstances, so we are well within that. We're not
13 well within what we would like to be. We were aiming
14 for 10 percent. You said it should be possible to
15 craft ridings at 5 percent and indeed it is, but we
16 think that 5 percent is cutting it too low to
17 accommodate growth which will occur between now and
18 the next Census, and that is true of many ridings,
19 particularly in Calgary, which is growing at such a
20 rate and to the west of Calgary. If you don't set
21 them too low -- I mean, if you don't set them, say,
22 between 5 or 10 percent lower at a minimum, you know
23 very well they are going to be way over by the time
24 the next Census comes around and, of course, who knows
25 how many elections will be held in that interval. So
26 the people's vote will be diluted if it becomes too
27 populous in the interim.

1 Now as to Athabasca - Fort McMurray, we have no
2 concerns about that at all. It is 88,000 or something
3 now, and Fort McMurray is growing at a phenomenal
4 rate. We have every confidence that within a few
5 years, even if the projections are half met, it will
6 be up to the provincial quota.

7 Fort McMurray - Athabasca area is quite
8 different with respect to Peace River. There is a lot
9 of farmland in the Grande Prairie - Peace River area
10 extending all the way up to High Level. That is not
11 the case at all on the eastern half of the Province.
12 There is nothing but bush there, right from
13 Lac La Biche up to the Northwest Territories border
14 basically, except for the City of Fort McMurray. It
15 is growing so fast that it will carry the whole area
16 with it.

17 Now, our real problem, of course, is over in
18 Peace River and Grande Prairie. You can't do without
19 either one of those ridings, the cities, without
20 making a constituency which is far too small, like 50
21 percent too small. And if you include them both, with
22 their natural trading areas and given -- bearing in
23 mind the isolation of the entire Peace River block,
24 you have a riding which is bigger than we would like,
25 but for the life of us, we couldn't come up with
26 anything better.

27 If you have a better suggestion, we are all for

1 it. So that is our problem. I don't know what's
2 going to -- I think what we thought from talking with
3 the Northerners that the only solution to this will
4 ultimately be a connector which goes across the
5 Province from Peace River to Fort McMurray. That
6 would enable you to have a northern riding, say, in
7 the northern one third of the Province which would be
8 populous enough and which would be manageable in terms
9 of representation. And then you'd have another one
10 below that and then you'd get into the Edmonton area.

11 So eventually that will happen, we hope, but it
12 hasn't happened yet and without a road east and west,
13 it's just completely impossible. There was a riding
14 up there at one time which included both Fort McMurray
15 and Peace River, and if somebody told me to hold a
16 constituency meeting, you would drive four and a half
17 hours from Peace River to Athabasca or from Fort
18 McMurray to Athabasca and the two sides would meet
19 there and then you'd have the meeting and then you'd
20 go four and a half hours, each of them, back home
21 again. So it was wildly impractical and that's gone
22 forever, but that's what the future holds, we hope.

23 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: So you've provided for some
24 growth, anticipated growth in Fort McMurray then --

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Lots, and there will be lots
26 by all accounts -- 23,000.

27 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: There was considerable growth

1 in Grande Prairie with the last --

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, and that's not a
3 good thing for us -- I mean, it's a problem, but there
4 is just no place to put it outside of Fort McMurray
5 because, you see, between the Wapiti River and the
6 Athabasca River, there is again a vast expanse of
7 bush, nothing but, no people.

8 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: Oh, Fox Creek is in there. I
9 lived there for a couple of years.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Fox Creek is there, that's
11 right. But Fox Creek fits well enough in the
12 Yellowhead riding, we think anyway. So that's one
13 point and now I just defer to my colleagues to address
14 your concerns about Calgary.

15 MS. KHULLAR: I just have one question and
16 then I'll turn it over to my colleague, Mr. Barry.
17 You had commented on the fact that we followed the
18 municipal boundaries in Calgary, whereas we didn't in
19 Edmonton, and one reason for that is the growth
20 patterns in Calgary and Edmonton are very different.
21 Most of the growth in Calgary is within the municipal
22 boundaries and in Edmonton much of the growth is in
23 the surrounding areas.

24 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: St. Albert and Sherwood Park.

25 MS. KHULLAR: Sherwood Park and there's a
26 number of large centers. But I'm intrigued by your
27 comment and I'm wondering what outlying areas, what

1 areas outside of Calgary would you think should be
2 part of -- if we were to consider doing similar type
3 of ridings in Calgary, did you have specific areas
4 that you thought would be appropriate to be included?

5 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: Well, certainly west of the
6 City, west of the city limits. Now, most of those
7 people work in the City, their children, a lot of
8 them, they certainly get hospitalization in the City,
9 there are schools, high schools out there so the
10 children don't go to high school in the City --

11 MS. KHULLAR: So do you mean as far as
12 Cochrane then or help me out?

13 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: No, not as far as Cochrane
14 but basically between Cochrane and Calgary city
15 limits, there is quite a population there. And then
16 south towards Okotoks, again, a lot of the people
17 there -- Okotoks serves as a bedroom community to
18 Calgary and --

19 MS. KHULLAR: So including Okotoks to the
20 south then?

21 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: Yes, you could go both
22 directions. You could add to MacLeod in the south and
23 the west.

24 MS. KHULLAR: Not -- that is something we
25 can consider and obviously those population taking a
26 centre like Okotoks out of MacLeod will affect
27 MacLeod's numbers and so forth but I'm just curious to

1 what you had in mind?

2 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: And that was the general
3 area. I don't think you could go as far as Airdrie in
4 the north. There is still quite a gap there. And
5 most of the growth is within the city limits to the
6 north.

7 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you. That helps me
8 out.

9 DR. BARRY: We had some sense that our
10 proposals for Calgary South Centre, Southwest and so
11 on, weren't being greeted with overwhelming approval,
12 so we had started working on a revised map, and if we
13 can bring it up, you will see that either you read our
14 minds or we read yours, because they are remarkably
15 similar.

16 We have the southern boundary of Calgary South
17 Centre now running along Glenmore Trail and we've used
18 the CP tracks as the eastern boundary, and that
19 creates a constituency with a variance of about 10
20 percent above the quota. The old -- the proposal that
21 we circulated has a variance of about 12, so this
22 takes it down a little bit and allows perhaps for a
23 little bit of growth in the centre of the City if that
24 is coming. That gives you an indication of what our
25 thinking is right now, about how it should go.

26 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: That gives me some comfort on
27 the local introspective. Well, thanks very much. I

1 know you have a difficult job. You do your best work
2 and we all come up and take pot shots at it.

3 DR. BARRY: In Calgary you feel like
4 you're writing the boundaries in water.

5 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you very much,
6 Mr. Kiernan.

7 MR. ALLAN KIERNAN: Thanks.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

9 And, I think, if I have the right one,
10 Mr. Barry Rust?

11 MS. KHULLAR: What about Bruce McDonald?

12 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: And I didn't, sorry, my name
13 is Bruce McDonald.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr. McDonald. Yes, I
15 skipped over you.

16 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: Given the revised map, I may
17 not be very long, and I have this written submission.
18 I've got copies for every member of the panel. I
19 apologize.

20 I am, you might just say, that I had expected to
21 be following Mr. Tudor Beattie, who happens to be a
22 resident of the neighborhood, and who is going to make
23 his own submission on behalf of the Calgary Centre
24 Federal Liberal Association, and I was basically -- he
25 addressed our Board about a month ago and brought this
26 matter to our concern.

27 I can simply say it's sort of a nonpartisan

1 approach, because as Mr. Beattie knows, I'm not
2 involved with the Calgary Centre Federal Liberal
3 Association. So I'm going to leave that.

4 But mine is a very narrow point because I'm the
5 President of Britannia Community Association and my
6 comments were directed simply in that context and to
7 specifically, as it relates to Britannia, and just so
8 we are clear, Britannia, is the neighborhood that is
9 bounded on the south by 50th Avenue --

10 MS. KHULLAR: Mr. McDonald, there is a
11 pointer, a laser pointer, on the little square. Just
12 push the button.

13 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: I'm not a hi-tech guy, just
14 bear with me here. I'm a lawyer. And besides, I need
15 new glasses.

16 But anyway, I think the point is that Britannia
17 is bounded -- I know I've got this part right -- on
18 the south by 50th Avenue, on the east by Elbow Drive,
19 and the west by the river, and on the north we are
20 about two blocks south of the Elbow as it goes to the
21 north there. So we're this little, sort of, bit of a
22 neighborhood here. And the history of Britannia was
23 that until 1997, we were part of Calgary Southwest,
24 and prior to that, we were part of the old Calgary
25 South Riding Association.

26 In 1997, what happened was the boundary of
27 Calgary Centre was moved down to 50th Avenue so we

1 then got lumped in with Calgary Centre which, at the
2 time, didn't cause any particular consternation, even
3 though we had traditionally been aligned more with the
4 Bel-Aire, Mayfair, Kelvin Grove, those neighborhoods
5 to the south. The reason being, quite frankly, is
6 that there was quite a high commonality of interest
7 and identity so that there was really no issue.

8 We have become concerned, I guess, with the
9 original proposal, which I understand may now be
10 revised, from what I've been told, that Britannia,
11 along with Mayfair, Bel-Aire, Rideau Roxboro, are
12 going to be put over into Calgary East, which is an
13 area that really is separated from us by a large
14 industrial tract, which is basically not got very few
15 people living there. And so we are sort of a
16 geographic orphan, in a sense, to the rest of Calgary
17 East, whereas we would much more logically included in
18 the proposal for Calgary South Centre. And I
19 understand that the -- to their credit -- the Calgary
20 Centre Liberal Association has got a more detailed
21 analysis on this which we, if I understand it
22 correctly, and they haven't changed their mind, we
23 would be completely supportive of.

24 But, in light of what I understand is the
25 revision that this panel is thinking of in terms of
26 having Britannia and some of the other neighborhoods
27 lumped into Calgary South Centre, I don't know if I

1 really have anything more to say, because that was our
2 main concern, as I say.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. McDonald, I'd -- as
4 a practicing lawyer, you know not to sit down too
5 quickly, assuming that you've got it made.

6 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: Oh, I assume nothing. I have
7 been around long enough to know that. So I'm going to
8 answer any questions but I was delighted to see the
9 change there, I must say.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we just -- thanks to
11 our very skillful technician, we were able to do
12 things like this fairly quickly, and we hope it
13 illustrates our willingness to be accommodating to
14 constructive suggestions and -- not to say that that's
15 going to be the end result.

16 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: No, I understand. You have a
17 lot of considerations, and ours is a sort of narrow
18 one, that I'm representing the neighborhood and I
19 guess some of the adjoining neighborhoods, but there
20 is a historical pattern that, you know, we have. Our
21 neighborhood of Britannia was always in Calgary South,
22 and then Southwest as that became a new riding, and
23 then more recently in Calgary Centre when they had to
24 take into account the expansion. But that's also
25 consistent with the historical pattern of that part of
26 the City and we really, to my knowledge, have never
27 been lumped in with any of the ridings -- any of the

1 districts in Calgary East for any Federal electoral
2 purpose ever, and I don't think we are provincially
3 either but, of course, we're concerned with the
4 Federal --

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we did have maps of
6 communities leagues, and so on, at our disposal when
7 we did our work and we certainly considered that
8 aspect of the matter. We obviously haven't succeeded
9 in every case.

10 Perhaps you might explain, from your
11 understanding of the situation, just what the nexus
12 is, if any, between discreet community associations or
13 neighborhoods, insofar as the Federal electoral
14 districts might be -- does it do any harm, in other
15 words, for a Federal electoral district to bisect a
16 community?

17 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: Well, I think it does. I
18 think it is preferable for similar communities be
19 represented -- if at all possible, if it's fairly
20 feasible, to be represented in the same constituency.
21 Certainly, as I said, that has been the historical
22 pattern with Britannia in Calgary South and then
23 Southwest and then Centre. I mean, it has all been
24 part of the similar pattern. And I guess, in terms of
25 Calgary, MacLeod Trail is a real dividing line --

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course.

27 MR. BRUCE MCDONALD: -- in many ways and that --

1 and simply put, our proposal was going to be that that
2 would be the western most boundary for Calgary East
3 because that is a very logical boundary for a lot
4 of -- well, it is a boundary for a lot of things. It
5 would be a very logical one for a Federal riding.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything further?
7 How about you? Thanks, Mr. McDonald.

8 MR. BARRY MCDONALD: Okay. Thank you. Sorry
9 about the technology there.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

11 Mr. Barry Rust?

12 MR. BARRY RUST: To the distinguished Members
13 of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to
14 address you on behalf of Calgary Southwest. I do have
15 a written submission in three parts, can I give you a
16 copy?

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. Thank you.

18 MR. BARRY RUST: Since you have it, I won't
19 read that but I will expand on a few of the points
20 that I do make here.

21 I do speak to you as the past candidate for the
22 Liberal party in this riding of Southwest. I was, in
23 fact, the Inaugural President for the riding of
24 Southwest for the Liberal party, so I was a part of
25 boundary discussions on the previous redistribution
26 and I've also spent a fair bit of time with the
27 provincial parties and the negotiation and discussion

1 of boundaries as well. So I do respectfully submit to
2 you that I am approaching this with a degree of
3 history at least and experience in the immediate area.

4 I have to say as well that what I'm going to say
5 to you, in part, is going to endorse the submission
6 made by Mr. Kiernan and Mr. McDonald and I'm also
7 going to somewhat endorse what I anticipate will be
8 some of the points, at least, I understand in
9 discussion with the Calgary Centre group, and I have,
10 in fact, had discussions with Mr. Stevenson who will
11 address you from the Alliance perspective, and they
12 too are making some of the very same proposals that we
13 have in mind.

14 Now, having said that, I was very heartened to
15 hear Mr. Barry's remarks with respect to some of your
16 considered changes because, to be frank with you, it
17 almost hits bang on what I am suggesting to you.

18 My one area of concern -- and it's an acceptable
19 concern, but I would still urge you very much to stay
20 with MacLeod Trail, as opposed to the railroad tracks,
21 as an eastern boundary. And Mr. McDonald identified
22 fairly well, involving the Britannia community, just
23 expanding on how important the demarcation point
24 MacLeod Trail is, and how people on one side of
25 MacLeod Trail are inclined to think and act
26 cooperatively in one manner, and those on the other,
27 in an equal fashion, but will not have that much

1 direct association with each other.

2 I was identified to this -- is this the little
3 gadget that gives you the red light?

4 In any event, I will likewise endorse the --
5 Mr. Kiernan's suggestion with respect to Bayview. I
6 identify it within my report as an area that will be
7 isolated into an island reserve and its entire
8 association is with all of the community below it,
9 including the Community Association, but including the
10 civic ward politics, and including provincial
11 electoral boundaries, and it would really sit all by
12 itself being blocked by a body of water.

13 In the suggestion that I am making to you is I do
14 feel very strongly about Calgary and the growth of
15 Calgary and the development of Calgary along the lines
16 of quadrants. Now, I appreciate we are not dealing
17 with four or five constituencies, but nevertheless, in
18 south Calgary those distinctions are very, very real.
19 And we have many members of our organization that work
20 during elections and I consulted with some; some took
21 the liberty of speaking with me knowing that I was
22 going to address you. But they all, without fail,
23 identified the little problem that exists now and it
24 refers in part to the existing use of railway tracks,
25 to those little bits and pieces that somehow say
26 Southwest on them but they're in the Southeast riding
27 or something equivalent thereof.

1 I spoke as well -- I took the liberty of talking
2 with the Returning Officer for the riding and he told
3 me -- and thus again, I'll underline my plea for the
4 use of MacLeod Trail -- how relieved he was to see the
5 existing boundaries were in MacLeod Trail as opposed
6 to the railway tracks, for the very reasons that I am
7 discussing.

8 But if you take the areas of Fairview and Acadia,
9 that southeast section, and lump it in with southwest,
10 then you are magnifying what has been a problem for
11 the last 20 odd years. Even with the old riding of
12 Calgary South, there was still some problems, despite
13 the fact we're all one riding, trying to identify how
14 one area geographically fits with another one.

15 So there is a long history here of working within
16 the quadrants in south Calgary and I would urge you to
17 please consider, with all possibility, the use of
18 keeping southwest, southwest, and keeping southeast,
19 southeast.

20 Having said that, of course, I think I am also
21 endorsing the position made by Mr. McLeod, and I am
22 expressing the same concern for what would be Calgary
23 South Centre people, that they would lose a part of
24 their natural southwest area and put over into Calgary
25 East.

26 So I'm suggesting to you that Bayview, Eagle
27 Ridge, Chinook Park and Kingsland should be returned

1 to Calgary Southwest, and suggesting that the areas of
2 Fairview and Acadia should go to their rightful place
3 in Calgary Southeast. And I have identified a
4 northern boundary of Glenmore Trail, which I felt was
5 more than workable.

6 I do know that particularly with my equivalent
7 with the Alliance party, that he questions whether or
8 not the population will meet your guidelines in
9 Southwest. My numbers indicate they will. I must
10 admit that I didn't prepare them personally. They
11 were done for me. But I am assuming at least, that if
12 in fact we are a little bit shy, you could extend the
13 boundary northward, but I'm really going to suggest,
14 if I could use the Chair's example with respect to the
15 area of Athabasca, I think if you even do a Census
16 take there now, you would find the numbers would have
17 increased sufficiently that it would meet your
18 targets, and the ongoing growth of the City and the
19 growth of this area of the City is such that by the
20 time 2004, you can almost be assured that you would
21 have those, if, in fact, there is some question.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you point to the
23 particular area again for my benefit, please?

24 MR. BARRY RUST: Certainly. I'm really
25 suggesting Glenmore Trail is the area I'm identifying
26 here, and the -- pardon me, sorry. Glenmore Trail on
27 this map would be existing up there.

1 And that, well, they would coincide exactly with
2 the map that was brought forward when you made your
3 point, Mr. Barry, about where you were thinking of
4 making the boundary. Maybe I'm confused there. This
5 is the northern part that comes through. I guess I
6 was right the first time and I apologize. Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: The purple and grey boundary
8 would be Glenmore.

9 MR. BARRY RUST: So this would be Glenmore.
10 Again, as MacLeod Trail is a very significant point of
11 demarcation, so is, in fact, Glenmore Trail. It's a
12 huge traffic artery. I think that, for the most part,
13 communities on either side of it would probably agree
14 it is in effect, the extent to which they relate to
15 the other communities. It may not have been the
16 traditional way but with the expanding growth and the
17 traffic that that particular area carries, it does
18 form a significant line for which I think people would
19 consider it to be a natural point, at least, for a
20 boundary. And as I said, I do think that the figures
21 would work.

22 Also, I would point out to you, again using the
23 same position that the Chair identified, we are --
24 announced recently that there will be new undertakings
25 with respect to prospective extension of the
26 boundaries of the City of Calgary and annexation, so
27 that by the time these come into effect, these might

1 very well in effect have expanded in any event, so
2 that if you did consider a further expansion, if you
3 needed numbers, that would also be a reasonable
4 option.

5 So with respect, I think that pretty much
6 contains the submission that we have to make, and the
7 suggestion, I think, is just simply that we do have a
8 tradition of working within the ridings that we have
9 identified. I think they have a natural affinity to
10 Southwest. Their community affairs or business
11 affairs, their cultural affairs, for the most part,
12 coordinate with the other ridings in Calgary
13 Southwest. I'm speaking specifically Bayview, Eagle
14 Ridge, Chinook Park, and Kingsland. And so I think if
15 these were to be returned to us, I think it would be a
16 compact riding and one that is very consistent with
17 the type of work we do now. We would lose, of course,
18 some areas. That is understandable and we know why
19 that is, but I don't think it would in any way hinder
20 the ability of the remaining ridings to work together
21 as a cohesive unit.

22 MS. KHULLAR: I just want to confirm, Dawn,
23 that's the revised, our revision for the revised
24 proposal?

25 We showed this revised proposal this morning and
26 one comment this afternoon that was made to us, and I
27 would just like your thoughts on it, Mr. Rust, is the

1 Lakeview community, which I understand is that little
2 bit just north of the Glenmore Reservoir, should, it
3 was suggested, be put into the riding, the purple
4 riding, in Calgary West, as opposed to Calgary
5 Southwest -- Calgary South Centre, sorry. I'm
6 wondering what your thoughts are, having been involved
7 in the area, or whether you think it belongs in the
8 Southwest?

9 MR. BARRY RUST: I guess I see Lakeview as
10 being the flexible part of the presentation here.
11 Originally I had it included, just as you show it, on
12 the map. The people from Calgary Centre, with respect
13 to South Centre, were worried that they required it to
14 get the needed population base, so I ceded to that
15 request.

16 I think, frankly, it would work either way. They
17 have been identified with the ridings on the other
18 side of the reservoir. Both some civic and provincial
19 politics have included them in the past there, so they
20 would be used to that. On the other hand though, both
21 37th Street, Crowchild Trail, are very major arteries
22 for them. Much of that traffic flows directly into
23 the downtown area, without impacting on what the rest
24 of our riding would be. So if I were having a debate,
25 I could likewise, you know, make an argument on the
26 other side. I would suggest to you that it is one
27 though that probably you could use without offending

1 any particular -- either the Centre people, or the
2 South Centre people, or the Southwest people,
3 depending on how it would work for numbers and the
4 accommodations that you require.

5 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Rust. That's
7 very helpful.

8 MR. BARRY RUST: Thanks very much.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tudor Beattie?

10 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Yes, as the agenda indicates,
11 I represent the Calgary Centre Federal Liberal
12 Association and many people who participated in the
13 presentation that I'm going to be making to you are
14 actually present here in court -- present here in the
15 hearing room, including Janice Capriotti, our
16 President, Mr. Alex Celenzi, Barry Poppenroth, Susie
17 Dix and Susan Platt, Jarred Lalonde and Juliett
18 Turnbull. So we formed a Committee and we're very
19 interested in this matter and of course we represent
20 what is presently Calgary Centre, although we did
21 reach out to various communities and I will be making
22 some reference to that.

23 Now, I don't have a written submission but I do
24 have a package which I'm going to perhaps just take a
25 moment, if that could be distributed to you? I will
26 say it is extremely close to your revised proposal and
27 I will simply make some points that deal with them.

1 I'm going to try and shorten up what I have to say.

2 Our major concern to begin with -- the package I
3 have given you starts on the first page with the
4 present Calgary South Centre, and the next page is the
5 original revised boundaries, and then the third page
6 is our proposal which I've, with some help, had color
7 highlighted. And highlighted in yellow is the part
8 which is presently in the proposed Calgary South
9 Centre and we are recommending that that stay there,
10 and highlighted in pink is that part of Calgary East
11 which we are asking be transferred in to Calgary South
12 Centre, and at the bottom highlighted in green is that
13 which we are suggesting be transferred out of Calgary
14 South Centre.

15 Now, we did do some work with the figures from
16 the civic Census to support what we have to say and I
17 actually have the figures for the communities we were
18 discussing. I don't have them in my package but if
19 you look at the back page of my package, you will see
20 that listed, first of all, are the communities which
21 we list as transfer in, Bel-Aire, Britannia, Elboya,
22 Eriton, Mayfair, Meadowlark Park, Rideau Park,
23 Roxboro, Stanley Park and Windsor Park, and I can tell
24 you that Mr. Zelinzi, for the most part, and to some
25 extent myself, canvassed all of these communities and
26 all but one were contacted and all are in favour of
27 going into Calgary South Centre.

1 Then if we go down to the transfer out
2 communities of Eagle Ridge, Bayview, Kelvin Grove,
3 Kingsland and Chinook Park, these are the communities
4 that Mr. Rust and others were talking about. They are
5 all presently in Calgary Southwest, and from what I
6 can gather, and there has been consultation again with
7 Calgary Southwest and certainly Calgary Southwest as
8 it's now constituted, and as far as I know, these
9 communities wish to remain in Calgary Southwest. So
10 far we are in a situation where there is -- as far as
11 we can ascertain -- and there was considerable
12 consultation -- community support for this.

13 Now, the strongest -- the largest concern that
14 sort of led to this was the criteria of -- in Section
15 15 of the Act, asking -- setting out that the
16 Commission shall consider the following in determining
17 reasonable electoral district boundaries, and (i)1,
18 the community of interest or community of identity in
19 or the historical pattern of an electoral district in
20 the Province and what our major concern -- and
21 Mr. Zelinzi is going to hold up a map for you which we
22 did some work on -- is under the present proposal,
23 there is a very large area which is depicted in white
24 in which there is virtually no population. That is an
25 industrial area. And then to the east of that is
26 Calgary East, and in pink are these nine or ten
27 communities that we are asking to be moved back into

1 Calgary -- into Calgary South Centre.

2 So that -- there simply is this non-residential
3 area which separates it and the demographics of the
4 two areas -- by the two areas, I mean that which is in
5 pink and Calgary East, are quite different. There is
6 in pink, generally, have people that do not go to
7 Calgary East for work purposes. They go downtown.
8 And I can tell you that there is just very little
9 interaction between those particular parts. So --

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. The white area
11 depicted is really between the Bow River and the
12 railroad tracks then?

13 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Yes. We actually picked
14 MacLeod Trail as our boundary and I don't take a
15 strong exception to your suggestion of the railroad
16 tracks, that's -- but, however, we did pick MacLeod
17 Trail and that was really as a result of numbers.

18 So we are suggesting that the western boundary of
19 South Centre be MacLeod Trail and, of course -- sorry,
20 the eastern boundary and the western boundary of east
21 be MacLeod Trail.

22 But, as I say, there isn't a huge amount of
23 difference.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

25 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Yes. The other area which we
26 differ slightly -- and you just discussed this with
27 Mr. Rust -- has to do with the areas which -- where is

1 this? Here we are. If we could move the map just up
2 a bit? Perfect.

3 We are suggesting that the southern boundary
4 actually follow the reservoir, so that this area which
5 includes, what I understand is North Glenmore Park,
6 Lincoln Park, and Lakeview Village, would come in with
7 Calgary South Centre. I must confess that this was
8 really because we were going to -- we were working
9 with the numbers. And I will just give you the
10 numbers as we calculated them on our proposal.

11 On our proposal, Calgary South Centre would
12 transfer in, under the 2001 civic Census -- and this
13 can be seen from the back page -- 11,449; and from the
14 second back page, we know that Calgary South Centre as
15 was originally proposed has 119,163 persons in there.
16 And on our proposal, the transfer out communities in
17 the 2001 Census, have 9,622 residents. So under our
18 proposal, Calgary South Centre would gain 1,827
19 residents, to increase it slightly to 120,990
20 residents. Calgary East would simply lose residents
21 under our proposal, a total of 11,449 to one thousand
22 four eight eight six, and Calgary Southwest would gain
23 these 9,610 residents, and that would increase their
24 population to 116,692.

25 So I thought it was important to just lay out the
26 exact figures, which we had calculated. As I say,
27 the -- your proposal certainly meets most of the

1 concerns that our committee had expressed and I don't
2 know if I can add very much. I can tell you that
3 MacLeod Trail does form more of an actual boundary
4 than the tracks, the railway tracks, in some ways.
5 There are very few residents between MacLeod Trail and
6 the railway tracks. There are some but the type of
7 community that is there is older and a lot of rental
8 housing and this type of thing. And while it is
9 presently in Calgary Centre, I simply leave that with
10 you. There isn't a large population there.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Beattie, do I take
12 it then that you would be content to live with a city
13 riding of 120,000 people, just to start off with?

14 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Well, it's only -- I mean,
15 under the proposal, it was 119,000 so that was -- it
16 was in that context, and I would be -- I would ask,
17 take this opportunity to ask the Commission, what,
18 under your proposal, what would Calgary South Center's
19 population be?

20 DR. BARRY: It's about 116 --

21 MS. MATHEWS: It's 117,223.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Under our published proposal?

23 MS. MATHEWS: The variance would be 10
24 percent.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the variance is ten. I
26 don't -- I'm not trying to debate the point with you,
27 sir. I just wondered because obviously if you listen

1 to Mr. Beattie, he sees no justification for having
2 that much of a variance.

3 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Well, I think you raise a
4 valid point and to some extent, you know, we have
5 worked as a Committee and I'm reluctant to say things
6 that I haven't consulted with the rest of my Committee
7 on but certainly, I think that it would stand to
8 reason that to be at 117,000 would be preferable to
9 being 120,000.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: But it is still better at
11 106, or even 100, don't you think?

12 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Not if the boundaries as
13 presently constituted. I can tell you that that was
14 really the driving force. The nine communities that
15 were asking to be transferred in have never -- not,
16 none of them have ever been involved as part of
17 Calgary East at any time. Traditionally they've
18 either been Calgary Centre, or Calgary Southwest, or
19 the old riding of Calgary South. There is simply no
20 affinity between those communities and the rest of
21 Calgary East and the fact of that large industrial
22 area -- which is more than two kilometers east to
23 west -- is what's most important from our perspective.

24 MS. KHULLAR: I have one question. Earlier
25 today we heard -- let me step back. One of the
26 reasons that the variances in the inner city ridings
27 is higher is because there's not as much growth

1 happening or in terms of potential for growth going
2 outward, as in the more suburban ridings, but we heard
3 about some large development projects arriving in the
4 east village area and west of Eau Claire, and I'm
5 wondering if you familiar with those or have any
6 numbers or --

7 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Well, I am. I have no
8 numbers and I think that the comment has some
9 validity. While there is very little potential growth
10 in the established areas to the south and the west,
11 there is certainly -- and still is -- a lot of
12 development taking place in Erlton, and there are
13 condominiums in the areas that you were just making
14 reference to. Having said that, I think I speak for
15 the Committee in saying that the potential growth of
16 Calgary South Centre as proposed is not of the same
17 magnitude as the areas that will touch the boundaries
18 of the City.

19 MS. KHULLAR: I have one other question.
20 Again, following up on some of the things we heard
21 earlier this afternoon. We've heard some comments
22 about the name of the riding, Calgary South Centre,
23 and I'm just wondering if you have anything --

24 MR. TUDOR BEATTIE: Yes, and actually our
25 original submission which I thought had been mislaid,
26 but I will make it, was that it is a feeling of the
27 Committee I represent that Calgary South Centre is a

1 perfectly acceptable name but we were going to try to
2 meddle with the name of Calgary North Centre and
3 suggest that that simply be changed to be Calgary
4 North. There is no Calgary North riding. There is
5 Northeast and Nosehill which cover those areas off and
6 it was the view of the Committee that to have simply
7 one riding bearing the name of Calgary Centre, whether
8 South went before Centre or not, would be -- would
9 avoid confusion. So that was our second submission.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to remark,
11 Mr. Beattie, that sooner or later in the growth of a
12 city like this, the old riding names lose their
13 currency. North is no longer north or east, west and
14 so on, because it has just grown way beyond the
15 original boundaries. So it doesn't appeal to some
16 people and they say that we called something Calgary
17 North when there is five or six miles of the city
18 beyond its northern limits of that boundary. So we
19 are supposed to, according to the Geographic Names
20 Board of Canada, choose names which give an immediate
21 sense of the area which they comprise, and if you use
22 historic names, for example, they might mean something
23 to people in Calgary or southern Alberta, but nothing
24 to people in the rest of the Canada. So those are the
25 sort of things we have to concern ourselves about. We
26 have a few historic names in Calgary now but we really
27 don't know whether to keep them or expand that trend,

1 or what to do. So we welcome any submissions that
2 people have to make in that respect but that is the
3 difficulty. As boring as it might seem to call
4 something east, west or northeast or northwest, at
5 least it identifies the area to a stranger.

6 Thank you very much, sir. Very helpful.

7 And Mr. Jim Stevenson?

8 MR. JIM STEVENSON: Yes, thank you. I want to
9 clarify that I'm speaking on behalf of more than just
10 Mr. Harper, actually. We had a Committee of people
11 from the four ridings because we found when we started
12 adjusting the southwest riding, that affected the one
13 next to it, so we had four ridings of the Canadian
14 Alliance get together, the Riding Associations,
15 Southwest, Southeast, East and Centre, and believe it
16 or not, we had agreement. I mean, it's hard to get
17 politicians to agree on what day of the week it is but
18 we had all these people agree that our proposal is
19 something that they could go along with 100 percent.

20 I'm also speaking on behalf of the three MPs,
21 Bepak Obrih for Calgary East, Jason Kenney for Calgary
22 Southeast, and of course, Chris Steven in Calgary
23 Southwest. So I'm speaking and giving you an
24 indication of all the different ideas that came forth
25 from all of these people, plus through a number of
26 meetings, plus a lot of constituents who had their
27 input too.

1 So first of all, I would like to thank the
2 Commission for this opportunity to suggest these
3 changes to the preliminary proposals and I would like
4 to compliment the Commission on how they have come up
5 with their initial proposals like dividing Calgary
6 Centre and keeping the hub and spoke principal. I
7 think that's something that's a tradition here.

8 And I also would like to thank you for avoiding
9 the temptation of mere change for the sake of change
10 as a potential problem with -- it's a potential
11 problem with redistribution, which I'm told is being
12 complained about in two of our neighbouring Provinces
13 so I would like to thank you for that.

14 I would also like to thank you for looking at the
15 likely growth pattern, rather than just sticking with
16 the 2001 Census, because the pattern -- the potential
17 growth is something that has to be adjusted -- looked
18 at when we are considering the next ten years.

19 I have some copies of my proposal, so I won't go
20 through it all. I'll just hit on some highlights with
21 this magic gadget that Bruce has figured out how to
22 work with. I'm not a lawyer but maybe I will be able
23 to work this thing anyway.

24 First of all, the first point is that --

25 THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think you have that
26 backwards, sir. If you were a lawyer, you wouldn't be
27 able to work it, as I understood the submission.

1 MR. JIM STEVENSON: The first thing is MacLeod
2 Trail, I do agree -- we agree that that's a natural
3 community boundary and we feel that MacLeod Trail
4 should be used rather than the railway tracks. There
5 are a couple of apartment buildings, I guess, in
6 between the two of them but it is better -- people
7 recognize MacLeod Trail as being the boundary between
8 southeast and southwest and therefore we are saying
9 that you should stay with that because people
10 recognize it, but we think that you should be going
11 with keeping Acadia and Fairview into -- in Southeast,
12 those two areas.

13 Now, I think under your proposal -- is this the
14 new proposal that you've got up here now?

15 Under this proposal, this is Fairview right here
16 isn't it? Those of you that know the -- we are
17 suggesting that that should stay in Southeast,
18 Fairview here, because Fairview and Acadia are really
19 one area and I'll explain to you when I get to Calgary
20 East why I'm saying that.

21 But let's, first of all, we will stick with
22 Southwest and tell you how our boundaries, what we are
23 recommending and how they change the population in
24 Southwest. We are suggesting that MacLeod Trail be
25 the boundary on up to 50th Avenue, which is where the
26 boundary is right now, so -- I guess this, right now
27 we've got Glenmore Trail. Under this proposal, that's

1 what you've got here, right?

2 So what we are saying is that Southwest should go
3 up to 50th, come across to the river, and down the
4 river and through the middle of Glenmore Dam Reservoir
5 and leaving this area here in Calgary Centre.

6 So that's our proposal for Southwest, it's pretty
7 straightforward. That changes the population figures
8 for Southwest from 106,000. On the last page of my
9 proposal, it shows the Calgary Southwest -- your
10 proposal is 106,272 and our proposal would be 106,517,
11 so within a couple of hundred by doing -- going north
12 here to 50th and leaving this part in Calgary Centre.

13 So that's -- the other sort of is a side note for
14 taking the Calgary -- the MacLeod Trail rather than
15 the railway tracks, as Mr. Harper said to me, that he
16 has trouble finding office space if you take the
17 railway tracks because the only office space in
18 Southwest is between the railway tracks and MacLeod
19 Trail, but I don't know whether that's true or not.
20 But his options are quite -- are limited by that.

21 Anyway, that's sort of a side note.

22 Let's talk now about Calgary Centre. Our
23 proposal on Calgary Centre is that the -- again,
24 MacLeod Trail be used as the boundary line from 50th
25 Avenue on up north until we hit Elbow, the Elbow
26 River, so from here we would go up Elbow Trail till we
27 hit the Elbow River, and then follow the Elbow River

1 up to the Bow. So that would take Calgary Centre
2 use -- it would basically be using -- Calgary South
3 Centre I should say, using the statistics or your
4 population was showing it at 120,700, and under our
5 proposal it would drop to 117,103.

6 So we are saying that this -- as everyone has
7 said, that there is absolutely no community reason for
8 having this area in here, which is all industrial,
9 connecting the people that live in naturally in the
10 Calgary Centre area here. They should stay there as
11 you've drawn this proposal so there is no need for us
12 to talk any further about that.

13 Ramsay should, we believe, should stay with
14 Inglewood, Ramsay and Inglewood, and I think that's --
15 is that how -- I'm not sure whether -- I can't tell
16 from this proposal whether you've got the Elbow River
17 drawing the line there or not -- I'm not sure how
18 you've got that area there? So MacLeod Trail -- what
19 okay, what we are saying is taking MacLeod Trail up
20 here until it hits the river right here, and then make
21 the river as the boundary line. So this here would
22 stay in Calgary East and that's Ramsay, right?

23 So our proposal is -- yeah, I'm sure that's
24 Ramsay, isn't it?

25 Yeah, so our proposal would be following MacLeod
26 Trail up here until it hits the river and then using
27 the river as a boundary to split Calgary South Centre

1 and Calgary East.

2 Now, let's talk about Calgary East then, because
3 of course this all affects Calgary East boundaries and
4 really, I've told you what the boundary would be there
5 at the north but our proposal would be to have
6 Glenmore Trail -- we'd be coming across from MacLeod
7 Trail, across Glenmore, until you hit the Deerfoot,
8 and then come down Deerfoot and have the dividing line
9 between northeast and -- between east and southeast in
10 all this open space here.

11 Riverbend -- this is Riverbend in here I think,
12 right? Those of you that -- we are saying that
13 Riverbend goes with Lynwood and I see that you've got
14 that same proposal in your revised thing here. The
15 only thing that I think we are adjusting here, from
16 our proposal, is for you to leave Fairview into the
17 Southeast. So I think that we are, as the other
18 people have said, it comes very close.

19 With the Calgary East, your proposal is 115,000
20 and our proposal is 114,800.

21 And Calgary Southeast, your proposal is 104 and
22 our proposal would jump it to 109, so they are all
23 within the boundaries there.

24 Before, when we were talking about the
25 differences -- Calgary East and Calgary South Centre
26 do not have, we believe, the potential for growth,
27 because Calgary East, as you're aware, can't grow

1 because of the proposed freeway that's to run up and
2 down here, the city limits.

3 Now, the City of Calgary is talking about
4 annexing. They just talked last week about annexing a
5 section right down through here, but of course, that
6 will be likely another 10 or 15 years before that
7 happens, before the growth. So Calgary East is
8 limited as far as where it can grow. So that is why
9 we think that it is wise to have the populations a
10 little higher in Calgary East and in Calgary South
11 Centre, the way you've put them together.

12 The only other thing that I wanted to comment on,
13 and this is a request of Mr. Harper and the people in
14 Southwest, is they are requesting a change of the name
15 of Calgary Southwest riding to Calgary Heritage. This
16 riding includes Heritage Park, which is a strong part
17 of the heritage tradition in the City, and we think it
18 is important that this be recognized by the Commission
19 and represented in Parliament. Also it would help to
20 reduce some of the current confusion between Calgary
21 Southwest and Calgary Southeast. Adding another
22 riding with south in the name, Calgary South Centre,
23 would only increase that confusion. Calgary Heritage
24 would immediately associate the riding with the
25 correct area of the city and reduce confusion and
26 recognize Calgary's history and heritage. The idea
27 has been tested with many constituents and they

1 responded favourably to the new name.

2 So in conclusion, we would like to thank the
3 Commission for its work to date and look forward to a
4 well deserved increase in the City of Calgary's
5 representation in the House of Commons. We believe
6 that the changes we have suggested are not only
7 reasonable but would constitute significant
8 improvements to community representation in the
9 Commission's final proposals.

10 We are convinced that these changes would meet
11 with general support in the communities which they
12 would impact. We are strengthened in this view by the
13 many comments that we've received and which form the
14 basis of this presentation.

15 Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevenson, you just made
17 one remark there that there was no reason to have the
18 industrial area with Calgary South Centre.

19 MR. JIM STEVENSON: Oh, I'm sorry, I meant
20 there's no reason to have the two areas divided the
21 way the proposal was. I'm sorry, I didn't word that
22 properly.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see because the
24 industrial area has to be with somebody.

25 MR. JIM STEVENSON: Yes, that's right. We think
26 MacLeod Trail. I'm sorry if it came out that way.

27 I'm a little nervous speaking in front of --

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine. In terms
2 of population, of course, it doesn't mean a lot.

3 MR. JIM STEVENSON: No. It was just a big
4 division between the two areas of population under the
5 proposal that was put forward.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Well, Mr. Stevenson,
7 thanks very much. We appreciate that. We very much
8 appreciate, by the way, ladies and gentlemen, the
9 submission of these written materials and the maps
10 which will allow us the luxury of reflection after the
11 public hearings are over, and I may say that if anyone
12 wishes to submit supplemental material in writing to
13 us, please do it by the end of this month. Otherwise
14 we might have written it in stone before it gets to
15 us.

16 I want to thank everybody for coming. I was very
17 pleased to see so many political activists here
18 tonight to offer their very relevant points of view.
19 You, after all, represent the building blocks in the
20 whole democratic process. Thank you very much for
21 coming and for your valuable contributions.

22 I don't think anybody else is on the menu so we
23 can adjourn.

24

25

26 PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUDED

27

1 Certificate of Transcript

2

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 foregoing pages 1 to 118 are a true and faithful
5 transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
6 shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes to the
7 best of my skill and ability.

8 Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
9 Alberta, this 29th day of October, 2002.

10

11

12

13

14

15

Olga Koval, CSR(A)
Official Court Reporter

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27