

PUBLIC HEARING HELD AT THE SUPER 8 MOTEL, COCHRANE  
23 OCTOBER, 2002

INDEX OF PRESENTERS - COCHRANE

| NO. | NAME OF PRESENTER | PAGE    |
|-----|-------------------|---------|
| 1   | MYRON THOMPSON    | 7 - 20  |
| 2   | ED EGGERER        | 20 - 29 |
| 3   | CHARLIE VAN ARNAM | 29 - 36 |
| 4   | JO TENNANT        | 36 - 38 |
| 5   | WAYNE GENT        | 38 - 43 |
| 6   | TERRY PETERMAN    | 43 - 48 |

1 Public Hearing held at The Super 8 Motel, Cochrane  
2 23 October, 2002, commencing at 10:00 A.M.

3

---

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome everybody to the Cochrane  
5 public hearing of the Federal Electoral Boundaries  
6 Commission. We are here to hear your responses and  
7 suggestions relative to our proposal which was  
8 published in this form. Unfortunately, we don't have  
9 any more copies of it here. We had to give them all  
10 away in Calgary. But if anybody doesn't have one and  
11 wishes one, our secretary, Ms. Petryshyn, will be glad  
12 to send one to you in the mail, if you leave her your  
13 address.

14 The proposal is also contained on the Web and you  
15 can get the Website address from Ms. Petryshyn as  
16 well, and it also came out in the major newspapers in  
17 the form of a handout.

18 My name is MacCallum. I'm a judge of the Court  
19 of Queen's Bench of Alberta. I was appointed by the  
20 Chief Justice of Alberta. Mr. Donald Barry, from  
21 Calgary, is a Political Scientist; Ms. Rita Khullar,  
22 from Edmonton, the other Commissioner, is a practicing  
23 Lawyer in the City of Edmonton. My colleagues were  
24 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

25 Our staff is Ms. Miranda Petryshyn, who just left  
26 momentarily. She is the Secretary of the Commission.  
27 Ms. Dawn Mathews, seated right in front of all the

1 equipment, is our Geography Specialist. The Reporter  
2 for today is Ms. Olga Koval.

3 The process ladies and gentlemen, is that we are  
4 an independent Commission, appointed under the Federal  
5 Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. We are  
6 intended to be and we are free entirely from any  
7 influence, whether political or administrative. We  
8 are expected to interpret the law and to serve the  
9 public interest in a wide sense. In doing that, we  
10 have to decide and balance competing interests and  
11 while we welcome constructive suggestions, you must  
12 understand, I hope, that if your suggestion is not  
13 adopted by us it is not because we didn't take it  
14 seriously. It's simply because we have to take a  
15 broad view of all submissions made to us.

16 I want to assure everyone that any suggestion  
17 made will be carefully evaluated and will receive the  
18 attention that it deserves. The final word in this  
19 process is ours but the process is a consultative one.  
20 We must follow the legal guidelines set out in Section  
21 15 of the Act and in Section 3 of the Constitution.  
22 We have done this in producing our proposal, which  
23 represents our best efforts to date but, of course, we  
24 are here to hear constructive suggestions, and if we  
25 deem it advisable, we will change that proposal, in  
26 these public hearings. We are just about finished  
27 with them now. By Thursday of this week we will be

1 finished. After that we will amend our report as  
2 required and send it to the Speaker of the House of  
3 Commons, where it will go into Committee, and the  
4 Members of Parliament will have their chance to  
5 object.

6 As a result of what they have to say, we will  
7 again modify the report, if we deem it advisable, and  
8 the final report will be sent to the Chief Electoral  
9 Officer, who drafts a Representation Order, and then  
10 it goes for proclamation to the Governor in Council.

11 All of this must be done by July of 2003. That's  
12 next year. The new boundaries, thus established  
13 however, are not in effect for a further year, that  
14 is, until July of 2004. So that if an election is  
15 called before that date, it will be contested on the  
16 basis of the existing electoral boundaries.

17 A word about the names that we assign to  
18 boundaries. If you will consult page 5 of your  
19 report -- of our proposal, I'm sorry -- you will read  
20 the following: According to the Geographical Names  
21 Board of Canada, the best names for Federal electoral  
22 districts are those that immediately give a sense of  
23 the Province and if possible, the region or part of  
24 the Province in which they are located. For this  
25 reason, the Commission favours place names. The names  
26 chosen are intended to reflect the core of the  
27 electoral district -- and it goes on.

1           So if the names that we have chosen initially  
2           seem to be rather prosaic or boring, that's the reason  
3           for it. We, of course, are, as always, open to  
4           suggestions for change. Some historical names now  
5           existing in the Province are very dear to the heart of  
6           the constituents and they object to losing those names  
7           so -- of course, we haven't made the final decision on  
8           that score by any means.

9           The object of the submissions today ladies and  
10          gentlemen, is electoral boundary readjustment and it  
11          is not the redistribution formula which allocates the  
12          number of seats to each Province. There is widespread  
13          interest in this subject of course, and in view of  
14          that, I will give a very brief explanation of it. You  
15          will find it fully explained in a booklet called  
16          Representation in the House of Commons of Canada, a  
17          copy of which you are welcome to take when you leave.  
18          If we don't have enough, again, you can get one  
19          through the mail from our Secretary.

20          What happens is that you start with 282 seats  
21          which was the number of seats in the House of Commons  
22          in 1985. From that you take away one seat for each of  
23          the northern territories, the Yukon, the Northwest  
24          Territories and Nunavut. That leaves you with 279.  
25          You divide 279 into the population of Canada as  
26          established in the 2001 Census. That gives you a  
27          national quotient. Then you take the population of

1 the ten Provinces and divide that by the national  
2 quotient, and you get the quotient for the Provinces.  
3 That's called the electoral quota. In Alberta, well,  
4 the amount we are working with 106,243. That is  
5 divided into the population of Alberta and, presto,  
6 you get 28 seats. We now have 26.

7 There are special exemptions affecting seven of  
8 the ten Provinces, which would give them more seats  
9 than they would otherwise be entitled to, and the ones  
10 who do not benefit, if you want to say, by that  
11 provision are Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia  
12 because their populations have increased. And so they  
13 gain the seats they have simply by virtue of the  
14 application of the formula.

15 The other Provinces are entitled to no fewer  
16 seats, by virtue of the Senatorial exemption, than  
17 they had Senators in 1915. And they are entitled to  
18 no fewer seats in the House of Commons than they had  
19 during the 33rd Parliament in 1976.

20 What we want to remember for today's purposes is  
21 that our electoral quota is 106,243. That is the  
22 number we shoot for for each riding.

23 And the Statute tells us that we must devise  
24 ridings which are as close as reasonably possible to  
25 that figure. In devising the ridings, we must also  
26 take account of historical pattern, of community of  
27 interest or identity and other factors which affect

1 ridings in remote regions, which we don't have to  
2 consider today particularly, unless you wish to refer  
3 to them later.

4 The hearing procedure is as follows: Each  
5 speaker will have 15 minutes. We would ask you to  
6 speak from that table. If you are uncomfortable  
7 standing, please help yourself to a chair from behind  
8 and you may sit during your presentation and just move  
9 the microphone down so that it will pick up your  
10 voice. Your voice won't be amplified but it will be  
11 recorded however, and a verbatim record of your  
12 presentation will be made.

13 The Commissioners may intervene at any time  
14 during the course of your remarks to ask you  
15 questions. If you have questions of us, you may  
16 certainly put them during the course of your remarks  
17 but unless you leave us time between the conclusion of  
18 your remarks and 15 minutes, we won't answer them  
19 immediately. We will simply take them under  
20 advisement.

21 I will have to enforce relevancy. There are a  
22 number of topics people would like to bring up which  
23 are not strictly related to our business today so we  
24 must stick to our business. The presenters may -- oh,  
25 I'm sorry. There will be a 3 minute warning. The  
26 secretary will hold up a piece of paper. Please don't  
27 be offended. It is just to show you that there is 3

1 minutes left.

2 We cannot take submissions or questions from the  
3 floor. I think we have five presenters listed today,  
4 the first of whom is Mr. Myron Thompson.

5 Mr. Thompson, if you would care to take the  
6 floor, please?

7 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: If I may distribute these  
8 suggested maps.

9 Good morning, it is a pleasure to be here and I  
10 appreciate the opportunity to discuss the situation  
11 with you in terms of the boundary changes that are  
12 suggested and what we have come up with as a  
13 suggestion that we think would improve the  
14 Commission's presentation.

15 The first thing I would like to do is introduce  
16 Blake Richards who is with me today. I may be calling  
17 on him during my presentation for further things as  
18 he's working on this on a regular basis. Blake is my  
19 Executive Assistant, sitting in the chair there.  
20 Throw your hand up and they will know who you are.

21 This suggested proposal is based on a decision  
22 made by five Members of Parliament and their  
23 constituency organizations who met in Red Deer some  
24 time ago, once your suggestions came out. They were  
25 the Members from Yellowhead, Wetaskiwin, Red Deer,  
26 Crowfoot and Wildrose, as we know it now.

27 We have jointly come up with what we thought

1 would focus on keeping one principle in mind, which we  
2 think is a valuable principle that the Commission  
3 bases their decision on, and that's the common  
4 interests of various communities that may be affected  
5 by any suggested changes that are presented.

6 The first thing I would like to mention, in  
7 regards to the name of the riding, Banff-Cochrane, the  
8 majority of the people that we have entertained  
9 believe that this strongly suggests that the name  
10 itself presents the riding as being basically a park  
11 orientated facility, when indeed that is not the case.  
12 A huge percentage or amount of industry that is  
13 represented in this riding is agriculture, and along  
14 with that, the energy industry.

15 Of course, Banff is certainly a major part of our  
16 riding. It is a park that is well-known throughout  
17 the country but we think the name simply means -- that  
18 is associated with parks and what it is all about but  
19 we would like to remain under the name of Wildrose.  
20 There is a resounding number of people that would ask  
21 that that remain the same.

22 In terms of the boundaries, the suggestions that  
23 we have on the maps that I have given you are very  
24 minimal, in our belief, compared to what was presented  
25 by the Commission -- minimal in the sense that the  
26 lines don't change a great deal, but it does extend it  
27 in certain areas, with the purpose of keeping common

1 interests as a key factor or a key principle in coming  
2 up with some decision.

3 I was wondering if it's all right if I approach  
4 that -- I will be away from the mike but --

5 MS. KHULLAR: There is a pointer, an electronic  
6 pointer.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, there's an electronic pointer.

8 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Oh, I don't know, I'm fairly old.  
9 Do you think I can handle this?

10 THE CHAIRMAN: It's quite a lot of fun actually.

11 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Okay. I would like to address the  
12 northern region to start with where -- on the proposal  
13 from the Commission, it includes the Rocky Mountain  
14 House district and that particular area into Red Deer,  
15 which presently belongs to this particular  
16 constituency here.

17 It's our feeling that when we keep common  
18 interests in place, that indeed the corridor from  
19 Rocky Mountain House to Red Deer has had strong common  
20 interests throughout the years and I think people in  
21 that region have indicated to you, if not already at  
22 the Drumheller meeting, that that indeed is not a  
23 favorable choice of theirs.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: No, they want to stay in Red Deer.

25 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: They want to stay in Red Deer. Of  
26 course, Caroline, which is presently in Red Deer -- I  
27 can't find it on there but -- I believe this is Sundre

1 here, if I'm not mistaken. Am I right? No.

2 MS. KHULLAR: I think that marker, you're just  
3 showing Caroline --

4 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Okay. Caroline, of course, would  
5 be, under your proposal, brought into the suggested  
6 Banff-Cochrane riding and of course that is -- that  
7 makes a little more sense in that Cochrane -- or  
8 Caroline and Sundre have a lot of common interests,  
9 including a local newspaper, hospital facilities, a  
10 number of things, so they fit quite nicely into that  
11 scenario.

12 The major problem that we see in this particular  
13 proposal is the division based on Highway 2. I  
14 believe this is -- there we go -- the Banff-Cochrane  
15 riding which would be developed would be because of  
16 the division line as suggested by Highway 2. The  
17 biggest problem that all the people throughout this  
18 region, up and down Highway 2, is that in this area  
19 here, these are the communities that deal directly  
20 with the municipalities along Highway 2. The common  
21 interest does begin to dwell more toward Three Hills  
22 district and Drumheller at about this point and this,  
23 of course, is where our suggestion is on the map that  
24 I have given you.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Highway 21 about?

26 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Not Highway 21, but  
27 approximately -- what is that highway, Blake?

1 MR. BLAKE RICHARDS: Secondary 791.

2 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: 791. Secondary 791.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That should be the eastern  
4 boundary of your riding?

5 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: That's our suggestion. Mainly  
6 because as you can see, the Town of Olds is taken just  
7 out the riding. While we have a huge amount of common  
8 interest in this area, with the Town of Olds, as well  
9 as to the east, and then as you continue down the  
10 trail of Highway 2, through Didsbury, Carstairs,  
11 Crossfield, into Airdrie district, all of these people  
12 in this particular area here would be removed from the  
13 common interest factor in conjunction with these towns  
14 along the same line.

15 Highway 2 simply puts a number of community towns  
16 in the Banff-Cochrane riding, while it takes the  
17 communities that do all their services in those  
18 various towns, in the eastern region, it takes that  
19 completely off, losing that factor of common interest.  
20 Recognizing, of course, that the size of Wildrose, as  
21 it presently is, there has to be some changes made.  
22 And what has to -- something is going to have to go.  
23 We certainly agree with the -- as you can see from our  
24 map -- by moving it to 791, that we feel that the  
25 areas east of 791 do fit in very nicely with the  
26 Drumheller district, including Strathmore, which is a  
27 large centre there and many of the communities in that

1 district. Lyndon, for example, Acme, along those  
2 lines, deal very nicely with the Drumheller region and  
3 Three Hills.

4 So that, although we hate to lose them because  
5 they've been great people to work with, we understand  
6 that something has to happen.

7 Also, we believe that the district down towards  
8 Calgary, down in this area here, as you can see from  
9 our map, we have brought the division line up to --  
10 what is that?

11 THE CHAIRMAN: You are almost up to Balzac on the  
12 south --

13 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Going south we're at -- what is  
14 that division line there, Blake, at the south end?

15 MR. BLAKE RICHARDS: It's a secondary highway as well,  
16 I'm just trying to remember --

17 MS. KHULLAR: 564.

18 MR. BLAKE RICHARDS: 564.

19 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: 564 -- and sort of squared off  
20 that particular district. Keeping in mind that  
21 population is a factor, after thorough research work,  
22 we have determined that our suggestion would be in the  
23 range of 103 to 104,000. Is that correct?

24 That would mean that the City of Chestermere, or  
25 the Town of Chestermere and some of the further  
26 southern regions of the -- which is presently in  
27 Wildrose, would be moved out of the Wildrose riding or

1 the Banff-Cochrane riding, thus eliminating a major  
2 part of the population growth, and at the same time  
3 keeping the common interests in the areas that they  
4 live, where it would not be basically affected.

5 Another major factor in this particular proposal  
6 which we have given you, it maintains the County, the  
7 entire County of Mountain View, which is the core  
8 county of the entire riding. It remains in -- totally  
9 intact by taking it to Highway 791 and I think that  
10 you will be getting a representation from the County  
11 which have felt that that was really an important  
12 factor in making this decision.

13 You had a map, I believe, of the counties, up  
14 earlier? As you can see, going down Highway 2, it  
15 literally splits the County of Mountain View right in  
16 half, right in the middle. The County of Mountain  
17 View, this area here I believe -- but I think you  
18 probably recognize that, it does split County of  
19 Mountain View completely in the middle, thus creating  
20 a great deal of loss of common interest as the entire  
21 county is certainly a very compact county in that  
22 common interest factor.

23 All of the MPs and the organizations that have  
24 come up with these proposals are united in their  
25 belief that what we have presented to you is an  
26 excellent way to go, which requires minimal changes to  
27 your suggestions, and at the same time keeps the

1 population factor intact, and is very satisfactory to  
2 the numerous number of residents, particularly the  
3 rural residents, which would be affected the most.

4 Airdrie would remain in the riding as the major  
5 city. It is the City of Airdrie, which has a main  
6 function. Although there are a lot of commuters to  
7 the City of Calgary, they service a great, huge amount  
8 of rural districts, both east, west, and north of that  
9 city. And I'm sure that their presentation will  
10 indicate their desire to keep those common interests  
11 in place as well.

12 Is there anything else, Blake, that -- I think  
13 that pretty well covers our position and we hope that  
14 the Commission will seriously take these into  
15 consideration as I do believe they are very minimal in  
16 respect to what you have presented in the beginning,  
17 but we must re-state, the one thing that we think is  
18 the worst possible scenario, and that is using Highway  
19 2 as a division line, which is going to create a great  
20 deal of problem with a number of people up and down  
21 that entire corridor.

22 Thank you for your time and I appreciate the  
23 opportunity to be here. I will be looking forward to  
24 meeting with the Committee when we get to Ottawa some  
25 time in the future.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, thanks, Mr. Thompson. If you  
27 could just stay there. I'm sure that we have a few

1 remarks.

2 MS. KHULLAR: Mr. Thompson, I've got a couple of  
3 things then. I'll ask them and I'll just also say we  
4 are receiving a number of written submissions from  
5 people and we realize the concerns about the Highway 2  
6 communities. As you know from our proposal, we  
7 struggled with the Highway 2 communities as well. We  
8 are trying to recognize a community of interest, as  
9 well as balance population. Our geography specialist  
10 has put up something that we have been working with,  
11 trying to take into account some of these suggestions  
12 we've received in writing and would like your comments  
13 on it, but before we turn to that, I just have two  
14 questions for you.

15 One, with respect to the eastern boundary of  
16 Highway 791, you mentioned that the entire County of  
17 Rockyview should be taken into account that, as I  
18 understand it, Highway 791 is just short of the county  
19 boundary, and I just wanted to be clear --

20 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: The County of Mountain View?

21 MS. KHULLAR: Yes. I just wanted to be clear.

22 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: I believe there is a -- do we  
23 leave a sliver of the County out of the riding by  
24 going down 791? I don't think it's very huge. But --

25 MS. KHULLAR: Okay. I just wanted to be clear,  
26 the boundary proposed is 791 and not the county  
27 boundary?

- 1 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Yes.
- 2 MS. KHULLAR: Okay. The second question I have  
3 for you is I'm intrigued by the suggestions about  
4 Rocky Mountain House and your comment that the  
5 proposal is based on representations and consultations  
6 with five MPs. One of the things that we had thought  
7 about -- we don't think we're going to be able to get  
8 Rocky Mountain House back into Red Deer but we toyed  
9 with putting it into Wetaskiwin as well, but we  
10 haven't really canvassed that with people from Rocky  
11 Mountain House, and I noticed that's one of your  
12 suggestions and I'm wondering if you have a sense at  
13 all whether people from Rocky Mountain House would  
14 find that proposal acceptable, being put into the  
15 Wetaskiwin riding?
- 16 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: I think, I think that you'll find  
17 that if you remove Rocky Mountain House from the Red  
18 Deer constituency, that there will be an upset group  
19 of people.
- 20 MS. KHULLAR: Regardless of where they are?
- 21 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Regardless of whether it goes  
22 north or south. I have a strong feeling that would be  
23 the case.
- 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, your suggested border seems  
25 to take in Rocky, doesn't it? Or does it go right  
26 straight through? I can't tell from your map, I'm  
27 sorry.

- 1 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: No, it's -- Rocky Mountain House  
2 would be just out of the riding and remain in Red  
3 Deer.
- 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. Yes.
- 5 MS. KHULLAR: I see. Deerborn. What is up on  
6 the screen now is a proposal that we have been just  
7 kind of working with, as I said, as we received  
8 written submissions and our eastern boundary is --
- 9 MS. MATHEWS: Range Road 290.
- 10 MS. KHULLAR: Range Road 290. Highway 791, it's  
11 a bit further over. I'm just wondering if that  
12 achieves the result of getting Olds back into the  
13 riding with Didsbury and Carstairs. I'm just  
14 wondering if you have any comments on that, that's the  
15 proposal up here.
- 16 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: I don't believe that the line of  
17 791 should be moved further west in the slightest. If  
18 anything, I would prefer to be moved a mile or two to  
19 the east. That's my personal belief, but I'm sure  
20 that others, particularly the County of Mountain View,  
21 would have a comment on that.
- 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thompson, you realize our  
23 problem, of course, is one of population. The area to  
24 the west of Calgary is experiencing great growth and  
25 if we are not very careful, if we set the population  
26 of the riding even at or near the quota, it is sure to  
27 be way over before the next Census takes place and how

1 many elections in between.

2 The best scenario would see us setting the riding  
3 something below 106,000 in population, so it follows  
4 that the further east we move the boundary, the more  
5 population we are going to get in right away, so that  
6 is what we are guarding against. But we fully  
7 recognize the wishes of the people along the Highway 2  
8 corridor between Calgary and Red Deer -- between  
9 Calgary and Bowden, let's say, to be united in one  
10 riding, whichever one it is, and I think probably they  
11 prefer the western direction.

12 So that is our problem with which we are  
13 struggling and we will see what we can come up with  
14 but we can't go too far east.

15 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: I understand that. However, I do  
16 believe that the growth factor, the growth possibility  
17 to the east is not nearly as great because it is major  
18 agricultural district through that entire corridor and  
19 I don't think you will find the expansion being a  
20 great deal that way.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: I know but this population we pick  
22 up right away, sir. That concerns me. I agree that  
23 it is probably not going to change very much but that  
24 was our concern.

25 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: And, of course, our initial  
26 concern is the extension of the City of Calgary that  
27 is causing a great deal of population growth to the

1 Wildrose -- presently, the Wildrose constituency. I  
2 believe we are up to 180,000 or 160,000, somewhere in  
3 there.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and on that very subject, we  
5 note that your south boundary would include Balzac,  
6 and we have heard on the grapevine that Calgary  
7 proposes to annex land up to and including Balzac. So  
8 we don't want to get too far south of Airdrie. To a  
9 degree we have to look into the future, you know. We  
10 need evidence to do so. We can't just go on a guess  
11 or anything, but we are trying to gather that evidence  
12 to make sure what's going to happen as nearly we can.

13 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: Well, it's my understanding  
14 also that the City of -- or the Town of Chestermere  
15 could likely be annexed, and other communities on the  
16 outskirts of the city at the present time, which  
17 are -- like, I don't know where those people are  
18 coming from but they're coming -- the houses are going  
19 up faster than you can believe.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. And talking of Red Deer, we  
21 had a very lively meeting in Red Deer and the people  
22 to the west on the Highway 11 corridor are very vocal  
23 in the desire to remain within the Red Deer  
24 constituency. But Red Deer city is growing and  
25 growing and growing, and necessarily at some point,  
26 the constituency must shrink and shrink and shrink,  
27 until finally it gets to include the City of Red Deer

1 as one constituency. That's not the case at the  
2 moment, but it is coming to that and what we have  
3 proposed is probably going to change, particularly to  
4 the east of Red Deer because the boundary, as  
5 proposed, cut off a lot of acreage people and so on  
6 from the city which they by no means want. So we've  
7 heard representations about why not the whole County  
8 of Red Deer, and things like that, which work out  
9 pretty well in terms of population, but which leave  
10 out the country to the west, who wishes to remain with  
11 Red Deer.

12 So we're struggling with that and we have to nail  
13 down the population figures exactly. There is quite a  
14 few people out there in the west, you know, and we  
15 simply can't include everybody that wants to be in.  
16 That's the long and the short of it. So we will do  
17 the best we can. Thanks, Mr. Thompson, for your --

18 MR. MYRON THOMPSON: I think, on a final note, I would  
19 just like to stress, once again, that moving the  
20 boundary from Highway 2 to 791 would not have a major  
21 impact on the population, sir.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: We will certainly verify that.  
23 Thank you.

24 Mr. Ed Eggerer from Airdrie. Mr. Eggerer, if I'm  
25 mispronouncing your name, please --

26 MR. ED EGGERER: No, you're fine.

27 Thank you very much Members of the Commission.

1 I'm here as a private citizen and not as the Returning  
2 Officer for Wild Rose. I have had the opportunity of  
3 administering a number of electoral districts, first  
4 of all, Bow River and when the Wild Rose electoral  
5 district was created.

6 A number of things that really came to mind -- I  
7 think Mr. Thompson probably highlighted most of the  
8 things that I was going to say, but I think  
9 Mr. Thompson speaks more from the political side,  
10 whereas I would probably speak more from the  
11 administrative side of what happens once an electoral  
12 district is created and what services are provided to  
13 the electors and how that boundary would affect  
14 electors as a whole.

15 What I think you have done, you have created an  
16 electoral district that not necessarily reflects  
17 totally what your mandate is and that, I guess, is to  
18 look at the historical patterns of an electoral  
19 district, to preserve the unity of individuals with  
20 common interests and to ensure manageable size.

21 Manageable size, from an electoral district and  
22 from an administrative point of view, is strictly a  
23 function of manpower, money, and probably the weather.  
24 Seeing we are not a Schedule Three district, we don't  
25 have all those problems. But manageable size -- and I  
26 know -- and it is not just really a function of just  
27 drawing the lines around a particular area and trying

1 to capture voters or number of population, and yet I  
2 think that is what you have done. I think the lines  
3 that you have drawn around the electoral district,  
4 yes, represents a certain amount of voters or  
5 potential population within that district, but I think  
6 you need to somehow have some flexibility and some  
7 changes need to be made.

8 This is a very diverse electoral district with  
9 tourism to the west, farms and agricultural  
10 communities, and urban sprawl of Airdrie and Cochrane,  
11 and a large indigenous community. My point too is  
12 that Highway No. 2 is a very poor example of drawing a  
13 line around an electoral district. It really doesn't  
14 reflect -- the Airdrie area specifically, the patterns  
15 for the people that are immediately east of Airdrie  
16 are now in a riding that they absolutely should not be  
17 in. The people on the east side, all their -- their  
18 kids go to school there, their traffic patterns are  
19 all towards Airdrie when it comes to trade -- in other  
20 words, it is almost like drawing a line through  
21 someone's living room and saying one side goes to vote  
22 somewhere other than that's immediately across the  
23 street. It is a very poor example of drawing a line.

24 My suggestion -- Mr. Thompson suggested that 791  
25 be used. My suggestion is that you probably go to a  
26 Range line that would encompass all of Rockview.

27 And I don't know if you can pull that up on the

1 screen. I don't know what Range line that would be  
2 but just simply follow that Range line and follow it  
3 north. If you do that, I think it encompasses the  
4 patterns again for those people who go west rather  
5 than east to do their trade. It is one that I think  
6 is very important, especially with the Olds area.  
7 There is absolutely no reason to go around Olds and  
8 include it into the Drumheller riding, none  
9 whatsoever. It just doesn't make sense.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: 791 is all right with you though?  
11 That's approximate --

12 MR. ED EGGERER: 791 is a very manageable line. It  
13 really wouldn't make any difference if that's the line  
14 that you use. I mean, we in the west have the beauty  
15 of having Range lines, which they don't have in the  
16 east.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: It would leave Banff-Cochrane at  
18 seven percent; Drumheller at minus six.

19 Go ahead. Sorry, sir.

20 MR. ED EGGERER: I'm sure it will be a process  
21 where you're going to have to take some away from some  
22 electoral districts. I mean, when you take a look at  
23 what is proposed now, you are going to find electoral  
24 districts that are not going to come anywhere near  
25 your 103 electors in -- or population, I guess. It's  
26 not electors.

27 THE CHAIRMAN: 106.

1 MR. ED EGGERER: So, I mean, you are going to have  
2 some disparities there anyway, so -- but I think you  
3 need to reflect that in terms of where you draw the  
4 lines.

5 The other thing that is very interesting in terms  
6 of the area such as Rocky Mountain House, lots of  
7 times we do create electoral districts where you have  
8 areas that are -- and I have nothing against the  
9 people up in Rocky Mountain House -- but I mean, they  
10 will find themselves very isolated, not only in terms  
11 of the Member trying to represent them but also in  
12 terms of just being in the far corner of an electoral  
13 district, really having nothing in common with us, not  
14 only from a transportation point of view -- their  
15 traffic goes east/west, rather than north/south, and  
16 you find yourself -- all of a sudden you're very  
17 isolated in the corner of an electoral district and  
18 really have nothing in common with the rest of it.

19 The other thing I think would be interesting,  
20 from an administrative point of view, is the  
21 overlapping of federal and provincial electoral  
22 districts. It was my belief that you would try,  
23 wherever possible -- and I couldn't do that -- I don't  
24 know if, again, from a geography point of view,  
25 whether you can do that or not? The Federal  
26 Government has had a mandate to try, with the  
27 permanent voters lists, to create a salable product

1       whereas -- where they would, of course, sell their  
2       lists to not only provincial electoral districts but  
3       also to municipal electoral districts. Now, I don't  
4       know if there's any consideration being given to that.

5               Finally, I guess, I too probably want to speak to  
6       the name. I remember sitting in a meeting of this  
7       sort when the name came up. The present name  
8       certainly doesn't reflect what the entire electoral  
9       district is all about. You've eliminated and you've  
10      missed the largest community of Airdrie. I don't know  
11      if it is more reflective if you say  
12      Airdrie-Banff-Cochrane. I guess, we can certainly use  
13      three names in the name. They certainly do out east.  
14      But there is absolutely no reason why you would  
15      eliminate the name of Wild Rose.

16             I really don't have anything else to add to it,  
17      other than, as I say, I think you need to be very  
18      cognizant of the fact that you do not use No. 2 as  
19      your dividing line. I think you need to address the  
20      area of Rocky Mountain House. It is not an area --  
21      from an administrative point of view, it can certainly  
22      be done. There is no question that wouldn't cause a  
23      problem at all but I think for the sake of the people  
24      up there, I think you would give them a much more  
25      effective way of voting for a Member that is a lot  
26      closer to their particular area and that they have a  
27      lot more in common with.

1           And again, reflect -- the reflection in the name  
2           itself, I think that needs to be addressed. I have  
3           nothing further to add.

4   MS. KHULLAR:           Thank you, sir. I have one  
5           question for you. We struggle with the population  
6           variances. The way we read the legislation is we have  
7           to take into account a number of factors but trying to  
8           get as reasonably close as reasonably possible to the  
9           provincial quotient is very important in terms of  
10          promoting effective representation for all voters in  
11          Alberta. I just want to throw something out at you  
12          and hear what you are saying about Highway 2  
13          communities.

14          In our original proposal, the reason Olds was cut  
15          out was to try and assist in reaching an acceptable  
16          population variance, both in Banff-Cochrane and  
17          Airdrie. What would your thoughts be if we kept those  
18          communities together, Olds, Didsbury, and Carstairs  
19          but excluded Airdrie and put Airdrie into Drumheller?  
20          We thought that was appropriate for helping to keep  
21          the population variances at -- I'm just wondering if  
22          you had some thoughts on that?

23   MR. ED EGGERER:           It used to be part of Bow River  
24          at one time but I don't think that would work either.  
25          I mean, Airdrie has absolutely nothing in common with  
26          Drumheller. I mean, you would even create a further  
27          disparaging kind of electoral district than you would

1           have -- in certain areas it is north, south  
2           relationship, and in along No. 2 Highway that  
3           relationship exists between Airdrie, and Crossfield,  
4           Carstairs, Didsbury, Olds. It then comes from the  
5           west towards Sundre, does some trade with Olds, but  
6           there are more communities along that No. 2 Highway  
7           that are now trading in that particular area, and also  
8           people who trade east of Airdrie -- Beiseker,  
9           Irricana, all those areas have a lot more in common  
10          with Airdrie than they ever will have with Olds. They  
11          just don't go that way. I mean I think there would be  
12          a great injustice if you said that you would cut off  
13          that particular area. I know sometimes you are  
14          constrained by putting lines around populations, and I  
15          guess as long as we have rep by population, somewhere  
16          that has to happen.

17   MS. KHULLAR:                    The line has to be drawn  
18                                    somewhere, sir. We are trying to struggle with where  
19                                    to draw it.

20   MR. ED EGGERER:                I realize that, but it just  
21                                    doesn't make sense and I guess common sense needs to  
22                                    prevail somewhere.

23   MS. KHULLAR:                    I just wanted to hear what your  
24                                    thoughts would be.

25   THE CHAIRMAN:                   I think you are almost preaching  
26                                    to the converted.

27   MR. ED EGGERER:                I'm pretty sure because, I mean,

1 most other people will probably talk to you a little  
2 bit more passionately about their own community as  
3 they come up, but I think as a whole --

4 THE CHAIRMAN: We have always recognized the  
5 community interest in the Highway 2 towns. It is just  
6 simply how to achieve it, how to preserve it while  
7 observing our fair amount factor of equality of vote.

8 MR. ED EGGERER: From the administrative point of  
9 view, as I said, it is not a problem.

10 DR. BARRY: You haven't mentioned the southern  
11 boundary of Banff-Cochrane. Does Secondary Road 564  
12 work well from an administrative standpoint?

13 MR. ED EGGERER: Yes, yes, it does. If you take a  
14 look at MacLeod and Wild Rose and No. 1 Highway was a  
15 good boundary. Anywhere you came across the top end  
16 of the City of Calgary, I guess the boundary of the  
17 City of Calgary was our southern boundary, and that  
18 extended a couple of miles just south of Balzac. So  
19 anywhere that you pick to go across that southern  
20 boundary would be fine. I see no problem there at  
21 all.

22 DR. BARRY: I guess we'll have to find out  
23 what the timetable for Calgary annexation is as well.

24 MR. ED EGGERER: Well, the best case scenario, I  
25 would think you are four years away, as long as they  
26 can agree. I mean, Airdrie has just gone through an  
27 annexation with the MD and that's taken almost three

1 years, so -- and we are still probably another half  
2 year away. I think Crossfield is in the process, are  
3 you?

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Just one final remark,  
5 Mr. Eggerer. Speaking of the business of creating  
6 contiguous boundaries with other municipal or  
7 provincial boundaries, it is, of course, the case that  
8 there are 83 provincial ridings as opposed to our 28.  
9 There are in excess of 60 counties and MDs so it  
10 follows therefore that we cannot do that. It is  
11 simply an impossibility. The boundaries of Federal  
12 electoral districts must necessarily cross  
13 municipality boundaries and they must necessarily  
14 cross provincial boundaries. I acknowledge, however,  
15 that both provincial boundaries and municipal  
16 boundaries do create well defined communities of  
17 interest and identity. So we do take it into account  
18 but you will appreciate that it is impossible to do so  
19 all the time. Thank you very much, sir, for your  
20 contribution.

21 We will go on to -- madam reporter, are you okay?  
22 Go on to Mr. Charlie Van Arnam?

23 MR. CHARLIE VAN ARNAM: I do have ten copies of my  
24 presentation, including some attachments. Thank you.

25 Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity.  
26 Excuse me, my name is Charlie Van Arnam. I am an  
27 elected councillor for Mountain View County. I had

1 intended to use some overheads but your maps are far  
2 superior to mine so, if I may, I'll just use yours.

3 Mountain View County is an area just 20 or so  
4 miles north on Highway 22 here, straight north of us,  
5 covering approximately 1500 square miles with 12,000  
6 voters. It includes five urban municipalities, those  
7 being Sundre, Olds, Didsbury, Carstairs, and the  
8 Village of Cremona.

9 Mountain View County has discussed the  
10 readjustment of the Federal electoral boundaries as  
11 they impact Mountain View County at our August and  
12 September, 2002 Council meetings. The Council has  
13 also reviewed the boundaries of the current Wild Rose  
14 constituency and the proposed Banff-Cochrane and  
15 Drumheller constituencies as prepared by the Federal  
16 Electoral Boundaries Commission. In addition, we  
17 considered some of the revisions suggested by the  
18 Members of Parliament in the central Alberta area.

19 It is our understanding that the Commission  
20 follow certain criteria when establishing these  
21 boundaries. We would like to suggest that the  
22 following key principals, drawn from those criteria,  
23 should be used in establishing revised boundaries and  
24 those being, firstly, that the boundaries should be  
25 established with common interests, trading districts  
26 and travel routes given priority over strict adherence  
27 to population quotient; and secondly, that boundaries

1       should be adjusted while keeping in mind proportionate  
2       population and geographic size.

3               Firstly speaking to the Banff-Cochrane and  
4       Drumheller constituencies proposal. The Commission's  
5       proposal does include the west side of Mountain View  
6       County, that is the area north and west of the Town of  
7       Sundre, in the proposed Banff Cochrane constituency  
8       instead of in the Red Deer constituency where it is  
9       currently located. This adjustment would bring the  
10      residents north and west of the Town of Sundre into  
11      the same constituency in which they conduct much of  
12      their business, that being, of course, the Town of  
13      Sundre. And we do see this as an improvement over the  
14      current situation.

15             Our major concern, however, with the  
16      Banff-Cochrane and Drumheller proposal is that it puts  
17      Olds in the Drumheller constituency, and Didsbury and  
18      Carstairs in the Banff-Cochrane constituency. We  
19      believe that all three communities and the area county  
20      residents should be in the same constituency due to  
21      their location along the Highway 2 corridor and the  
22      fact that the residents primarily conduct their  
23      business in a north/south manner and not to the east.  
24      This has been strongly confirmed to us when the  
25      Province of Alberta created Regional Health Authority  
26      No. 5. That health authority includes Didsbury,  
27      Carstairs, and Crossfield and areas to the west with

1 the Drumheller area, and those boundaries have created  
2 difficulties and great confusion among our residents  
3 along the Highway 2 corridor.

4 As for our recommendations, Mountain View County  
5 Council unanimously approved the following  
6 recommendations at its September 25th, 2002, meeting.  
7 With reference to the boundary adjustments, we  
8 recommend that the communities and area residents  
9 should remain in the same constituency.

10 We recommended, secondly, that the town of Olds  
11 and its associated rural population should remain in  
12 the Wild Rose constituency because of the Highway 2  
13 corridor and the neighboring urban centres.

14 Thirdly, following the principal of common  
15 interests and trading districts, Rocky Mountain House,  
16 we believe, should remain in the Red Deer  
17 constituency.

18 Fourthly, we believe that the residents in the  
19 north and west of Sundre should be included in the  
20 Wild Rose constituency because of the Town of Sundre  
21 as their primary place of business.

22 And fifth, that consideration should be given to  
23 moving -- or could be given I guess to moving the  
24 south boundary further to the north if the population  
25 so dictates, and this could allow the east boundary of  
26 the proposed constituency to be moved as far east as  
27 791 or perhaps even to the eastern boundary of

1 Mountain View County.

2 With reference to the name, Council unanimously  
3 supported staying with the Wild Rose name. The  
4 Banff-Cochrane, or as has been suggested,  
5 Banff-Cochrane-Airdrie are all major centres  
6 obviously, but all on the southern boundary of the  
7 constituency, whereas Wild Rose, being our provincial  
8 flower, which grows very prolifically throughout the  
9 area, we feel is a very appropriate name for the area.

10 Mountain View Council developed their  
11 recommendations following a review of the adjusted  
12 boundaries prepared by the central Alberta Members of  
13 Parliament, is included as attachment D, both in a  
14 map form and in legal land descriptions. We felt  
15 their proposal addressed the key principals in the  
16 best manner possible. Our only suggested change from  
17 their proposal would be perhaps to move the eastern  
18 boundary further to the east, thereby including all of  
19 Mountain View Country in one constituency.

20 We recognizes that making boundary adjustments is  
21 not an easy task and that no matter what you do, not  
22 all residents or affected parties will be in agreement  
23 with the final result. Having said that, we ask that  
24 you give serious consideration to our recommendations  
25 as we believe they meet the criteria and principles of  
26 common interests, trading districts, travel routes and  
27 while keeping the population and geographic area in a

1           manageable size.

2                   Just this morning I received -- although I don't  
3           have copies of it for you -- a letter from the Village  
4           of Cremona, which is in the area that I represent, a  
5           letter of support, supporting the position of Mountain  
6           View County.

7                   At this time I would like to thank you for the  
8           opportunity to make this presentation. Thank you.

9   MS. KHULLAR:                   Thank you very much, sir. Just a  
10           couple of questions for you. The fifth suggestion or  
11           recommendation approved by the County Council suggests  
12           or says that consideration should be given to moving  
13           the south boundary further north if the population so  
14           dictates. I'm just wondering if you could expand on  
15           that and how far the north and south boundary can go?

16   MR. CHARLIE VAN ARNAM:       At the time the county considered  
17           this option, we did not have the benefit of the  
18           population numbers that -- or the computer you are  
19           playing with here. So we didn't have anything in  
20           mind. I realize we have to move those boundaries to  
21           suit certain population sizes. I think it is -- for  
22           us, it is much more critical that the town of Olds and  
23           that area be included in the constituency. When many  
24           people in our county talk, they talk Olds, Didsbury  
25           Carstairs. It's almost like they're one word. So we  
26           feel it is quite important to move it to 791. Some of  
27           the other areas -- I mean, we are Mountain View

1 County. We don't want to make suggestions for other  
2 areas, I guess.

3 MS. KHULLAR: The other question I have is with  
4 respect to our suggested proposal that was put up on  
5 the screen a little earlier. We had an eastern  
6 boundary of Range Road -- I can't remember what it  
7 is -- 290, which is not as far east as 791. Would  
8 that capture some of those, be sufficient to capture  
9 acreages, or the community east of the Olds area, the  
10 people that work and go to school in Olds and that  
11 type of thing?

12 MR. CHARLIE VAN ARNAM: It is certainly an improvement  
13 over the existing proposed boundary. 791 -- in a  
14 rural area, secondary highways are more recognizable  
15 boundaries, and so we would prefer 791, but any  
16 movement to the east -- the further east you go, the  
17 more likely, I guess, those residents are to deal more  
18 in the Lyndon, Acme, Three Hills and the eastern area.  
19 But primarily, those people, until you get a long ways  
20 east, do not deal in Drumheller. They just don't.  
21 And so certainly that proposal is an improvement but  
22 we would stick with our recommendation of 791.

23 MS. KHULLAR: Thank you very much.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Van Arnam, thank you very much  
25 for that presentation. This is very good work. It is  
26 brief and well presented and it will be of great use  
27 to us.

1 MR. CHARLIE VAN ARNMAN: Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: We have three more. How about a  
3 short break?

4 (ADJOURNMENT)

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Tennant, if you would care to  
6 present your thoughts to us?

7 MS. JO TENNANT: Thank you for the invitation and  
8 the opportunity to speak. I would like to thank the  
9 Commission also for all their hard work and I know  
10 it's a difficult task.

11 I'm Mayor Tennant from the Town of Crossfield and  
12 we're kind of in the south corner there. The Highway  
13 2 division certainly doesn't work for the community of  
14 Crossfield, that being that the Highway 2 corridor is  
15 less than a mile to the east of our community.

16 So I would ask that you reconsider that eastern  
17 boundary, and as Myron indicated, that he would like  
18 Secondary Road 791 to be that eastern boundary and the  
19 Town of Crossfield and its community concurs with that  
20 suggestion.

21 If we look at effective representation for our  
22 community, I think that has to include things such as  
23 our school district, certainly our trading corridor,  
24 everything from fire to more of our health region and  
25 also although Crossfield is part of the MD of  
26 Rockyview, extending the boundary to 791 would  
27 certainly include more of the MD as well and give us a

1 little more of our trading partners to be in the same  
2 riding. The natural community dividing line is  
3 certainly further east than the No. 2 highway, and  
4 this includes our recreation area and pretty well  
5 anything to do with our local community -- again, to  
6 reiterate, whether it is schools or health regions or  
7 the MD.

8 Also, as had been indicated previous, the  
9 population considerations to the east are not that  
10 extensive so Crossfield is hopeful that that would  
11 not skewer the population requirement for the  
12 re-designation.

13 In conclusion, I guess, like many of the other  
14 people that have spoken have indicated the name of  
15 Banff-Cochrane, although we don't expect you to  
16 include the name of Crossfield in there, we believe  
17 that the riding as it is now or as changed will  
18 certainly have more to it than just the Banff-Cochrane  
19 name indicates, and so we would ask that you consider  
20 keeping the name as Wild Rose.

21 I believe that's all the representation or all  
22 the comments I would like to make at this time but  
23 certainly for the community of Crossfield and the  
24 Highway 2 being less than a mile to our east, we would  
25 certainly ask that you extend that to 791. Thank you.

26 MS. KHULLAR: I just have one question,  
27 Ms. Tennant. I'm wondering what your views are if we

1 extend the boundary east to Range Road 250? Does that  
2 encompass -- I understand you want to go to 791 but  
3 what are your thoughts if we decide to go as far as  
4 250 -- or 290, sorry?

5 MS. JO TENNANT: Again, as I have indicated, I  
6 think we would like it to be 791 but, you know,  
7 further east is certainly -- certainly past the No. 2  
8 highway, we would certainly ask for that  
9 consideration.

10 MS. KHULLAR: That would capture the immediate  
11 people right on the east there?

12 MS. JO TENNANT: Certainly. Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Tennant.  
14 You have certainly given emphasis to a point of view  
15 which has been repeated to us several times. Thanks a  
16 lot.

17 Mr. Wayne Gent?

18 MR. WAYNE GENT: I would like to thank you for this  
19 opportunity, Your Honour and fellow chair.

20 May I first bring out the disclaimer that in the  
21 army I would have been shot for impersonating someone  
22 else and I am not the Mayor of Cochrane, although I  
23 wished I could receive that remuneration. I am the  
24 Mayor of Sundre, which has been mentioned here today.

25 We are a small community of 2500, and in the past  
26 15 years, this is my third experience with boundary  
27 divisions -- not federal, both provincial, and when Ed

1 suggested we follow the provincial boundaries, I  
2 almost dropped dead in my chair, and I will explain  
3 why -- or there was at least mention made thereof.

4 About 15 years ago, I was involved in the  
5 Province dividing up a couple of municipalities and  
6 they drove it right down the middle of a village, the  
7 line. And so after about nine months of severe  
8 fighting, we were able to put it back at least to a  
9 reasonable distance and not divide the communities.  
10 This particular year, at our AUMA, which is a body of  
11 all of the Municipal centers within the Province,  
12 Mayor Dale Barr of Rimby was almost in tears because  
13 he was just notified that the Province had redone  
14 their boundary system and his sitting MLA was a senior  
15 member of Cabinet, had been there for more than 20  
16 years as their MLA -- they had taken him and moved him  
17 off to some other direction and divided the town of  
18 Rimby up in half and they now have two new MLAs.

19 So I would like to commend this Commission at  
20 least for the opportunity to at least suggest or at  
21 least to participate. It has been my experience in  
22 both of these others -- and I do appreciate that I see  
23 consideration, I see understanding in your group and  
24 that is encouraging.

25 We are a small town and at the moment we have  
26 four miles to our east, two little communities of  
27 McDougal Flats and Bearberry, which are

1       inconsequential number wise, but they are, ironically,  
2       in the Red Deer constituency. So whenever our MP,  
3       Myron, who has a town hall meeting, they come to our  
4       town naturally because it is only of their interest to  
5       be within our confines. When you drew the line  
6       through Olds, you again socially and economically cut  
7       the lifeline. Olds, Sundre, Didsbury, Carstairs, and  
8       Cremona work together with ambulance service, fire  
9       service, many facilities that we do -- senior housing.

10             If you cut one off, the only thing that I would  
11       ask is that you add a proviso that being that they are  
12       in the next constituency, we can, as a group, get two  
13       federal grants rather than one. Failing that, I would  
14       ask that you at least consider that the marketing area  
15       of that area is Olds, Sundre, Didsbury, Carstairs. It  
16       is a viable, functioning entity which is growing and  
17       the county also participate in that. So I was  
18       appreciative of their presentation as well.

19             Our council unanimously agreed to our MP's  
20       presentation. We feel his boundary suggestions are  
21       apropos, although they don't normally affect us  
22       whether they are 791 or any other number, other than  
23       the fact that if you take Olds and/or Didsbury out of  
24       our mix, you definitely affect the workings within our  
25       system.

26             So on that, I would like to not take any more of  
27       your time so that we can all leave, other than the

1 fact that, again, I would like to thank you folks for  
2 having an opportunity to voice our concerns and  
3 hopefully you will look at the human side of the  
4 number. Thank you.

5 MS. KHULLAR: I always have a question or two.  
6 You mentioned at the beginning of your remarks that  
7 the two smaller communities that were in the Red Deer  
8 constituency that would come to your town hall  
9 meetings in Sundre. Under our proposed boundaries --

10 MR. WAYNE GENT: They would be included.

11 MS. KHULLAR: They are included in  
12 Banff-Cochrane, so that problem is taken care of.

13 MR. WAYNE GENT: The only other thing I would like  
14 to add -- and I like to fly from the seat of my pants  
15 from what I hear at the meetings and our council have  
16 a problem with Banff-Cochrane, unless you add Sundre.  
17 So perhaps we would support Wild Rose much better.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Somebody suggested Bow Valley.

19 MR. WAYNE GENT: Anything other than distinctions  
20 of towns, unless you have a major player such as  
21 Drumheller -- in our area Banff-Cochrane may be major  
22 players to the south, but we are a long ways away from  
23 the south. We are an hour away. So our trading  
24 partners are more important to us than Banff-Cochrane  
25 because we will and do function with Cochrane but  
26 Banff and Canmore to us are tourist areas.

27 THE CHAIRMAN: Tell me, as a matter of interest,

1           what is your relationship with the north, like the  
2           Rocky Mountain House --

3   MR. WAYNE GENT:           Well, as I said, we function with  
4           Caroline now which is because -- I guess, I can take  
5           some blame or credit for this. Highway 22 has been  
6           ignored for a long time. Highway 2 is the artery of  
7           our Province, as you guys are, I'm sure, aware. So  
8           what we are trying to do is generate the tourist  
9           traffic which is our ace. We have it, No. 2 doesn't.  
10          So we should be functioning and circulating in that  
11          area. Rocky, I have to concur with the previous  
12          presenters, it works only primarily and almost  
13          exclusively with Red Deer and some to the north of  
14          Drayton Valley. They do their schooling systems that  
15          way but they have no, other than the County of  
16          Clearwater, functioning to the north of Sundre, we --  
17          I shouldn't say that. Forestry is trying to pull all  
18          of the forestry stations into Rocky so Sundre may be  
19          affected in the forestry area and we may be forced to  
20          go that direction, but at the moment I can suggest  
21          that Rocky and Red Deer are brother and sister and we  
22          are distant cousins, and so what you are marrying here  
23          is cousins rather than brothers and sisters by doing  
24          that. I know you are faced with the situation of  
25          numbers but I think you have to remember who your  
26          brothers and sisters are in each of these areas and it  
27          may require, hopefully, some serious direction

1 changes.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: It may indeed, sir, and we want  
3 everybody to understand that we are not married to  
4 these -- to continue with your familial metaphor -- we  
5 are not married to our proposal either.

6 MR. WAYNE GENT: I understood that and I liked  
7 that.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: And we certainly welcome input  
9 from everybody. In fact, we actively sought it by  
10 holding public hearings throughout the Province,  
11 irrespective of the written responses we received from  
12 people and I'm glad we have because people tend to  
13 walk in anyway and let us know, and we inevitably find  
14 something out of a local nature that simply was not  
15 known to us and couldn't be learned from looking at a  
16 map. So we propose to continue our voyage of  
17 discovery. As a matter of fact, we're going to go up  
18 to Wetaskiwin via Highway 2A instead of Highway 2, so  
19 we will get a little bit of local flavor along the way  
20 through the towns most affected.

21 MR. WAYNE GENT: You could always come up 22. It  
22 is beautiful.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I have been there many times.  
24 Thank you, Mr. Gent.

25 Now we have Kris Bojda and Terry Peterman.

26 MR. TERRY PETERMAN: I'm Mr. Peterman, Mr. Bojda.

27 This is on behalf of Olds. I too am here

1 representing the Town of Olds or I should say am  
2 representing the Town of Olds. I believe --  
3 Terry Peterman is my name, as we already established,  
4 I guess, and I too wish to thank the Commission for  
5 this opportunity to have some input.

6 And we are last on the agenda here today to  
7 present but I believe that definitely are not least.  
8 I think the Town of Olds is the most affected by the  
9 proposed changes and we strongly wish to get our  
10 opinion across to you that we prefer to -- we  
11 unanimously endorse, as a Council, speaking for the  
12 citizens of Olds, the proposal by the five area MPs  
13 for the boundary changes. We looked at it as a  
14 Council and we couldn't come up with a better division  
15 than they had so we strongly endorse that and we hope  
16 you give that consideration.

17 We share the common -- I think just about  
18 everything has been touched on that we oppose this for  
19 but our common interests lie with the area that we are  
20 in. We have nothing really to do with the east  
21 area -- I shouldn't say all of us -- but generally our  
22 travel lines are lifelines in our community are  
23 Highway 2 and Highway 27, which goes west through our  
24 community to Sundre, where my esteemed colleague is  
25 from. And although we aren't far enough west to  
26 endorse marrying brothers and sisters or cousins --  
27 sorry about that -- that is our lifeline. Our

1 community is growing substantially and we believe it  
2 is due to the geographical location of our town, which  
3 is right on the major artery of -- the north/south  
4 artery, Highway 2, and then Highway 27 west is the  
5 route that most of our traffic goes through, of  
6 course, heading down Highway 22 south to the Trans  
7 Canada -- large volume of traffic in that area and  
8 thus our trading partners are in that area and our  
9 economic interests.

10 Like I said, we endorse the proposals of our area  
11 MPs that they put together, and as far as the name  
12 goes, we will reiterate what has been said here today.  
13 While Banff-Cochrane are important players in this  
14 riding or proposed riding, the County of Mountain View  
15 is big as well and so Wild Rose, we think, does  
16 encompass a larger area and give it some broader  
17 connotations than just Banff-Cochrane. Although the  
18 name issue is not a really big one for us but just  
19 emphasizing that cutting us out of this area -- we are  
20 a bit like a family, we have worked on a lot of  
21 initiatives recently with the county of Mountain View,  
22 with our neighbouring towns, alliances too numerous to  
23 mention, but we are opening up a great dialogue and  
24 starting to work together better than we have in the  
25 past, and to cut us off, I think, would be like  
26 cutting off an arm or a limb off a major body part  
27 here. So to me it -- I think in closing then, it just

1 looks to me that the proposed changes you made, we are  
2 just a victim here of population numbers in Olds. It  
3 looks like that, you know, with bringing Rocky in,  
4 because they had to get out of Red Deer, it looks to  
5 me that it was just looked at to say where can we  
6 gouge off a major chunk of population and separate it,  
7 and that to us is not acceptable as a community. We  
8 seem to be a sacrificial lamb in the whole picture and  
9 we hope you give strong consideration to the five MPs  
10 proposal for changes.

11 In conclusion, the town of Olds is definitely not  
12 opposed to change so we are not opposing this for the  
13 sake of wanting to keep things the same. I think our  
14 community in the last four years has shown that we are  
15 ready for change. We have gone through some dramatic  
16 changes. I think we are in the infancy stages of  
17 transforming from a small town to a larger centre and  
18 with that goes some hard changes and there's been some  
19 battles, but I believe our community is moving that  
20 way, so it is not opposing for the sake of opposing  
21 change. It just makes sense to us.

22 I will conclude on that and thank you again for  
23 the opportunity.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: How far north would you say this  
25 Highway 2 town community -- how far north does it go?  
26 Does it go to Bowden? Does it go to Innisfail?

27 MR. TERRY PETERMAN: Well, we are on a regional water

1           commission with Innisfail and Bowden, and with that we  
2           work together quite a bit, but I would say far more of  
3           our initiatives do stem from the County arrangement,  
4           the County of Mountain View. We have Olds, Didsbury,  
5           Carstairs, Crossfield, Sundre. That's basically our  
6           area. We do have some commonalities north but  
7           generally the dividing line has been at that County  
8           line.

9   THE CHAIRMAN:            You wouldn't suggest going as far  
10           as Bowden or Innisfail?

11  MR. TERRY PETERMAN:       I don't think anybody would be  
12           opposed to that in our community.

13  THE CHAIRMAN:            They would be in Red Deer, of  
14           course. The gravitational pull of that large centre  
15           seems to extend quite a ways south so we have to draw  
16           the line at some point, you know. We can't get all of  
17           the Highway 2 satellite towns in in one riding, we  
18           simply can't.

19  MR. TERRY PETERMAN:       Yes, that right. But that seems  
20           to be the way it has worked -- you know, that is the  
21           cutoff line. It seems to be the county line. There  
22           is several things we do work with, like Innisfail and  
23           Bowden on, like I mentioned, the water line and RCMP.  
24           Our RCMP cover, our detachment in Olds covers the  
25           community of Bowden as a satellite detachment.

26  MS. KHULLAR:             I will just ask the question I  
27           asked everybody else. The five MPs' proposal proposes

1           an east boundary of 791 and the revised proposal we  
2           have been working with is eastern boundary of Range  
3           Road 290, and I'm just wondering what your thoughts  
4           are on that? I understand you endorse having 791 as  
5           your eastern boundary but...

6   MR. TERRY PETERMAN:        I don't think that would be a huge  
7           issue for us, speaking for myself and council. I  
8           don't think where that line is is as big of an issue  
9           as keeping Olds with the group that we are a part of.

10   THE CHAIRMAN:             Would it be safe to have lunch in  
11           Olds today?

12   MR. TERRY PETERMAN:        Absolutely. I will buy. That  
13           wouldn't be seen as a bribe or anything, would it?

14   THE CHAIRMAN:             That is the end of our list.  
15           Thank you all very much for coming. It has been a  
16           very useful exercise, from our point of view, and I  
17           hope you feel the same.

18

---

19

20   PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

21

---

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 Certificate of Transcript

2

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the  
4 foregoing pages 1 to 49 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 31st 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