



COLWOOD RESPONSES
Amalgamation Yes Questionnaire
2018 Municipal Election
www.amalgamationyes.ca
amalgamateyes@gmail.com

1. Are you in favour of a [citizens' assembly](#) process to look at governance in your community and its relation to the region? Why or why not? Please explain.

2. The current Capital Region District Board consists of municipal councillors and mayors who are appointed from the 13 municipalities. By legislation, these municipal appointments are responsible to represent the interests of their home municipalities. Do you think that regional interests would be better served if the entire CRD Board was directly elected by voters region-wide? Why or why not? Please explain.

COLWOOD CANDIDATE RESPONSES: (NOTE: Candidates listed in alphabetic order. Mayoral candidates denoted with “M”)

Name	Q 1: Supporting the Citizens' Assembly Model?	Q 2: Electing CRD Board by all voters, region-wide?
Michael Baxter	Q1 – I am in favour of a citizen’s assembly only if there is some reasonable indication that a significant number of people in Colwood are interested in having this happen. Currently I am not aware of any such indication and therefore of any appetite on the part of Colwood voters to spend money on the process. The 2014 non-binding referendum that took place in many other municipalities in the region indicated overall support for the province funding a study of amalgamation but support for anything more than that was not clear because of the questions asked. There was a candidate for amalgamation yes in the 2014 election who got very few votes but that could have been a rejection of the particular candidate or simply rejection of a single issue candidate. I think it very likely that the people of Colwood would be happier to know more about the issue of amalgamation before making any decision to spend money looking into it. I also think that if it were clear that significant overall tax savings would result as well as some service improvements then many would support it. It is possible that	The current system sounds good in theory but has three major flaws in my opinion. The first flaw is that if the two largest municipalities plus one other are in agreement on a course of action then they can drag the 10 other municipalities with them which does not have the appearance of democracy no matter what the real fairness of that may be. This has produced much bitterness of feeling in some municipalities. A simple solution to this problem would be to change the way votes are counted. If every process had to be supported by a majority of population represented (similar to current voting) as well as a majority of the number of jurisdictions voting (i.e., for this purpose both Saanich and Highland would have the same voting weight) then both large and a majority of small jurisdictions would have to agree before anything could change. Vote counting would be simplified by having all directors vote through buttons on their desks linked to a computer that would display the results (with or without names as required by the situation) on a screen with the net result. This would also end the many controversies surrounding the issue of whether votes were counted properly. The second flaw is that councillors in the municipalities (and even more so

	<p>the vote in Saanich and Victoria will give Colwood an opportunity to study the outcome of their process and make a more informed decision on whether Colwood should pursue the idea with the public.</p>	<p>the mayors) are so busy in their home jurisdictions that they do not have adequate time to pay close attention to the large and complex agendas at CRD meetings.</p> <p>The third flaw is that taxation without directly elected representation is an evil only slightly less bad than taxation without any representation. Curing these last two flaws would require direct elections. However, if every director was elected by region wide vote the populous centre (Saanich and Victoria more or less) would control the entire outcome (in the same way that eastern Canada sometimes elects a new government before we on the west coast have finished voting). A ward system would be better although not a total solution to this problem and it would increase accountability. Drawing the ward boundaries would be a challenge as they would likely be best if they did not coincide with municipal boundaries but they should not assume strange shapes in order to avoid any coincidence of boundaries.</p>
Cynthia Day		
Carol Hamilton - M	<p>I created a Mayor's task force in our community in 2012 to look at this however after 2 months of advertising only 3 persons were interested in participating - 2 did not even live in Colwood. The phone 'survey' undertaken also did not produce results worthy in following up on. Perhaps a more sub regional approach would garner more interest.</p>	<p>I believe the CRD, governance and services they provide requires a full comprehensive review, assessment and evaluation by an independent body before any changes are made to the 'voting structure'. There are service deliveries they excel in but times and technologies have changed and so have community needs. New services are rolled out with a 'learn as we go' kind of plan. This can be an expensive undertaking and way to do business. Municipalities have little control of CRD requisitions to their community as it is tied to 'services' and a change of service requires the Municipality to pay for a review. Expensive!</p>
Dean Jantzen		
Doug Kobayashi		
Gordie Logan		
Rob Martin - M		
Scott McDonald	<p>YES. In the last election, 75% of CRD residents who were given a chance to respond, voted yes to further study. The time is now. Let's find out what people think, let's have a look at governance options once and for all.</p>	<p>I think the CRD board should be directly elected. The current system puts CRD directors in a difficult situation—they were directly elected to serve their community, not 12 other municipalities and their community.</p>
Eve Millington		
Jason Nault		
Misty Olson		
Stewart E. Parkinson		
Aaron Weisgerber		

