

9:07 a.m.

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll officially begin. Welcome to you, Steve. With your permission, the meeting will be recorded and in *Hansard*.

The process we've been following, Steve, is to ask the presenter to share with us their observations, and then we turn into a general question-and-answer session. Hopefully, we'll be able to learn a little bit about Vermilion-Viking and the east-central part of the province through your eyes and experiences. So with those brief comments, I'll turn it over to you.

DR. WEST: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. It seems this morning that I've been here before. That would be a tongue-in-cheek statement. But I have been present at various meetings with the public in Vermilion-Viking since this process began, and of course I took all the documentation that had been presented before by the courts and the select standing committee that had done the work throughout the province. At those meetings you heard a strong plea to look at the distinct nature of various geographic discrepancies as they relate to boundaries and population. I'll make a statement that in democracy where large geographic areas are involved there cannot be any fairness with absolute equality – no fairness with absolute equality. We have a unicameral House. We have just gone through an extensive process in Canada, a tremendous amount of energy spent by Canadians to establish equality in the second House and still maintain the principles of democracy. It's the same old discussion, the logistics of Vermilion-Viking or any area of the province of Alberta versus democracy: one vote, one representation.

As I've said, I was present at the meetings. I don't want to rehash all that, but the courts did say that they recognized the exact things that have been discussed in Canada, as they will be discussed in Alberta, that there must be variance for other key discrepancies in a democracy from one vote, one representation. There must be variance so there is fairness and there is democracy. In all of this Vermilion-Viking has stood by while various maps have been drawn in best attempts by various individuals and has watched as it has been eliminated. If the variance had been applied as the courts had given direction to the various committees, I believe Vermilion-Viking could be sustained as an election constituency. Up to 25 percent variance and 50 percent in – I believe it's four, is it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. WEST: If you apply that to the province of Alberta with the census – I know it's a struggle and it will change the lines, and I accept here today that lines will have to be redrawn in major ways in some areas – I believe that Vermilion-Viking could be sustained along with other constituencies in the province.

The corridors of life where I live – and what I call corridors of life are so important to that fairness in a democracy. If you live along Highway 16, over the years in this province right from the beginning of the 1900s traffic has been east-west. If you start slicing up individual areas by slicing that corridor of life into a north-south dimension, you start breaking up people's ways of life, traditions, families, and municipal processes. I think we've come to those discussions in other areas.

In my constituency I have three highways – 13, 14, and 16 – that transfer us across. Those are corridors of life. People on Highway 13 move from Loughheed through to Camrose as they go to see their mother who's at the Bethany centre. They move through Killam.

They move through Sedgewick. They move through Strome. When I move north, the people of Viking move straight through; they do business all the way to Edmonton. The people from Kinsella, the people from Irma – that's in another constituency – move through Highway 14 in a corridor of life, and 16 does the same way. Vermilion moves east to west. Vermilion doesn't move its corridor of life to Lloydminster. Now, that's tradition.

With all due respect, these corridors should be maintained where possible, and that comes to the discussion as to where variances would have to be accommodated within the court decision of 25 percent. I believe we have room to move north to the river in Vermilion-Viking, and I believe we have room to move west. Some breakup or concessions would have to be made perhaps in the south to maintain those corridors of life with other constituencies, not Vermilion-Viking. I say that there are ways to look at this as well as look at the rest of the province. You're going to have to pick up some of those constituencies with 50 percent variance in order to accommodate the population densities required for even the 25 percent variance.

I'm not going to go into details on what you've already heard at the meetings in Vermilion and Viking. You heard in Vermilion an outcry. When Vermilion was imaged with Lloydminster, there were people that didn't want to see their constituency (a) lost and (b) removed from the corridors of life. Mannville, a small community, echoed that they didn't have anything in common with Wainwright. To be thrown in a Wainwright constituency, as had been done, would put them totally out of their corridors of life. They don't shop in Wainwright. They don't have their long-term care nursing there. They don't have their hospitals there. Not many of their kids go to school in Vermilion. They're 14 miles down the road. That's what I'm talking about, a corridor of life. When you make a massive change and take one area, a community that for 60, 70 years has been associated with another, and move it off in a political sense to another area, you will cause a tremendous amount of damage. I don't need to get into the one other essence.

I saw on television last night the media taking another attempt to show the discrepancies of equality, of one vote, one representation. With all due respect, I know that the media's here today. It was on T.V. that I saw this, not the written word. It was comparing some constituency with 59,000 to some constituency with 12,000. I admit that there has to be some rationalization of these figures. There's no doubt that as every decade goes by, population densities have to be changed, but there are city constituencies – you've heard this over and over, and I'll say it one more time. The person who sits in the city of Edmonton in a large constituency and goes home every night to their family doesn't have one clue about what representation means in a democracy and the plethora of issues and things I have to do as a rural MLA. Not all MLAs perhaps are ministers, but having a dual responsibility to the people of Alberta and the province, the time allocations I have for a constituency with five hospitals, 17 schools, five counties, 11 communities, lodges, highway projects, sewage and water problems in all communities as we move through, dealing with everything from waste disposal to where the next loads of gravel are going to go in an area a hundred miles away – and I can go on and on. That individual in the city can move home every night while session is on. I have to go downtown to a strange place and leave my family and take the strains and stresses of personal life. I have to go downtown to a rented or purchased accommodation, which we took criticism on.

I just say that in God's name somebody had better apply common sense to this, because representation into the '90s and the next decade is going to take understanding on all parts including the media, the people of this province, and whatever government is in power. I say again that in God's name somebody had better apply

common sense here, because if you expand these constituencies and call this equity, then that will never go in the future because you will have problems; this will explode right in our very faces. So I make the plea that you cannot have fairness with absolute equality. The courts recognized that; the committee that was put in place to do it didn't. If an explanation were given to the person down here on Jasper Avenue about what I just said, the logistics of Vermilion-Viking or whatever it be, I believe the majority of people in fairness would accept the premises we're trying to achieve, but because of the conduit of information today, people in the centres of cities and that sort of thing get a skewed impression of the truth and logistics and what fairness means.

I won't go any further because I said I'd keep it short, but I make the strong statement that we'd better pay attention very carefully to the essence of common sense and fairness in a country and in a province the size of this one with sparsely populated areas.

Thank you.

9:17

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Steve.  
Questions or comments? Stock.

MR. DAY: Well, first, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to assure the minister that even if we did take a personal and wrongheaded view of this whole issue and zeroed in on absolute voter equality, we would be in contempt of court. So we're not going to be doing that. I just want to assure you of that. The courts couldn't be clearer, and I agree with you that it's a message that doesn't go out. Despite the fact that the message isn't going out, we are still bound by what the court has ruled. Before this went to a commission, the special committee, as you know, insisted that everything we draw up be subjected to the Appeal Court. The Appeal Court of Alberta decision and the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of Saskatchewan v Carter absolutely upheld everything we did, as a matter of fact even in some ways stronger than we had anticipated or stronger than maybe we would have done it.

As an example and just to put you at rest, this is quoting from the court ruling: a rule permitting a 25 per cent deviation does not offend the Charter as an undue intrusion upon voter parity. That's absolutely what it says. Because some of the members of the commission chose to disagree with the Supreme Court, that doesn't affect what we're doing. We are bound by the court. We'd be in contempt of court if we didn't follow that. As far as the rural areas, I could go on page after page quoting these cases. Again, this is a quote. The actual court ruling says that rural communities are a community interest within the meaning of the rule about effective representation, and their existence warrants departure from voter parity. So I'm just assuring you the courts have said that the key issue in Canada is effective representation. That's the key issue: effective representation.

As I've pointed out before, when you stand up in the Assembly and bring an issue to our attention that affects, for instance, Vermilion, you're the only MLA doing that. You have to get the attention of your colleagues and everybody else in the Assembly and say that this is an issue of importance to, as an example, Vermilion, or it might be Viking. But when somebody stands up in the Assembly about an issue for Edmonton, there are automatically 17 MLAs plugged into Edmonton who are saying, "Yes, that's right." So to say that Edmonton or Calgary or for that matter Red Deer – at least when one of us stands up, there are two of us automatically speaking for Red Deer. But when you as a rural person stand up for your constituency, there's one, and the courts have said that effective representation is the key, not absolute voter equality. That's why even in Edmonton you have wards. You take one ward compared to

another; there's a 26 percent variation in population even in the wards in Edmonton. So variation is permitted, and we will be doing all we can to satisfy the court rulings and also satisfy the people of Alberta. You have our assurance on that.

Just on a specific. You mentioned – I didn't catch everything you said; I was looking here when you said it – the north boundary possibly taking in the river as a natural boundary?

DR. WEST: Yes, and I was referring to corridors of life. Highway 45 is another one. I mean, if you take all those east-west that I talked about, you go up Highway 45 and then the river blocks it off and the river becomes a natural. Everything funnels down through. I'm saying there is distance that way, if northern areas can accommodate some of the court decision in wider variances. You know, we were looking at 50 percent.

MR. DAY: Okay.

DR. WEST: I say in respect to your last comments that I should have premised all this on that I felt the 10 percent variance that was given by the previous committees was closer to an absolute equality than to fairness.

MR. DAY: Oh, right.

DR. WEST: I just said that by 10 percent they came closer to having no variance. We should have seen some constituencies with upwards of 20 to 25 percent variance. The average and most of them came out at 10 percent, and that wasn't the court decision.

MR. DAY: No, that was an arbitrary decision. It's like my saying: "I like the sound of 13 and a half percent. It just has a kind of nice ring to it." Well, it's fine for me to say that, but the courts have said something entirely different. So somebody on a committee saying they like the sound of 10 or 9.2 or whatever – that's not the question.

Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, if I could. On your southwest boundary, if I'm looking at this correctly, that line doesn't actually coincide with county No. 29. Is that right?

DR. WEST: County of Beaver? No. The southwest boundary came inside Highway 36, bounced over to take in Viking, and moved straight on down . . .

MR. DAY: Right. Daysland is not inside your boundary then.

DR. WEST: No. Daysland is a long way over. It's towards Camrose.

MR. DAY: Yeah.

DR. WEST: I didn't come here with any direct lines on a map.

MR. DAY: No, I appreciate that.

DR. WEST: I'll tell you that right now. I didn't come here to start carving up, because you have a job to do. I won't be bringing any carved-up maps to you.

MR. DAY: Okay. I just wanted clarification of a couple of them.

DR. WEST: I came here with the principle to discuss and the challenge you'll have under that principle. That's my main reason in being here today.

MR. DAY: Thanks. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARDINAL: Steve, the bigger concern you have, and I have a concern about something like that, is that we may not use common sense in laying out the representation in Alberta in the future. Well, as a member of this committee I was involved in the development of the legislation. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms allows us to use a lot of common sense, and the legislation that's in place with the following allows us to use a lot of common sense. You can be assured that we will be doing that.

When you look at the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Democratic Rights, for an example:

Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.

Under Equality Rights it says:

Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination.

It goes on, and this is the area you've brought forward very strongly. In part 3 under Equalization and Regional Disparities it says:

Without altering the legislative authority of Parliament or of the provincial legislatures, or the rights of any of them with respect to the exercise of their legislative authority, Parliament and the legislatures, together with the government of Canada and the provincial governments, are committed to . . .

and these are the important areas.

- (a) promoting equal opportunities for the well-being of Canadians;
- (b) furthering economic development to reduce disparity in opportunities; and
- (c) providing essential public services of reasonable quality to all Canadians.

Those were the points you really stressed. You can be assured that the legislation that is in place allows us to do this. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms allows us to use common sense, and you can be assured we will be using common sense and will get the job done.

9:27

DR. WEST: That's good. I don't have much more to add.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Steve, I was interested in your comments about following highways, your calling them corridors of life. That's very similar to the information given to us by Butch Fischer, that we need to pay attention to highways. Maybe because I travel from my home to Edmonton through your constituency – I come up Highway 36 to Viking and then follow Highway 14 from Viking in – I know what you mean by rivers of life in terms of the highways through our counties. So I was just interested in your observations on that point.

DR. WEST: Well, you're all aware that those highways today don't make sense because they wander through picking up the communities and angle down. The farther away you get if you're going north, you can't get there because each highway angles south. Those highways were all built for the seven- to eight-mile grain hauling between small communities with horses and everything else, and then they were paved after that. They literally were built for what we call a corridor of life to link those communities together in that central area. We find it very difficult even to get people to send their mother to a nursing home on the highway north. If you go from 13 to 14 and say they should go up to Viking or that sort of thing, no, they want to stay right in Killam; or if Killam's full, they don't want to send them north to Viking, only 25 minutes away, because they say, "Well, we have nothing in common." So we have always put up with distance with our health care and seniors' facilities. That's the corridor I'm talking about. People like to flow to where a doctor is. I know there will be arguments saying, "Well, people have to start to have more flexibility in where they go," and

that's a fair comment. That maybe will help another generation, but to take somebody who's 75 years old and has all their family – they've started in this country and built it. If you're not going to consider the last decade of their life, if it's not worth consideration – good luck. You know, try that with your mothers and fathers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks very much, Steve.

[The committee adjourned from 9:29 a.m. to 9:35 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; we'll reconvene. Welcome, Fred. With your permission, Fred, we'll stay on *Hansard* for the meeting.

MR. BRADLEY: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The process we've been following is to listen to the presenter and then go into a general question-and-answer session. If you're comfortable with that, please proceed.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm here really to ensure that the representations that were made by my constituents to the previous select committee and to the Electoral Boundaries Commission are represented to this new committee looking at the electoral boundaries.

The people who live in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency feel it is in a unique circumstance versus a lot of other rural ridings in the province given the geography and the economic mix of the riding and have made strong representations that they be considered one of the special consideration electoral divisions. I believe that the riding in that area could meet those conditions. I note with the census data that the riding of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest even falls below the minus 50 percent, so in order to meet a special consideration electoral division requirement there would have to be some additional area added to the riding. But what makes this riding fit into this category? Obviously, distance from Edmonton, approximately 450 kilometres. There's a great distance factor required in terms of representation. It takes me around 50 eight-hour working days a year in terms of travel back and forth from the riding to the capital. That's two and a half, almost three months if you look at a normal five-day working week at eight hours.

MR. DAY: Fifty eight-hour days you're talking about?

MR. BRADLEY: Fifty eight-hour days just in travel time. That makes a person not able to access one's constituents, and I think that's a significant factor you have to look at in terms of the size of a riding. For other members who live closer to the capital, obviously constituents have more hours available when they can directly access a member than people who live farther away.

There's no community in the current riding which has a population of over 4,000. The municipality of Crowsnest Pass is a unique regional government which brought together two towns, two villages, nine hamlets, and an improvement district area, so there are actually 14 communities within the municipality of Crowsnest Pass. Each has some unique circumstances or features. That requires some different kind of representation because the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not similar to every other municipality in terms of its responsibilities. There are some special provisions in it which make it different from other municipal governments, so it's not a town or a municipal district or county like others.

The constituency geographically has mountainous areas, foothills, and prairies. The Crowsnest area obviously has been heavily reliant on the resource industry. Logging is now one of the major industries in that area. Coal mining had been a major industry and still is a

resource there, but there are no operating mines currently on the Alberta side of the Crowsnest Pass. There are some 800 people, however, who are employed in coal mines in British Columbia, which added a different twist in terms of representation, because a member in that area having that significant amount of its own population employed in a different province is very involved in issues related to employment in another province. Currently there are some labour disputes. One mine has declared bankruptcy. That adds to the types of issues a member must be cognizant of: what's happening in the different province, how they are treating employees, workers' compensation issues, how they handle labour disputes, how they handle a shutdown of a company, and it spills over. There's currently about 400 people directly affected by a closure, and it could go up to 600 in an industry in another province. So that's a different aspect to the representation.

There have been losses of population in the area and some significant decline in population on the '86 census over the '81 census, and I note with the '91 census a further decline in population in the Crowsnest Pass. There had been closure of some significant industries. Coleman Collieries had 650 employees; Phillips Cables, 250. Those are losses to the area, and that is a special responsibility, I think, in terms of a member. When you have these significant industrial disruptions where there's loss of employment, it adds pressures to look at those special circumstances in terms of the representation.

Of course, when we get out into the prairie areas, we obviously have different agriculture-based operations: cattle, feedlot operations, grain, mixed farming operations. I mentioned the logging operations. There are significant gas processing operations both in the Pincher Creek area and in the Crowsnest Pass area. There continues to be exploration for coal and other mineral exploration. There are lime quarrying operations. So it's got a broad basis of different industries which are important to the area, and all require representation. It also is a very historic area. I believe the Crowsnest Pass has probably the greatest collection of provincial historic sites in the province of Alberta, ranging from early Indian inhabitation back 10,000 years to the early history of this province in the late 1800s, coal mining history, et cetera. There are major initiatives there to try and develop cultural tourism in the Crowsnest Pass Ecomuseum Trust, which is trying to develop the historical mining and other attributes of the community. Of course, there are the provincial historic sites of Frank Slide and Leitch Collieries and many other provincial historic sites there.

The area also has pressure on it from the recreational industry with recreational activity on the Eastern Slopes, a very narrow mountain base along the eastern slopes of the Rockies. There's a lot of pressure there in terms of environmental issues, development issues, recreational issues, which adds to the type of representation a member must look at. Of course, you are probably aware of the environmental issues relating to the Shell Waterton gas plant over a number of years. The Oldman River dam is located within the riding, which also adds to the representation requirements. It's one of those classic environmental resource development issues which requires a member's time. Looking at developing a major ski facility at Westcastle is another type of community of interest which requires representation. The riding is adjacent to Waterton national park, and the Waterton biosphere adds to those types of land environmental resource development management issues. It's adjacent to the Peigan Indian reserve. There's a lot of interaction between the Peigan Indian reserve and the town of Pincher Creek. Part of the Indian reserve is within the current riding. I've talked about the uniqueness of the regional government of the Crowsnest Pass, which adds to those unique communities of interests.

So all in all the riding has a lot of complexities to it, a lot of history to it, a lot of different communities of interests which require representation. The constituents there have made those representations, and I think to significantly expand it beyond what its current boundaries are is going to dilute the ability of their community of interests to be represented adequately in the provincial Legislature. I recognize that the population numbers with the current census don't even fit into the minus 50 percent. It's been suggested by the mayor of Pincher Creek and others and in consultation with the Peigan Indian reserve that maybe one of the likely boundary changes to look at would be to move in an easterly direction from the current Pincher Creek-Crowsnest riding and add in the Peigan Indian reserve. I believe there is some support on the Indian reserve for that, but to significantly expand those boundaries beyond that I think would dilute the community of interests and the ability of those people to be adequately represented given the diverse and unique interests there. I don't think any other rural riding in the province faces the type of economic or social uniqueness that that area collectively has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Fred.  
Mike? Stock.

MR. DAY: The fifth meridian forms part of your northwest boundary there. I can't tell by this map; do you actually also take in a slice of MD 26?

9:45

MR. BRADLEY: That may have been corrected.

MR. DAY: It's hard to tell on this.

MR. BRADLEY: There is a small part of MD 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It looks like there is, Stock.

MR. DAY: It would be right there, yeah.

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, a very small part of MD 26 is currently in.

MR. DAY: So that would give you MD 26, MD 9, ID 6. Then the municipality of Crowsnest Pass: does that split ID 6?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

MR. DAY: Okay. I wanted to clarify that just to see how many different areas you're taking in there.

The other question, too, just from a point of view of how it would work. It's nothing directly to do with lines, but I guess it shows the added complexity of some of these rural areas. You have many of your constituents working in B.C. When they've got a problem employmentwise or with WCB – any MLA would get a lot of those calls – do you have to talk with the MLA in B.C.? Do you work through their ministry there? How do you handle their concerns?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, it depends on the issue. A lot of B.C. WCB concerns we work through the B.C. WCB commission. I also work through the MLA's office there on occasion to see if they are able to assist, or go directly to government ministries in British Columbia.

MR. DAY: That's probably fairly unique in terms of the number of constituents. We've probably all got a few that work somewhere in some other locality, but you would have a significant portion there.

MR. BRADLEY: I think about 800 people that reside on the Alberta side of the border are employed in the five mines in British Columbia. That's split between, as I say, five mines. Some of them are at various stages of economic viability. One has just declared bankruptcy, and it's the major employer, which is going to cause some significant hardship for the people in the area. So the continuing economic viability of those coal mines in B.C. is an issue with which one is directly involved in working to look at solutions to keep those viable. Even though they're in another jurisdiction, one is certainly cognizant of it and doing whatever one is able to from a different area to impact upon that or to arrive at some positive solutions.

MR. DAY: I'm also thinking in terms of delivery of services. If you have a plant go down in Edmonton, or even, let's say, Red Deer, as we have had over the last year, and all of a sudden you've got 200 or 300 people out of work, there's immediate accessibility of government services, employment services, retraining, vocational. Do you have to try and arrange for temporary services to be set up in something like that? Do you have to try and co-ordinate it all through your office? What do you do in a situation like that?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, obviously there are some federal services which would relate to the operation in B.C. The B.C. government would provide some services to their citizens, but it would be left to our government to provide the services to those people who are resident on the Alberta side. There may be a varying overlap. I mean, that's something that has to be clarified, and it presents a difficulty because one jurisdiction may approach it differently from another jurisdiction, and then you have to try and meld these programs or try and ensure there's a fairness and equity to the delivery of them.

MR. DAY: For instance, even in Red Deer, and certainly in Edmonton or Calgary, those staff from career development and other areas are more or less immediately accessible. You'd have to do some arranging of staffing and making sure those employment upgrading needs get met.

MR. BRADLEY: In any situation like that it puts a considerable amount of involvement of the member on it, but this makes it more complex because you've got two jurisdictions you're working between.

MR. DAY: A unique situation which I don't envy you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recall some of the concerns that were brought forward to us by residents of the area when we had our committee hearing in Pincher Creek. One factor that has stayed in my mind is the employee who works in B.C. but lives in the Crowsnest Pass, has a workers' compensation concern in British Columbia but comes to his Alberta MLA for help. So it's an added complexity that the member representing the area has to deal with. I think the only other parallel with it would be if you were the MLA for Lloydminster.

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, Lloydminster might have some more. I think there's special city legislation there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was thinking of a worker out at the heavy oil sands plant, which is in Saskatchewan, someone who lives on the Alberta side. Yes, the Lloydminster charter is unique as a city.

MR. DAY: How far is Fernie from you?

MR. BRADLEY: It's about 45 miles.

MR. DAY: Are they still annually moving to be annexed by Alberta? I know that's not taken all that seriously, but about once a year we hear there's . . .

MR. BRADLEY: In terms of how people feel, there are obviously frustrations in border areas which are a far distance from their capitals. I think every once in a while that's raised by them as an attempt to get some attention, but seriously it wouldn't be something that takes place.

The earlier commission suggested splitting Pincher Creek from the Crowsnest Pass. It just doesn't make any sense whatsoever, in my judgment, to do that. You'd really isolate the Crowsnest Pass further from the next large community nearest to it in the province of Alberta that it has any relationship with. I mean, it is in a mountain corridor. Historically it's felt isolated from the province of Alberta. You talk about the isolation that the people in southeastern B.C. feel from their capital. I think the Crowsnest Pass in some ways operates in its own cultural and social way. It's not the same, in terms of its relationship with the rest of the province, but Pincher Creek is the closest community it does have a relationship with, and that ties it into Alberta in terms of its other provincial relationships. It can't, obviously, go west to have a community it can relate to, so Pincher Creek is an important community that it relates to. To split the Pass away from Pincher Creek does not make a lot of sense, nor does it make any sense in my judgment to split any part of the MD of Pincher Creek from its hub, which is the town of Pincher Creek.

In an earlier boundary commission back in '79 the southern part of the MD of Pincher Creek was then in the Cardston riding. The people there very aggressively pursued a campaign to have their representation be part of the representation of the MD and town of Pincher Creek. So I don't think that would be a solution in terms of the best representation for those people in the MD of Pincher Creek. I would argue strongly, in terms of the decisions you have to make, to keep the MD of Pincher Creek whole, with the Crowsnest Pass, and then move in an easterly direction to add that amount of territory that's necessary to bring it up to the numbers for a special-consideration riding. To significantly move beyond that and bring in a larger territory towards the east I think is going to impact significantly on the ability of those people to get representation for their community. Their special community of interests would be diluted significantly and their ability to get that representation.

I don't have anything more to say, gentlemen.

MR. DAY: Just one more. Fifty eight-hour days: that's two months of the year, almost, you're driving.

MR. BRADLEY: Two and a half. Well, driving or on an airplane, a combination of driving and air time.

MR. DAY: If you're down near your Waterton border and you've got a meeting up in the municipality of Crowsnest Pass, what's your driving time there?

MR. BRADLEY: About an hour, a little over an hour.

MR. DAY: Great. Thanks.

MR. BRADLEY: I should note that the nearest airport to that riding is Lethbridge, which is 90 miles from Crowsnest Pass, or Calgary, which is 160 miles. That's the only place you can get scheduled airline service, so it's not easily accessible.

9:55

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Fred.

[The committee adjourned from 9:55 a.m. to 11:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll reconvene. Welcome to you, Tom. With your permission we'll stay on the record.

MR. THURBER: No problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The process we've been following is that we've listened to the presenter, and then once the presenter has completed some opening comments, we've gone into a general question-and-answer session.

As I indicated, Mike Cardinal had to leave; he's gone out to a funeral and won't be back until this afternoon. He extends his apologies.

We'll proceed.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Chairman Bob. The presentation I have given you a copy of is made up on the assumption that there would be a new constituency of Wetaskiwin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Do you have a second copy?

MR. THURBER: Just the one I have here; I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's take just a momentary break and make a copy of this, please.

MR. THURBER: Okay.

[The committee adjourned from 11:06 a.m. to 11:09 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Tom.

MR. THURBER: I'll start again then, Bob. The presentation I've brought forward here is based again on the assumption that there would be a new constituency of Wetaskiwin, which has seemed to be rather consistent with all the reports the boundaries commission has brought forward. I've tried to use municipal boundaries where possible and trading patterns to some extent, although you realize, as most people should, that the majority of the business and the contacts an MLA has with municipal districts and counties goes through the highways and the schools and the hospitals and areas like that. So trading patterns are somewhat important, but they're not the key that I have used in this area.

We have prorated the population using the 1986 township figures and the 1991 census totals to arrive at a very close estimate. Now, I can't say that the numbers are exact, but they're as close as we could make them without having 1991 township figures. I have tried to take into consideration as much as possible without total collaboration the surrounding constituencies, and the figures I have used in this presentation do not move any of these, in my estimation, beyond the accepted plus or minus 25 percent.

If you look at the Drayton Valley constituency in the light of a new Wetaskiwin constituency as I have suggested it on the attached map, it leaves the Drayton Valley constituency with 20.55 percent below average. It would provide relatively good access to their MLA, with the town of Drayton Valley as the major centre. Now, it becomes a little difficult to deal with in the western part of the Drayton Valley constituency because very few people live out there. In some cases there are townships with no one living in them. So it

becomes a bit of a problem to try and follow municipal boundaries, although we did wherever possible.

The Wetaskiwin one is comprised basically of the majority of the county of Wetaskiwin with a portion of the county of Leduc containing Calmar, Thorsby, and Warburg. The city of Wetaskiwin is the major agriculture centre of the area and should allow good access to the MLA for all constituents in that. The way it is drawn on the attached map, it would achieve a population base of approximately 28,400 or 7 percent below the mean.

As I said before, this is all based on the assumption that there is a new constituency of Wetaskiwin. If you take away that assumption, then you have to look at the existing Drayton Valley constituency with maybe some modification to better fit municipal boundaries. It's just right in the ballpark of the average or maybe a slight bit below that at this point in time.

If there are any questions I can answer, please feel free.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Stock?

MR. DAY: I'm trying to digest all this and just assure you, Tom, that we're going to be taking a lot of time with all suggestions like this. We may have to get back to you and ask for more clarification on some of this.

Just looking quickly. On your proposed one, on the northern limits here, does that follow a county line there?

MR. THURBER: Yes. That's on the county of Parkland boundaries to a certain area. Now, I believe that if you came down – you'll see the numbered 757 right up in that top little peak. Yeah, right in there.

MR. DAY: Yes.

MR. THURBER: From the western side of that, if you followed that down to the Evansburg area, I believe that is the actual county boundary. It follows right along that little river there, the Pembina River.

MR. DAY: Okay. Right now on the existing lines, Winfield is in your constituency, right?

MR. THURBER: In the present constituency?

MR. DAY: Yeah, in the existing one.

MR. THURBER: Yes, Winfield is, and so is Pigeon Lake.

MR. DAY: Is that interruption of a major trading pattern, say Winfield to Breton, up and through that area? Under your proposed one, Breton would be in the new Drayton Valley and Winfield would be in the new Wetaskiwin, right?

MR. THURBER: Yes. The trend from Winfield is more to Wetaskiwin, although Breton is a hospital and police centre and a minor trading centre, but there are no agriculture outlets other than the hardware stores in Breton. Generally, your flow is to Wetaskiwin and then somewhat to Rimbey and Red Deer.

MR. DAY: That Saskatchewan River border in your new one is already partially existing in the existing one. Is that right?

MR. THURBER: Yes.

MR. DAY: That, then, would put a new Drayton Valley constituency at minus 20 percent, was it?

MR. THURBER: Yes, I believe so; approximately minus 20 percent.

MR. DAY: What does it do with Wetaskiwin, or did I miss that?

MR. THURBER: It's at minus 7 percent.

MR. DAY: The new one would be . . .

MR. THURBER: The new one would be at approximately minus 7 percent. The area that we tried to deal with as much as possible in the new constituency of Drayton Valley and the one that I proposed here – we've tried to keep it back as far as we could from the acreages around Stony Plain and Spruce Grove, because in my view these are more closely connected to the town of Stony Plain, the city of Spruce Grove, and the city of Edmonton than they are to the Drayton Valley area.

MR. DAY: Okay. So that would move Devon out of – it's presently in Wetaskiwin, isn't it? Where is it now?

MR. THURBER: It's in Drayton Valley.

MR. DAY: It's in Drayton Valley now. Okay.

MR. THURBER: Uh huh. That would put Devon into Leduc. You'd have the three centres in Leduc. You'd have Leduc city, Devon, and Beaumont.

MR. DAY: Calmar would be in the new Wetaskiwin?

MR. THURBER: Yes. The other jagged line that you see in the northwest corner between the new Wetaskiwin constituency and the new Drayton Valley constituency is the actual boundary of the MD of Brazeau.

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't think it's on that little map, Stock. It's on the larger wall map.

MR. DAY: Oh, yeah. Okay. So in the new one, in your southeast corner, again you've got the river being the boundary then, coming up . . .

MR. THURBER: Yes.

MR. DAY: And where it heads east again . . . Do you see where the river comes up?

MR. THURBER: Yes. Just south of Buck Creek.

MR. DAY: Is that a baseline along there?

MR. THURBER: That's the county of Wetaskiwin boundary.

MR. DAY: That's the county of Wetaskiwin; okay.

I'm just sort of talking and asking questions as we go here, Mr. Chairman, so feel free to jump in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine.

MR. THURBER: The only portion of the county of Wetaskiwin that's not included in this is the southernmost part and the

southeastern part. There's a jut down there of the county, and the county actually goes down about another five or six miles, I think, which is not included in the proposed constituency of Wetaskiwin.

MR. DAY: Your existing line . . .

MR. THURBER: Right now?

MR. DAY: I'm just looking up there where – you already take in Evansburg and Entwistle in your existing . . .

MR. THURBER: No, I don't. I think I'm about five miles south of Evansburg and Entwistle and about five miles south of Seba Beach.

MR. DAY: Yeah, you're right. The new one would put Wildwood, Evansburg, and Entwistle into Drayton Valley.

11:19

MR. THURBER: Yes.

MR. DAY: I can't see the dot here. Does that put Alberta Beach into Drayton Valley?

MR. THURBER: I believe so.

MR. DAY: No, maybe you're just north, or Alberta Beach goes just north. I can't tell on this one where the dots are there.

MR. PRITCHARD: I think Alberta Beach is north.

MR. DAY: Alberta Beach is here. Is that the dot there for Alberta Beach?

MR. PRITCHARD: Just above it, I think, Stock.

MR. THURBER: It could be.

MR. DAY: So that puts Alberta Beach north of his proposed line there.

MR. THURBER: Yes. I think it's up at the 584 there.

MR. DAY: So all the way out pretty well to Beach Corner you would take in Highway 16 then?

MR. THURBER: Yes. From Beach Corner right through to the other side of Wildwood.

MR. DAY: Because right now you don't, really.

MR. THURBER: No. I don't touch Highway 16.

MR. DAY: Then from Beach Corner heading south again there on the proposed, Tom, you mentioned the acreages around Stony Plain and Spruce Grove. How close are you there to those? You don't take any of those in, right?

MR. THURBER: No. Well, there are some. There's a lot of acreage development all through that area once you get up along Highway 16: in Lake Wabamun, the Duffield area, Edmonton Beach, Carvel Corner. There's a lot of acreage development all through that area. As you see on that map, Stock, the township populations are in there, but those are the 1986 populations on this map.

MR. DAY: Oh, yes. Okay.

MR. THURBER: You can see the more intense population bases along there. You'll find 400, 500, 700, 1,300 people per township in places.

MR. DAY: In the existing you've got Alder Flats, Buck Lake. That's in Drayton Valley now?

MR. THURBER: Yes.

MR. DAY: Would they see that, do you think, as a major disruption with Wetaskiwin coming through there?

MR. THURBER: No, because they're part of the county of Wetaskiwin now. Of course, there is a group in the Alder Flats area that has always wanted to be part of the MD of Brazeau, but it's only a six-mile strip right at the end, right in the Alder Flats area. We did some numbers on it shortly after I was elected, and it was split just about half and half. Certainly they do shop in Drayton Valley, but their school funding, highway funding, recreation funding, and all the rest of it flow through the county of Wetaskiwin anyway, so I don't see that as a deterrent to leaving them in with Wetaskiwin. Certainly as far as agriculture supplies and stuff, they do go to Wetaskiwin. A lot of them bank in Wetaskiwin.

MR. DAY: Okay. So under your proposal, then, you'd have to travel out of your constituency to visit that little historic village?

MR. THURBER: No.

MR. DAY: Is that still in?

MR. THURBER: It's still in there. It's directly south of Alder Flats. I don't think it's that far south. No, I'd still have the village.

MR. DAY: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the points I had have been answered, Stock. As I understand it, in your proposal we'd be going to the county line between the county of Parkland and the MD of Brazeau.

MR. THURBER: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's something we're looking at following wherever possible, county MD lines.

MR. THURBER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In this proposal you would have a portion of the county of Parkland and all the MD of Brazeau, and you're going to fringe into some of the others around Evansburg, Entwistle, and Wildwood. But in order to make up the population base, you have to in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. Thanks very much, Tom.

MR. THURBER: Thank you. If you have any other questions, please give me a holler.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're welcome to stay if you like.  
Brian, welcome.

MR. EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With your permission, we'll stay on the record.

MR. EVANS: Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. EVANS: I'll move into the centre. It might be easier for the recorders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The process we've been following is to listen to the presenter, and then we've entered into a general question-and-answer session. We expected Mike to be with us this morning. Unfortunately, he had to leave for a funeral out in the constituency. He'll be back this afternoon.

MR. EVANS: Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. Generally, I make my presentations impromptu from my background memory, but I have come down with the flu, so this morning I wrote down some notes. I'm going to refer to them so I don't lose my train of thought.

I really do appreciate the opportunity to meet with you, Mr. Chairman, and with Mr. Day to give you some of my impressions of this process and my own recommendations with respect to Banff-Cochrane constituency.

I want to start with a little history. Banff-Cochrane was first identified as such in 1940 for the provincial election held that year. Its boundaries have essentially been the same since the 1952 election, and it's my recommendation that the boundaries remain the same. I made an oral presentation at the Electoral Boundaries Commission in Calgary on February 27, 1992, and much of what I said during that presentation I'll repeat today.

I argued against the proposed boundary for Banff-Cochrane found in the interim report of the commission because it would have removed a traditional part of Banff-Cochrane constituency north and mostly east, but a little bit west as well, of the town of Cochrane. That would have gone into the proposed constituency of Didsbury, and in turn there would have been added to Banff-Cochrane a part of the western extremities of the city of Calgary. All this to come closer to the average population based on the 1986 census.

This proposal, in my view, was not supportable for a number of reasons. First, the common community interests. Clearly, from the length of time that area north and east of Cochrane has been part of Banff-Cochrane constituency, the trading area was established. Because of things such as roadways and access back and forth throughout the constituency, the people who are in that area are clearly identified with and do identify with Banff-Cochrane constituency.

On the other hand, the area the commission wanted to add to Banff-Cochrane was really a very, very interesting part of the city of Calgary. One is Scenic Acres, which is a brand-new and very affluent subdivision. The other part, to the south end of the proposal, is the old Bowness area, which is a traditional community in Calgary and has very little, I would suggest, in common even with Scenic Acres, much less with Banff-Cochrane constituency.

The second point I'd like to make is that it's a recognized fact that the First Nation constituents of the Sarcee and Stoney reserves were not included in the 1986 census. They weren't enumerated.

Thirdly, the premise, as stated by Madam Justice McLachlin in the Attorney General of Saskatchewan v Roger Carter, that effective representation doesn't mean mathematical parity. I believe the commission and this committee should concentrate on ensuring that constituents throughout Alberta have reasonable access to their MLAs. Thus the desire to create constituencies with populations close to the provincial average must be tempered by factors such as geography, distance, which takes into account the diversity of interest, and transportation constraints such as highway transportation. Our legislation allows for a plus or minus 25 percent



population variance from the average, and I don't believe the Carter decision from Saskatchewan restricts that allowance. In my brief review of the case I believe that the Supreme Court of Canada was silent on the issue. The variance in Saskatchewan happened to be approximately plus or minus 10 percent, and since the court didn't specifically address the variance, I believe it's incorrect to infer that the court was by implication accepting a plus or minus 10 percent variance and rejecting any greater variance.

11:29

Back to Banff-Cochrane. Banff-Cochrane is geographically large, and it is quite diverse, starting west of the city of Calgary's boundaries and extending to British Columbia. It consists of the country residential communities of Bearspaw and Springbank; the towns of Cochrane, Canmore, and Banff; two Indian reserves; the Banff national park, Peter Lougheed provincial park, and Kananaskis Country; the summer villages of Ghost Lake and Waiparous; the communities of Bragg Creek, Redwood Meadows, Seebe, and Exshaw. It's prime ranching country, it's also prime oil and gas country, and obviously the tourism interest that's being shown in that part of the world is going to grow as time goes on as well. Its population is diverse and expanding. As I mentioned in Calgary, I think it's the area where many if not most Albertans would choose to live, with all due respect to Taber-Warner, Mr. Chairman, if they had the choice, and many people in Alberta are making that choice . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not to mention Red Deer-North.

MR. EVANS: Well, of course, Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: . . . whether they're doing that during their active lives when they're employed or whether they're choosing to move into the area when they retire. In fact, if you study the 1991 census figures, you'll see that Banff-Cochrane has grown to a population of 34,160. That does include, by the way, the Sarcee and the Stoney, so that is an accurate reflection of the population at 1991. That's 11 percent above the provincial average. I may say, with all of that, it is manageable for an MLA to effectively represent the constituency's residents. There's no need to add or subtract from the present area identified as the electoral division of Banff-Cochrane. Its population falls well within the plus or minus 25 percent variance, and keeping the boundary as is is consistent with the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries, a factor that the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act indicates must be considered.

Thanks for your time and attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Brian.  
Stock.

MR. DAY: I guess my first question, a burning one, is: has the present constituency of Banff-Cochrane yet increased by one more constituent?

MR. EVANS: No, but it is a burning question. It may well occur within the next week, according to my wife's doctor yesterday.

MR. DAY: Of course, we'll have to take another look at any anticipated drawing of lines should that event take place. We'll look forward with . . .

MR. EVANS: I'm virtually certain that the constituency could accommodate that new arrival.

MR. DAY: Okay.

I just wanted to look at this for a couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman, so if you've got something there, just go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I'm pleased you reminded us that the Stoney band members are now included. We've been working with both federal Indian affairs and our own Municipal Affairs to ensure that those native people who were not counted for census purposes, for whatever reason, are not left out of this process. It's quite surprising; we've got large numbers in some constituencies. It has quite a dramatic impact in areas where they were not counted. I'm certain one of our recommendations will relate to a factor in addition to the census so that we can use an approved list so a constituency is not shortchanged.

MR. EVANS: Well, just for the record, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the numbers are 1,673 at the Sarcee reserve and 1,993 at the Stoney reserve, for a total of 3,666, which is substantial. That's better than 10 percent of the constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. DAY: I'm just trying to determine, on that proposed boundary in the interim report – in your existing one, that southeastern tip, I guess you'd call it, where it touches on the constituency of Highwood, has that changed under that interim one?

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. DAY: That's the same there?

MR. EVANS: The only changes, Stock, are in the northwest section, in a very lightly populated area – it's really wilderness area – adjacent to the British Columbia border and then the national park as you move easterly. The boundaries on the south end of the constituency remain exactly the same as they have been over the years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A supplement on that. While we're dividing ID 5 in half, there is comfort by the residents, whether they're in Banff-Cochrane constituency or Highwood constituency, that the line is in the right place?

MR. EVANS: Yes. The line is in an area, Mr. Chairman, that is not populated at all. Those who are in the south part of Kananaskis Country really do have much more community interest with the Highwood area, whereas those in Kananaskis Village and the Ribbon Creek area and the majority of Peter Lougheed provincial park that is populated use Canmore as their service area. They are much more oriented towards Canmore and the Bow corridor and the city of Calgary than they are to the south.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the northern part of Banff national park currently there are two other constituencies that take in part of the park, West Yellowhead and Rocky Mountain House. When we met with Ty, the suggestion was that Saskatchewan River Crossing should remain part of Rocky Mountain House. Do you have any objections to that area being part of the Rocky Mountain House constituency?

MR. EVANS: No, I don't. As I understand it, there are only two constituents who are residing on a permanent basis in Saskatchewan River Crossing. Without minimizing their importance, I must say that, generally speaking, I don't get a lot farther north on Highway 93, on the Jasper-Banff highway, than Lake Louise. When I advertise a meeting, it's intended to include those folks who are working in Peyto Lake or in the Saskatchewan River Crossing area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks.

MR. DAY: We seem to be doing this a lot, but just to reassure you on the Supreme Court decision. I personally, as this committee, am in agreement with the fact that if we were to stray and pick just an arbitrary number, as some members of the commission seem to have, which we thought sounded pleasant to us in terms of what the deviation should be – 10, 14.2, or 16.9 percent – I feel we'd be almost in contempt of court. The court has clearly said that deviations of 25 percent, if they're justified, which they would be, are permissible. Just to reassure your constituents, I'd put a lot of weight on the fact that the Carter case said that rural communities are a community of interest within the meaning of the rule about effective representation, and their existence warrants departure from voter parity. The issue here is effective representation, and that's certainly what we're committed to.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. I think that's extremely important. If we all lived in a geographically homogeneous area with populations equivalent throughout Alberta, then I think we could look more seriously at representation by population. I used the example when I was in Calgary that I had left my residence in Canmore to go to a meeting in Banff at 7:30. I got to Banff at about 8 o'clock. The meeting was a couple of hours. I then went to Calgary. As I said, my constituency goes right to the Calgary boundary, so there wasn't much more time involved than that. I could be in Calgary for another two hours for a meeting and then drive back to my office in Canmore. That would be a seven-hour day with two two-hour meetings. Now, if I were to have driven to Lake Louise for that meeting, I would have added another hour, so my nine-hour day would have allowed me two two-hour meetings.

In the city of Calgary or in any densely populated area you'll have an MLA who can be across his or her constituency, by normal means of transportation, in 10 to 15 minutes maximum. So that makes it much easier for that MLA to effectively represent his or her constituents, and it means there's a much more homogeneous population that that individual is representing. To presume that Banff-Cochrane is a homogeneous population, or that any rural area in Alberta is, I don't think is reflective of reality. I think we have to concentrate not on how easy or difficult it is for the MLA but rather on how effective that representation is for all Albertans. I think if we were to do that on a strictly representation by population basis, we would not be ensuring effective representation for our citizens.

11:39

MR. DAY: Well, not only have the courts really clearly backed up what you've just said, but the whole social mood today is one in which people are demanding increased representation in terms of being able to see their MLA, especially in those rural areas. They're not satisfied with you just sending them a fax across the constituency; they want to sit down with you; they want to see you.

We just had an MLA in this morning from Pincher Creek, and he had averaged out his travel time using the quickest routes and modes of travel possible between his constituency and the capital. He had that worked out to 50 eight-hour days a year. He's actually just getting back and forth, trying to maximize time and everything else.

How long does it take you to get from your constituency to the capital?

MR. EVANS: From my home in Canmore, which is essentially my constituency office – it's a minute or two away – it takes me between three and three-quarters to four hours to get to my office here in Edmonton. That's if I drive. If I take the airbus, because of the fact that the airport is on the east side of Calgary, it takes me between two and a half and two and three-quarters hours. This week is a perfect example; this is the second time I've been to Edmonton this week. You are spending a lot of time – any rural member, anyone outside the main urban areas is spending a lot of time – going back and forth. Granted, we do have access to cellular technology, and we can make use of that to take care of our constituents over the telephone. But when you're away, you're not nearly as effective as you are when you can deal with people face to face.

For example, I had people in my constituency office yesterday from just outside of Cochrane. They couldn't reach me on any of the eight lines that I have because I was out meeting people, so they drove all the way to my constituency office in Canmore. Now, to them that wasn't a major time restriction. That was a two-hour turnaround for them plus our meeting. For those same people, if they were living in the city of Calgary or Edmonton or any urban area and wished to meet with their MLA, it would take them perhaps five to 10 minutes to go to the MLA's office.

MR. DAY: Right. And a 10-minute wait in the constituency office would be inappropriate.

MR. EVANS: That's right.

MR. DAY: So time is certainly relative, given those considerations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Brian.

MR. DAY: I've got one thing, Mr. Chairman, I just thought of on the technology end. Any of us who have to drive back and forth a lot . . . I mean, the cellular phone is a lifesaver because we can get a couple of hours done, but – and the newspapers continue to remind us with stories on this – none of that is confidential. All of that is subject to being taped very easily with electronic devices, so that limits you if you're talking to a social service recipient with confidential information. You're limited if you're talking to someone who's got some business problems, if you're talking about an in camera situation with a city or town council. You still have to wait till you get home to make some of those calls.

MR. EVANS: And some of those telephone calls begin very innocuously and then get into some delicate matters. I've found myself mentioning to people on the phone that I don't think it's appropriate that we deal with this over the cellular phone and that I would get back to them. Another factor is just the safety factor itself, driving down the highway and using a phone. I've often said that I don't think being the MLA for Banff-Cochrane will ever kill me, but that cellular phone may well, because your concentration level is often not what it should be on the road. I often find, when I'm driving at a busy time frame from the mountains to Calgary, that I don't use the phone because there's too much traffic on the road. That applies as well to Highway 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We take from your comments that you'll be speaking in favour of Ron Moore's motion in the Assembly when it comes up?

---

MR. EVANS: Well, I'll certainly give it due consideration.

MR. DAY: One of the best parts of your constituency, of course, which I'll be especially sensitive to, is the Red Deer River. It takes you from your constituency all the way to the . . .

MR. EVANS: It's one of the very beautiful parts of a gorgeous constituency, probably the most beautiful area in North America.

MR. DAY: It's certainly leading to one of the most wonderful constituencies.

MR. EVANS: We're starting to get somewhat off topic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that note we'll conclude.

[The committee adjourned at 11:44 a.m.]

