

**Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings  
Pincher Creek**

1:00 p.m.

[Chairman: Chief Judge Edward R. Wachowich]

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon – I was going to say ladies and gentlemen, but I see we have no ladies attending today from the public other than some of our staff that are waving. I want to welcome you to the public hearing of the Electoral Boundaries Commission which we are holding in Pincher Creek today. My name is Edward Wachowich, and I am the chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I am also the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of Alberta.

Let me introduce you to the other members of the commission. On my far left is Robert Grbavac of Raymond, Alberta. On my immediate right is Joseph Lehane of Innisfail, Alberta. On my far right is John McCarthy of Calgary, Alberta. On my immediate left is Wally Worth of Edmonton. The five people you see before you make up the commission, and I want to say that we are very happy to be here to receive your comments and consider your thinking with respect to our duties.

The commission is holding public hearings here in Pincher Creek to receive and to consider your arguments and points of view with respect to the areas, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions in Alberta. We must do this according to a particular set of rules, which I will review in a moment.

I want to assure you that every member of the commission has reviewed the law and the literature which has been recently written concerning electoral boundaries in Alberta. So I want to tell you that our minds are open inasmuch as we have not reached any conclusions. We have given this matter a lot of thought. We have reviewed the law. We have reviewed the work of previous commissions and committees who have studied boundaries in Alberta. We have reviewed what the courts have said about electoral boundaries in this province and in Canada.

I would like to put before you for your consideration the following summary of the law in Alberta with respect to electoral boundaries. One, our function is to review the existing electoral boundaries and to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly about the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions in Alberta.

Two, we have very limited time to accomplish this task. We must submit a report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly setting out our recommendations with respect to area, boundaries, and names of any proposed electoral divisions with our reasons by the 31st of January 1996. The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly shall make the report public and publish the commission's proposals in the *Alberta Gazette* as soon as possible.

Three, the commission is required to hold two sets of public hearings. This is the first set. These hearings are being held before we make any report or proposals to the Speaker. The second set of hearings will be held in 1996, probably in March, after our report to the Speaker has been made public.

We are required to hold the public hearings to enable representations to be made to us by any person or organization in Alberta about the area, the boundaries, and the names of the electoral divisions. We are required to give reasonable public notice

of the times, places, and purposes of our public meetings, which we have done in this case.

After our report is published by the Speaker, we will undertake a second set of public hearings, as is required by the Act, and lay before the Speaker a final report by June 30, 1996. Again, the Speaker shall make this report public and publish it in the *Alberta Gazette*.

If more than one report is submitted from among the members of the commission, the report of the majority is the report of the commission. But if there is no majority, my report, or the report of the chair, is the report of the commission.

The final report of the commission is then laid at the earliest opportunity before the Legislative Assembly, immediately if it is then sitting or within seven days after it begins the next sitting.

Then it is up to the Legislative Assembly by resolution to approve or approve with alterations the proposals of the commission and to introduce a Bill to establish new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution. This law would come into force when proclaimed before the holding of the next general election.

With respect to the matter of population, population means the most recent population set out in the most recent decennial census of the population of Alberta as provided by Statistics Canada. We are also required to add the population of Indian reserves that were not included in the census, as provided by the federal department of Indian and northern affairs. But if the commission believes there is another provincewide census more recent than the decennial census compiled by Statistics Canada which provides the population for proposed electoral divisions, then the commission may use this data.

The second rule is that the commission is required to divide Alberta into 83 proposed electoral divisions. The commission may take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but it must and shall take into consideration the following: the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; sparsity and density of population; common community interests and community organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Métis settlements; whenever possible existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary; the existing municipal boundaries; the number of municipalities and other local authorities; geographical features, including existing road systems; the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

The population rule is that a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 percent above or below the average population for all 83 electoral divisions. There is an exception to the 25 percent rule. In the case of not more than four proposed electoral divisions the commission may have a population that is as much as 50 percent below the average population of the electoral divisions in Alberta if three of the following five criteria are met: one, the area exceeds 20,000 square kilometres, or the surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15,000 square kilometres; two, the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of any proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres; three, there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 4,000 people; four, the area of the proposed electoral division contains an Indian reserve or a Métis settlement; five, the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the province of Alberta.

With respect to the Crowsnest Pass, for our purposes the boundaries Act instructs us that the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town.

This is a very general overview, but we must now also turn to the guidance that has been provided by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Supreme Court of Alberta.

What the Supreme Courts have said. The Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal have agreed that the right to vote under the Charter includes, one, the right to vote; two, the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; three, the right to effective representation; four, the right to have the parity of the votes of others diluted, but not unduly, in order to gain effective representation or as a matter of practical necessity. The rulings of the Supreme Courts as well as the electoral boundaries Act must guide our decisions and ultimately the proposals that we make to the Legislature.

I want to talk to you about the focus that we have disclosed in our advertising. The commission in its public advertising has clearly stated that it is considering after its preliminary deliberations, one, merging a number of rural electoral divisions into contiguous or neighbouring divisions; two, adding a number of urban electoral divisions to Edmonton and Calgary; three, any other revisions necessary to achieve one and two.

We have set forth our focus after preliminary deliberations. We have not reached any final conclusions. The commission wishes to hear the views of all Albertans with respect to this focus. Please let me assure you that our preliminary deliberations are preliminary and that no final conclusions have been drawn. The commission will not move to the consideration of proposals without the benefit of input from individuals and organizations in Alberta. Indeed, this is the purpose of the public hearings.

I also want to say that without public input the work of the commission will be seriously impaired. We want to hear the arguments and the reasoning of all organizations and individuals in Alberta with respect to the area, the boundaries, and the names of all electoral divisions.

I would therefore like to call upon the first presenter today, Fred Bradley.

MR. BRADLEY: Your Honour, members of the commission, it's certainly an honour to be here today to again make a presentation before the Electoral Boundaries Commission, something with which I have had some practice in the past. I have been involved in numerous boundaries discussions on many occasions, both federal and provincial. I'm a former member of the Legislature, and I thought I could bring to you the perspective of a former member in terms of representing a diverse riding with many communities of interest, a diverse geography, economic interests.

I was concerned when I read your initial pamphlet. Your Honour, I think you have somewhat given me some solace by the fact that you said that the commission has an open mind and hasn't come to any conclusions. You went over the deliberations, considerations which the commission had preliminarily arrived at, and that's what really, I think, concerned me: when I saw that you were giving consideration to eliminating a number of rural ridings or merging them in order to give further representation to Calgary and Edmonton.

1:10

I've read the recent Court of Appeal decision. In my printed comments, which I've provided to you, it seemed that the concern of the most recent appeal was that deviation is possible from the norm but that each electoral division must be justified on a division-by-

division basis. That's the approach that I thought I would take today in terms of the enormity of the task that a person has in representing a riding like Pincher Creek-Macleod. Now, the riding I represented was about half the size of what now the riding of Pincher Creek-Macleod is.

One of the reasons I think that you can justify a deviation from the norm for this rural riding and many rural ridings is on the basis of the distance from the capital. This riding, if we took the centre, is probably 300 miles from Edmonton. If you took an eight-hour day, a five-day workweek, a 40-hour week, I estimated that I spent 10 weeks of the year just in travel time to and from Edmonton from the riding. That takes a significant amount of time that the member is not available to the constituents. It takes away from the member's ability to provide effective representation, just that travel time of getting the person physically back and forth for the 50-odd trips or 60-odd trips you would make a year between the capital and the riding.

The second factor is travel time within the riding. In this riding I think it would take about two hours to travel from one end of the riding to another. I estimated that it took me, again using this eight hours a day, five-day workweek, about one and a half months of travel time just to travel around the riding to be accessible to the constituents.

Most constituents like to have a meeting with their member face to face. We can use telephones, we can use the mail, we can use faxes, but still the reality is that a person wants to access their member directly. That travel time is not only for the individual to get to the member but for the member to get out to see the individual. So that time factor is another factor which dilutes the member's ability to provide effective representation: travel within a large geographic riding.

The third area is the diversity of community of interest, and I've outlined that on page 2 of my remarks. This is in addition to the health concerns, the education concerns, the social services concerns, which all members of the province must deal with. In a riding like Pincher Creek-Macleod I've enumerated a number of other community and area interests which a member must represent and be familiar with and which all take time: in the agriculture area mixed farming, ranching, dryland farming, irrigation, public lands, feedlot operations, the Waterton biosphere, Eastern Slopes land use, wilderness issues, mineral exploration, historical resources, native communities and aboriginal rights, sour gas extraction facilities, oil and gas extraction, logging and sawmilling, tourism, recreation, snowmobiling, fish and game, water resources, and alternate energy, here in Pincher Creek focused on wind power.

There are three municipal districts, four towns, two villages, an Indian reservation, numerous hamlets, four hospitals, a number of schools, nursing homes, auxiliary homes, senior citizens' lodges, seniors' self-contained residences. A member must be available to all of these interests and all of these organizations in a large riding. Again, travel time to get to these different organizations, to schedule one meeting a year or two meetings a year with these organizations – it takes a lot of the member's time to effectively get around and to hear these people's concerns.

We have diverse geography and land use in a riding like this. We encompass the Rocky Mountains, the foothills, the prairies. We have major transportation, utility corridors that dissect this riding: the Crowsnest 3 interprovincial highway, Canadian Pacific railways' Crowsnest line, a 500 kv interprovincial electrical transmission line, Nova's 48-inch gas pipeline and a 36-inch gas pipeline which

exports gas to California, the Lethbridge Northern irrigation district main canal. The export highway, Highway 2, cuts through this riding. Also, we're the only part of the Rocky Mountains in the province of Alberta that's outside a national park or a provincial park. Our southern boundary is Waterton; our northern boundary is Kananaskis Country. This creates an incredible amount of recreation pressure in this riding, which is entirely in this riding, outside of a national or provincial park.

Significant different land use issues. I'll just give you a few of the sort of land use conflict issues which a member in a riding like this has had to deal with or will deal with: the Westcastle ski hill NRCB decision, the Castle integrated land use and access plan, the Oldman River dam, Livingston-Porcupine integrated land use plan, Shell Waterton gas field extraction and processing facilities, Castle/Crown coalition, the recent Whaleback ERCB decision. This diverse geography and land use creates conflicts, has a significant impact just by the nature of these concerns on the ability of the member to provide effective representation. My point is that if you add more land base to a riding, you add more of these types of issues in a diverse area like this.

The fifth point I had was that this is a border constituency, and there's some uniqueness, I think, to our border constituency concerns. We have about 800 people in the Crowsnest Pass who actually travel 30 miles to work in the coalfields of British Columbia. From my time as a representative there were a number of interprovincial issues that I then had to carry forward on behalf of those people who worked in B.C. You had to be knowledgeable of B.C. laws, some of their economic governmental programs, coal-related issues, in contact with the industrial people there, labour relations, a lot of workers' compensation issues, interprovincial trade issues, and other matters relating to interprovincial issues. This, I think, is a unique consideration for a riding like this in terms of having an impact on effective representation.

A number of general comments on the role of a rural member. A member of the Legislature not only has a legislative role which is defined by law, which is that you elect the person to go to Edmonton to represent you in the Legislature and vote on your behalf in the Legislature – that is common to all members – but I think a rural member has even a heavier workload. I've talked about the impact of travel, geography, the multitude of issues, unique community of interests. Those all impact on representation, but a rural member is usually the access point to government for his citizens. In large urban centres most every department of government is represented. In either Edmonton or Calgary a citizen can directly access an agency of government and have their problem addressed by the bureaucracy in those cities. In a rural area the member is the access point to the citizen for government. He's a facilitator, a director of traffic. He's an intermediary. He's a problem solver. He's the ombudsman. He's the final court of appeal to a citizen's concerns. All of these issues affect the ability of that person to provide effective representation.

There's also a representational role that a member of the Legislature plays as the official representative of government, and that's whether you're a government member or you're a member of the opposition. You're called upon to represent, quote, the government at any number of official functions. I've outlined some areas where a rural member has many more of these types of ceremonial functions to conduct in a year than would an urban member.

For example, the July 1 celebration; Edmonton and Calgary would have one official function. They have 18 and 20 MLAs who could cover that official function, whether they would be involved directly or not it's hard to say. A riding like Pincher Creek-Macleod may have as many as seven official functions for the member to try and physically accommodate on the July 1 occasion or November 11; for example, the number of cenotaphs where a member may be invited to participate in those ceremonies. That's in addition to the social functions which a member may be required to attend on that day, whether it be an urban or a rural member, on July 1 or other occasions.

I put an example in there about the Calgary Stampede. A member in Calgary may be invited to participate in that stampede parade as a number of members in the Calgary area would be. Pincher Creek-Macleod probably has seven or eight parades and stampedes which the member must participate in or is invited to, and that virtually takes up every weekend of the summer season for that member. That's another one of these time considerations.

I made a comment about media, the difference in the media contacts that a rural member would have versus an urban member in Calgary. The rural member must cover not only the same media bases that the urban member in Calgary has – the two daily newspapers, the three TV stations, and numerous radio stations – but he has the Lethbridge media – two TV stations, radio stations – and he also has six weekly newspapers in this riding, a local cable station, a local radio station. So in terms of just dealing and communicating with people, the task is greater for a rural member in the number of media contacts he has to maintain.

I guess, in conclusion, I look at time as a very important factor in being an effective representative. I've talked about the two and a half hours of travel time to the capital a member from this riding would take, probably, in a year, the one and a half or more months of travel within the riding, that the diverse community of interests and issues each require time, that diverse geography and land use require time, that this border constituency role of the representative is important, and the expanded representative role of a rural member. With all of these factors I think and believe that the current boundaries of this constituency stretch to the absolute limit the ability of a member to provide effective representation.

*1:20*

In conclusion, as you have alluded to, Your Honour, the courts have had judicial pronouncements on the question of boundaries, and I think the Supreme Court has said that a deviation of up to 25 percent is allowable in Canadian constitutional practice. I think when we look at this, we also have to look at the fact that in Alberta we have a unicameral Legislature; we only have one House. When you look at one man, one vote, you usually have one House in terms of absolute parity there – one man, one vote in one House – and you have a second House which represents regional interests. Well, in Alberta we only have the one Legislature. You must meld both those: one man, one vote plus the need for these regional representations.

I guess my conclusion is that I think that for the reasons I've alluded to and the role of a representative to be able to effectively represent this diverse community of interests and geography, the current boundaries of this riding should not be expanded, that they're at their absolute limits in terms of the ability of someone to represent such a diverse constituency.

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Bradley, I want to thank you for coming here and presenting a well-prepared, focused presentation. I would also like to comment that as we're traveling the province, most people are wanting to know why we're around again. They're fed up with Electoral Boundaries Commissions. You're the first person we're aware of that has read the case and has interpreted the decision the same way as I think the board interprets it; in other words, that we have to justify the discrepancies, as you've said. I would like you to wait because there may be some questions from some of the members of the commission.

John.

MR. McCARTHY: Yes, Fred, I do. Just a couple of comments; that is, just one small correction. I'm from the city of Calgary, and the city of Calgary has at least two Stampede parades. On the Saturday there's the Bowness Stampede parade. There are about 5,000 people participating in that, including myself. There may be others that I'm not aware of.

I'm going to explain to you or discuss with you these court decisions, because the Supreme Court of Canada decision was rendered by Madam Justice McLachlin, who I understand grew up in the Pincher Creek area, so that kind of puts a local focus on the thing, and then from that discuss the Court of Appeal case so that you can understand the dilemma we're in.

MR. BRADLEY: Do you want me to get my briefcase with the decisions in them?

MR. McCARTHY: You could if you wanted to, but I've got them here. I've got them in front of me.

Let me first of all say that your submission was excellent and informative. Now, I'll keep in mind your submission when I try to summarize what Madam Justice McLachlin indicated in that Supreme Court of Canada case. I'm just going to summarize it not only for your benefit but for the others here, and maybe it'll help us promote some discussion as we go along this afternoon.

In summary, what the Supreme Court of Canada has said, through Madam Justice McLachlin, is this.

The purpose of the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the Charter is not equality of voting power per se but the right to "effective representation". The right to vote therefore comprises many factors, of which equity is but one. The section does not guarantee equality of voting power.

Relative parity of voting power is a prime condition of effective representation. Deviations from absolute voter parity, however, may be justified on the grounds of practical impossibility or the provision of more effective representation. Factors like geography, community history, community interests and minority representation may need to be taken into account to ensure that our legislative assemblies effectively represent the diversity of our social mosaic. Beyond this, dilution of one citizen's vote as compared with another's should not be countenanced . . . Effective representation and good government in this country compel that factors other than voter parity, such as geography and community interests, be taken into account in setting electoral boundaries.

So Madam Justice McLachlin I think did a pretty good job in explaining that.

MR. BRADLEY: I was thinking of quoting her in my brief, but I thought that perhaps you folks had her knowledge and wisdom before you.

MR. McCARTHY: Yes. So when you look at that – and she was considering the Saskatchewan situation, where it's the same age-old dilemma: the alleged underrepresentation of urban voters and the overrepresentation of rural voters. From what I can see at this point, everything that you've said in your brief could be applied to those comments that the Supreme Court of Canada has given. Here's the problem. The Court of Appeal of Alberta was aware of the guidelines, if I could say that, that Madam Justice McLachlin had given and was aware of the 25 percent variation, because in Saskatchewan it was very similar. The legislation was very similar to Alberta's legislation.

The Court of Appeal concluded – and you correctly stated a summary of what the Court of Appeal said in part. But the dilemma that we're faced with is – and I'm going to read the passage from the Court of Appeal of Alberta. They looked at the boundaries. Your point is well taken that you don't want them changed, but just listen to what the Court of Appeal says.

In the result, we again have decided to withhold any Charter condemnation. We do, however, wish to say more precisely what we meant by "gradual and steady" change. We think that a new and proper review is essential before the constitutional mandate of the present government expires, and, we hope, before the next general election. We reject any suggestion that the present divisions may rest until after the 2001 census.

This is the only review we can have until the 2001 census according to the legislation.

Now, if you'll just bear with me, Fred, because this is the one that may promote the most discussion here this afternoon and this is dealing with southern Alberta. I've read your comments in the local papers on the process that we're going through. I don't want to provoke you; I want to encourage discussion among others here. But here's the passage that deals with southern Alberta from the Court of Appeal.

The new electoral map clearly shows the result of that approach. For example, it was common ground before us that the population figures indicated the need, in the absence of any special considerations, to reduce the number of divisions in southern Alberta by two. Mr. Bogle acknowledged this in his affidavit . . . but explained that the committee chose instead to reduce the number of divisions by one, despite the fact that a further reduction would eliminate one of the smallest divisions in the province, which, by happenstance, was that for which he was then the sitting member. One reason he gives in his affidavit for this decision was that a further reduction "would have meant a sudden and substantial reduction in the level of representation." That is, we observe, exactly the concern of some electors. The concern, we fail constrained to add, of other electors, those in Metropolitan Alberta, was that their existing inadequate level of representation would remain reduced.

So I'm just trying to highlight to you the dilemma that this commission faces.

Now, one other comment. I thought I knew a lot about Alberta and a lot about politics, and I found out that I didn't. I have now discovered that one thing you avoid like the black plague is electoral boundaries, so I sure have found out I didn't know as much as I thought.

If you have any comments, I'd like to hear from you, Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: John, I thought you knew a lot, and if you'd asked me for my advice, I would tell you that any person I've known who's sat on an Electoral Boundaries Commission has come out of it

bruised, because it is a difficult task. I recognize what you've said. I've also, in reading the court decision – I think they said in their interview with Mr. Bogle that he had in fact justified the reasons for the variances or deviations of the southern ridings. I think there's something further in the court decision which reflects upon that. I am aware of Madam Justice McLachlin's decision. I believe that I've laid out some groundwork here for this riding in terms of what the court has said: each riding must be justified on a riding-by-riding basis. I've tried to put forward, in my view as a former member, the difficulties of the task and that to make this riding any larger would in fact stretch the ability of any one individual to carry out that task.

1:30

MR. McCARTHY: If it had to be made slightly larger, which way would you think would be the most logical for it to go?

MR. BRADLEY: That thought hasn't even crossed my mind.

MR. LEHANE: Well, in dealing with this, Fred, in terms of it being a difficult task, if we assume for a moment that after this commission is finished all its hearings and has reviewed all the materials and they reach the conclusion that there has to be some adjustment of the boundaries of some of the constituencies in the south, if we put it in terms of the best of some poor choices, it would seem to me that perhaps the number 2 corridor, where the MLA would travel to Edmonton, which would include on the north side, I believe, Stavely and Nanton, might be a possible extension of the boundaries that would create less problems than some other alternatives. Could I get you to comment on that? I'm not suggesting you do that in terms of recommending that it's acceptable or suitable but in terms of being perhaps better than some other option.

MR. BRADLEY: I'd have to think about whether I'd want to make that observation or not.

What comes to my mind in fact is that in part of my presentation I didn't talk about weather, which is one thing which affects a member's ability to be effective. The other is the Crowsnest Pass. We've just gone through a referendum in Quebec. They want to be recognized as having distinct society status. Well, the Crowsnest Pass is in fact a very unique part of this province. It is entirely different in terms of cultural mix, the direction politically that it's taken, a number of issues, and it should be considered a distinct society. If you want my honest recommendation in terms of what to do, I would consider Pincher Creek and the Crowsnest area as one of those special consideration ridings just because of the diversity of issues. In fact, I would make this riding smaller, not bigger.

MR. McCARTHY: As you know, the legislation requires four special areas, which include right now Athabasca-Wabasca . . .

MR. BRADLEY: I'm only making representation on behalf of what my feelings are about this area. I don't feel competent in terms of offering ideas about areas outside of here.

MR. McCARTHY: No, but the dilemma is that if this were to be made a special area, we would have to bump another special area. So any ideas on who gets bumped?

MR. BRADLEY: I leave that to your wisdom.

MR. McCARTHY: Thanks very much.

MR. WORTH: Mr. Bradley, in a couple of the other hearings that we've held we've heard from some MLAs, and I'd like to get your reaction as a former MLA to one of the ideas advanced by both of these gentlemen. The point they were making was that you can adjust boundaries to take into account population and the scope of the area but that that in itself would represent perhaps a relatively minor adjustment in terms of what could be accomplished if one were to increase the resources available to the local MLA to carry out his or her duties. In other words they were saying, you know, give us more resources and we could probably handle a larger area and more people. How do you react to that?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, I do think that in terms of the resources that are available to members there should be consideration in a number of ridings in terms of increasing those resources. I think that may be fair to look at in terms of a recommendation from this commission in terms of providing members with resources. Even airplane flights to the capital, some sort of a pick-up system that directly lands in an airport that's adjacent to a riding, would certainly give a member more time. I think the other resources you're talking about are more secretarial, administrative assistant, et cetera, to deal with the number of different issues. But still a member in a diverse geographic area such as this one has to spend the time himself in terms of familiarity with issues and meeting with people. There's no number of resources you can add to that member that will compensate for just the diverse geography and the community interests which he is tasked to effectively represent.

MR. WORTH: If I hear you correctly, you're saying: some combination might probably be a reasonable thing, increasing resources and looking at the sparsity of the population and the area in which they're found.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, physically getting a member around, et cetera. I still find, though, that just the nature of the issues in rural communities requires the actual member's time. You can't compensate with additional resources versus the actual physical time that it takes the member to provide that effective representation. You can have all sorts of office assistance and every mechanical or electronic device and airplanes, but there's still just so much time that a member can physically be available to provide that effective representation. The larger the area you make it, the more issues and the more difficult the task becomes.

MR. GRBAVAC: Well, Fred, maybe that's a good point you make in summation.

Just to add a little context to the complexity of our situation, I know you appreciate that it is not our mandate to reduce the number of seats overall in the province of Alberta. Our mandate is to simply reconfigure or to rationalize or justify the existing 83. However, we have been implored on numerous occasions to reduce or at least add an addendum to our report suggesting a significant reduction in the number of seats in the province of Alberta based on the premise that Albertans are largely overgoverned. Now, we're not hearing a lot of that from rural Alberta, but a significant number of presentations have been to that effect from the urban ridings, and I find it quite interesting to see that our urban representations are in large part telling us that we are very much overgoverned and that we ought to

reduce the number of seats and maybe in some instances pass on the governance more to the local or municipal level of government. I just wonder if I could hear your comments with respect to that particular school of thought.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, it's interesting that the commission in its preliminary deliberation suggested it wanted to add more seats to Calgary and Edmonton. It may in fact be their perception, with the number of aldermen they have and the access to government, that they're overrepresented. That is certainly not the case in rural Alberta.

MR. GRBAVAC: They're not confining their comments specifically to the urban areas of Calgary and Edmonton.

MR. BRADLEY: I don't think you'd find in the rural parts of this province that any area feels they're overrepresented in terms of a member of the Legislature. If there are serious considerations in that direction, what I would suggest as a solution – and it's been suggested before, perhaps facetiously but with a point. If this is a concern, perhaps what you'd do is go to a bicameral Legislature and split the seats: 41 on the basis of absolute equality of population – absolute equality – and have the other 41 seats under some regional basis. Only have Edmonton and Calgary have one as a region, and divide the other ones up around the province on some other regional basis in terms of representation. Then you'd have a bicameral House. Everyone would have their vote in terms of equality of voting power, absolutely, down to the last person, like they do in the U.S. House of Representatives, and the other half of the House would be on a regional distribution with Calgary and Edmonton only having one member in terms of that regional representation. It might work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Fred, in conclusion I want to say this. The Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat last night told us that he spends four and a half months in his car, and you've reduced that by half a month here today. Maybe there's a difference between the two constituencies.

In respect to giving this constituency distinct society status, I want you to know that it's not part of our mandate.

MR. BRADLEY: Just in conclusion, the riding that is here now versus the one I had is twice as large an area, so those travel times and distances have probably expanded for the current member.

The second part in terms of distinct society, all we want is special consideration status.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Ken Sorensen, Crowsnest Pass Chamber of Commerce. Would you please put your sign over Mr. Bradley's? We don't want to call you Fred, because I don't know who might be insulted.

1:40

MR. SORENSEN: Thank you very much, Your Honour and panel, for the opportunity to be here this afternoon to address you on behalf of the Crowsnest Pass Chamber of Commerce. I will go through the

written submission. I'll try not to sort of bore you by reading it verbatim but rather to comment on some of the highlights that can be addressed wherever possible I think from an economic viewpoint as well as viewpoints of other factors: the uniqueness of geography, culture, population base, economics, et cetera.

Not to insult or add humour or however you want to interpret it, but we do not understand the many varied reasons why the problem has been studied, as we said, virtually ad nauseam over the last six years. We share the interest in arriving at a solution, certainly from the growing economic concerns that we have in the Crowsnest Pass, and we're very interested in participating with you to achieve that end.

The Crowsnest Pass is very unique. If I might digress just for a moment, I served many years on the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce up until 1990 and as president in the past Premier Getty's riding for three and a half years. I've been involved in politics most of my life, and I share the concerns that we're going through throughout Alberta to try to resolve this particular issue.

The comments that Mr. Bradley had made before concerning the various uniqueness of our base of operation, whether it's our principal resource, our culture, our people, or whatever, stand certainly better explained than I can. Again, as I say, we'll try to address our comments relative to the economics of resource.

We are the international fly-fishing centre of this province and will continue to be so with rivers such as the Crowsnest, the Castle, the Oldman. We are constantly seeing an increase in people coming to us from all over North America to take part in this great recreational resource. The Crowsnest Pass is anticipating economic changes, development, and tourism growth in the next five to 10 years, as I've said in the presentation, the likes of which most of our residents cannot comprehend. Why? They're not used to it. It's a change. It's a change in a massive way, because we are going to become a major rural recreation tourism centre due to our excellent and unique geography, climate, and varied recreational activities.

We are a unique community. Originating with the mining and the timber and the railroad industries, the Pass grew from the hardworking, highly unionized labour force of many, many cultures into what is today, since the amalgamation of the various towns in '79, an amalgamated community that no longer just lives in the black smoke of the mines but in extremely clear skies and weather that's constantly warmed by chinook winds, as we were yesterday when it was plus 5 and raining and last night when it dropped to 20 below and started to freeze. I compliment the good flying capabilities of your pilots that got you here safely and hopefully will return you so.

What's all this really got to do with boundaries? I guess simply these kinds of things. We're part of a very large and very unique riding. We're already constantly driving back and forth between our communities within that riding to conduct our businesses and ask our member who represents us to do the same. We're very spread out. We're extremely diverse in culture. We have extremely unique geographic considerations and the weather, as I've just commented on, that goes with them. We are going to grow. We're going to grow substantially, and it's at that point that we need ever increasing communication with our representative to government, not a decreasing one.

We would submit to you that any changes to increase the size of that area of representation will dilute the principal resource of time – time we can't add to – that the member has to communicate with those in the riding. Our school board is centred way up in the northeast, Claresholm, basically in the northeast corner of our

existing riding. Our hospital board is outside our riding. While we as a chamber certainly from the economic accountability aspect appreciate these and support them in principle as a way of reducing our education and growing health costs, we see absolutely no benefit but substantial losses potentially to us by increasing our boundaries.

We'd like to improve our communication with our MLA by reducing the boundaries, quite frankly, at least leaving them the way they are. We do believe there has to be a balance between all the good things that we talk about and are certainly presented in the rationalization for the review: equity of representation on the one side and the density of population, geography, et cetera, on the other. The urban ridings are generally very compact, and without all the statistics that even as an engineer we like to quote, in almost any urban riding it takes me less than half an hour to get from one end to the other. I can communicate with my MLA probably easily within the day, have a coffee that night. It takes 10 times that at least in terms of time to drive around this particular riding, which, by the way, should be renamed Crowsnest-Pincher Creek-Macleod.

Most Edmonton members are within a very short drive. That's not "dive." Some of them have been diving, but I won't get into the politics. The drive of communicating with their representatives and the rest of the comments statistically that are contained in the presentation deal with the return trips from here, back and forth, et cetera. It takes us basically nine to 11 hours to get from here to Edmonton and back without stopping. Our members are already at a disadvantage because they have to travel to the area, as Mr. Bradley has so aptly pointed out, with more frequency than in the urban ridings.

The service to the urban constituent has continued to increase over the years in the sense that we take our principal government activities out of the capital city from time to time and go to Government House South, go to the principal cities of Lethbridge, Red Deer, and all the way up to Grande Prairie in an attempt to establish even better communications with those members. What we're asking you to consider here is that we are attempting, as we are in our business, to improve our communications and more efficiently use our time resource. We need to have more contact with our representation, not less. Therefore, we're asking for our boundaries to remain the same.

We believe that any consideration of increasing the number of Edmonton and Calgary seats by eliminating rural ones – and certainly it's a perception that that's already part of the decision process. You've explained that it is not, that it's a consideration; I thank you for that. This change would have a negative impact on the ability of our members in the constituency or division to adequately express and have represented their diverse community of interests and all of our growing economic concerns.

So on behalf of the chamber of commerce in the Crowsnest and our growing economy, we thank you again for the opportunity to make our presentation to you today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you for coming, Ken, but wait. Much to your surprise there may be some intelligent questions to come from this panel.

John, do you have anything?

MR. McCARTHY: I notice you were looking with surprise at me when you said that.

The point on the name change: just for the information of the people here, we do have the authority within our mandate to propose

name changes, so if anybody else has any ideas other than the one you gave us, then we can take those into consideration. We do have the authority to act on it.

MR. SORENSEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No questions.

MR. WORTH: Just a small question. Given your aspirations to become the major recreational and tourism centre for the region, would it make any sense to include ID 4 in this constituency, in other words Waterton Lakes?

MR. SORENSEN: I think not. To my knowledge – and I have to admit that that's rather limited. I should properly state that I've only been a resident of the Crowsnest Pass for a year and a half, and I'm struggling with that communication to learn as quickly as I can more about it. Waterton seems to serve a different sort of tourism basin of activities basically than we do. I'm not sure that that would have any advantage at all. Certainly the additional geographic disadvantages of travel would increase the problem, not alleviate it any way, Mr. Worth. Thank you.

1:50

MR. GRBAVAC: I have two questions. One, pertaining to the names, we've had numerous suggestions that the names of the constituencies ought to be neutral, if you will, or geographic in terms of not giving a particular advantage to one maybe suburban community within a rural constituency over another. When you start listing one community, it turns out you have two, three, or four communities, and it makes it kind of tough for people answering the phone at constituency offices. We've been severely chastised for one of our existing constituencies that's named after an American geographical mountain, I guess, shall we say. So I'm curious to hear your comments on that.

The second would be: would you define for me what you consider to be urban versus rural?

MR. SORENSEN: Yes, I'd be glad to. I think, simply put: urban in the sense that in an urban division or constituency the people that live there regardless of the number are probably all within a sort of much more condensed block of activities. There's a lot more direct sense of community: they're going to one arena; they're going to basically one school; they're going to a number of single events; they're taking part in a single community. Those kinds of characteristics generally define it as being urban. They can access all kinds of goods, services, et cetera, on a much quicker basis.

MR. GRBAVAC: So Lethbridge, Red Deer are urban to you.

MR. SORENSEN: Lethbridge-Centre is an urban riding to me, yes.

MR. GRBAVAC: What about the geographical name of a constituency? How would you feel about that?

MR. SORENSEN: I don't think I'd be prepared to comment throughout the province. Certainly motivated by those I represent, the Crowsnest Pass wants to be recognized more and more. I'm not

sure that we need to be as unique as Mr. Bradley indicates that we might want to be. We are somewhat radical in our aggressiveness and continue to be so. We're all after more recognition. It is a large population base within a municipality within a riding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank you then, Ken, for coming and making your viewpoints known.

MR. SORENSEN: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenters are Cliff Reiling and Kathleen Kerr, representing the Crowsnest Pass Economic Development Board.

Has your helper disappeared on you?

MR. REILING: Your Honour, I'm much like the person who attends the academy awards and accepts it on behalf of. I'm the economic development co-ordinator and Mrs. Kerr is the chairman of the economic development board. As these in fact are the comments of the board, I would like to cover them as they are in the document.

Your Honour and panel,

On behalf of the Crowsnest Pass Economic Development Board, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to have input into such an important issue. The concept of representation by population is valid and has been upheld within the courts. My purpose is not to argue with the rationale which was used. My concern is that at what level is representation deemed equal but not adequate. I question the need for approximately twenty Members of the Legislature for the City of Calgary when there is one Mayor and one Council which speak for the City. Any one of these M.L.A.'s can access all of their constituents within twenty minutes of their residence. The changes which happened in the last boundary review has M.L.A.'s driving over one hundred and fifty kilometres from their riding offices. Another major concern is that whenever isolation is considered it is assumed that you are talking north of Highway 16. I would like to challenge that belief when one considers where the Crowsnest Pass is related to a full service airport. Our distance from Edmonton and the time required for that trip, regardless of mode of transportation, exceeds the time of travel from all communities of our size north of [Highway] 16.

In the Pincher/Macleod riding, there are five sectors of the economy unlike the urban ridings. Problems in the coal industry cannot be addressed in the same manner as those in oil and gas, agriculture, lumber or tourism.

A strong economy in Alberta must include rural Alberta as this is still the major source of income which drives our economy. The health of the cities is dependent upon the resources of rural Alberta. I trust that these concerns will be given the attention which they deserve and decisions made are best for all Alberta. When talking of the Alberta Advantage it should include adequate representation not just equal by population.

It is signed by Kathleen I. Kerr.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Cliff.  
John, do you have any questions?

MR. McCARTHY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe? Wally? Robert? I guess there are no questions, Cliff. Thanks for coming.

MR. REILING: Okay. You'll be seeing me in a short time again as I'm also the presenter on another one. So thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh. Okay.

The next presenter is Shawn Patience, Pincher Creek-Macleod Progressive Conservative Association.

MR. PATIENCE: You're finally going to get some representation from the eastern part of our constituency instead of all from the west, although I certainly appreciate my counterparts from the past in Pincher Creek.

My name is Shawn Patience, and I'm the past vice-president of the Pincher Creek-Macleod Progressive Conservative Association. I'm one of the first vice-presidents that that new constituency had in fact, having been only formed before the last election.

I would prefer to simply read my presentation to you, and I may add comment along the way. I'd firstly like to thank you for the opportunity to present here. As is the case with Mr. Bradley, I've also presented at these hearings before, and obvious as the results, unsuccessfully in our last attempt to have the then Macleod riding kept as was. Indeed, we made a pitch to have it named as a special distinction electoral riding.

It's important to point out that during the last round of hearings many excellent submissions were made to the boundaries review committee in favour of keeping the current boundaries of the day intact. Strong positions were made even to have the Macleod constituency classified as a special case. All of our efforts failed, and we were united with the bulk of the old Pincher Creek-Crowsnest riding. This expansion of our boundaries and the increase of thousands of constituents – and I believe the number was around 8,000, if I remember correctly – has made our MLA's job much more challenging and certainly has hindered his ability to adequately represent his constituents despite his finest efforts.

In the case of our current riding, the Pincher Creek-Macleod constituency, its cultural, industrial, commercial, and social interests are as varied as any other constituency I've ever seen in the entire province and why in 1992 we fought the expansion of our constituency boundaries so adamantly, as we do now in fact.

Major economic generators vary throughout our constituency from coal mining and logging in the west to ranching and farming in the east, and appropriately – and I'd written these comments some days ago – with 90 miles of icy highway in between. Cultural variations within our constituency include dealing with many of the complicated issues surrounding the Peigan reserve, a wide variety of religions and social sectors, all of these making our MLA's job even more challenging, and that certainly is a reiteration of what some of the previous presenters here this afternoon have said.

Representation cannot be quantified by numbers of population alone. One must also consider other numbers such as the numbers of school boards, towns, and MD councils, health authorities, religions, cultures, industries, not to mention the miles of highway in between constituents. In our case, our constituency ranges 90 miles in width and over 50 miles in depth and encompasses one of Canada's largest native reserves. It's absurd, to me, to think that a city MLA dealing with 30,000 constituents in a few square blocks area, dealing with one city council, one chamber of commerce – I have in my written submission, attending one parade; I certainly understand John's comments earlier – that that workload bears any resemblance to that which a current rural MLA has.



Certainly logic would not dictate the requirement for a realignment of electoral boundaries that would see the cities of Calgary and Edmonton having more MLAs than they indeed have aldermen. That certainly would be some inkling to me why perhaps you're hearing from the city ridings that maybe they feel like they are overgoverned, because certainly from a rural perspective it does seem to be that way. The lumping together of rural and urban ridings to avoid this fact is to me the equivalent of two noes not making a right. Perhaps this is why the Charter of Rights did not guarantee equal voting power but did guarantee effective representation and why the plus or minus 25 percent of rural average formula has passed all major legal hurdles.

2:00

After three years of hard work following the recent boundary realignment in 1992 and the inclusion of thousands of additional people within our riding, each carrying their own varying and very different concerns, there is now a spirit of co-operation developing. In a constituency, especially in a rural riding, it becomes a community of sorts because you tend to deal with similar issues with your MLA. Although this may be different in a city, especially coming from the standpoint of our party association, you try to develop an atmosphere of co-operation among yourselves. Now, we've spent three years attempting to do that at this point, and I certainly would be very remiss to try starting that process all over again by realigning the boundaries that were simply realigned three years ago.

It takes time and effort to unite a new constituency, and these efforts are not enhanced with the spectre of a new potential realignment hovering over our heads. It seems like a very poor use of tax dollars, especially since the last alignment change only three short years ago meets the criteria that were set down by the Supreme Court in 1991 and is legal under the current Charter of Rights and Freedoms. When you consider that our current constituency population meets the current legal requirement, we see absolutely no reason to realign our current boundaries. Since another review is slated after the next election, there really seems no point or use to the review at this point. I understand what you've said previously about the Court of Appeal's ruling, but it is our position that minimally our constituency should stay the way it is and that maximally really this review probably is not required from a layman's point of view.

Mr. Chairman, that's really all I have as a submission, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thanks for coming, Shawn.

MR. McCARTHY: Where did you say that you live?

MR. PATIENCE: Fort Macleod.

MR. McCARTHY: So that was part of the addition to the constituency last time.

MR. PATIENCE: That's right. The Macleod constituency along with the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency were basically united and became one.

I might also say that I've had very close dealings with our previous MLA Mr. Fjordbotten and have very close dealings with our current MLA. I certainly see the workload expansion and see at times his

frustration in trying to deal with the wide variety of interests and the large distance in between those interests. I'm certain that from his point of view it is very trying, and I don't realistically see how anyone could expect a rural MLA to do more than he is currently doing at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe, any questions? Wally? Robert?

MR. GRBAVAC: Yes. I have one, Mr. Chairman. Shawn, I think maybe my comments with respect to interpreting or relaying to you what some of the urban counterparts are saying have been misconstrued and misunderstood. I want to make myself more clear. What they were suggesting is that rural Alberta was grossly overgoverned. They were saying that in some of the rural municipalities, you may have four or five towns with five councillors. That's 25 elected officials. You may have four or five counties with anywhere from five to nine councillors, which is about 30 to 40 more elected officials. You'll have a school board and sometimes two with six or seven elected officials. So these people were making the case that in some of the rural municipalities or rural constituencies there may be a hundred elected officials representing maybe 20,000 people, and they were suggesting that one elected person for anywhere from 150 to 250 people was the premise for being overgoverned.

I'm not concurring with that. I'm not necessarily suggesting that they're right. I obviously misrepresented what they were saying, and that was the premise for which they were suggesting that we have too many ridings in the province in that there are all these other levels of government that exist, particularly in rural municipalities. I think that was their premise. So I apologize for misleading you on that. I can also appreciate the concerns that are brought to us by MLAs who have to deal with maybe upwards of a hundred elected officials within their constituencies.

MR. PATIENCE: I certainly did misunderstand how you had stated that.

MR. GRBAVAC: Yes. That was my mistake.

MR. PATIENCE: I certainly would not concur with that point of view either.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have an irrelevant comment. What do you do?

MR. PATIENCE: What do I do as far as making a living goes?

THE CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. PATIENCE: I own a business in Fort Macleod, a sign and graphics business.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was hoping that someday you might consider becoming a lawyer and a judge, because there'd be nothing nicer than the name of Judge Patience.

MR. PATIENCE: Actually I've often thought of sending my son to medical school, too, because I always thought Dr. Patience would be sort of nice.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming.

MR. PATIENCE: I appreciate it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see our next presenter now is Cliff Reiling, again the municipality of Crowsnest Pass.

MR. REILING: I will be leaving copies of this submission with you, although it was already faxed to you earlier. I would like to start, though, with a letter from our mayor. It's addressed to Your Honour and to the panel.

It is rather unfortunate that the date of the hearing conflicts with the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association conference and neither my Council colleagues nor myself can be present to make a personal presentation.

She goes on to state that she will make arrangements to have somebody here representing the municipality. It's signed by M.E. Utley, MD, mayor of the municipality of Crowsnest Pass. The actual presentation, which she has given me to present on her behalf and on behalf of the council:

The Municipality of Crowsnest Pass wishes to express its grave concern about the Commission's preliminary deliberation in considering "merging a number of rural electoral divisions into contiguous or neighbouring divisions" and thus "adding a number of urban electoral divisions to Edmonton and Calgary".

In the most recent redistribution which doubled the size of our riding by amalgamating the previous Pincher Creek-Crowsnest riding with the Macleod riding to form the now Pincher Creek-Macleod riding, we believe, has had the following negative impact on our community:

1. Less "effective representation"

Because the riding is significantly larger with more community of interests our representative is not able to be as effective as he would like to be, because he has less time to physically meet the demands of such a large, complex, and diverse riding. While M.L.A.'s from Calgary and Edmonton may travel only several city blocks within the division and are available to their constituents those representing rural electoral divisions must travel many miles to provide the same service. Merging a number of rural electoral divisions into contiguous or neighbourhood divisions will only compound the existing situation and only further provide less effective representation.

2. Negative Impact on our "community of interest"

The Crowsnest Pass's community of interest lies in resource exploitation (coal mining, logging and natural gas extraction in the Eastern Slopes of the Rocky Mountains). Our natural economic flow is westward to our neighbours in British Columbia where the major employer of our citizens, the coal mining industry, is active. Also our community values its Eastern Slopes for industrial and economic activity as well as promoting diverse recreation interests. We strongly support multiple use of these lands.

However, the majority of community of interest in the Pincher Creek-Macleod riding lies to the east of our mountain community and is basically agricultural in nature (although very diverse from ranching and mixed farming to dryland and irrigation farming).

We do not believe that our community of interest is best served in an expanded and diverse riding. We believe our unique mountain oriented community of interest has been negatively impacted by being swallowed up and diluted by being amalgamated with a large agricultural based riding.

We lack "common community interest and organizations" with our rural prairie neighbours to the east of us.

Our issues are different from our prairie neighbours and require our representative [to] spend the additional extra time and effort to effectively represent us. Increasing the size of the riding has

negatively impacted on our representation. Our current representative is doing the best job he possibly can but the current riding is just too big.

Your suggestion to merge a number of rural electoral divisions into contiguous or neighbouring divisions will only exacerbate the negative impacts the existing new boundaries have had on our community.

We do not support any suggestion of increasing the size of this riding. Our preference would be to see the existing Pincher Creek-Macleod reduced in size to accommodate our unique interest which would provide proper representation not just equal by population.

As the largest community in the current Pincher Creek-Macleod riding and because of our unique mountain community of interest we request that the name "Crowsnest" be inserted as part of the name of the riding to reflect our history, geography, economic and community interests.

We respectfully request your consideration of our submission. Thank you.

2:10

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Cliff. Robert, any questions? Wally?

MR. McCARTHY: Do you have any comment on the proposed name change?

MR. REILING: Well, I think the point that our mayor makes in there is that in fact it is the largest population. I think one of the suggestions made was that if there was a riding which included Raymond, Magrath, and Lethbridge and if it was called the Raymond-Magrath riding, there may be a question from Lethbridge. I think that that definitely would be the rationale.

MR. GRBAVAC: How do you feel about a neutral geographic name?

MR. REILING: Well, you know, how neutral can one get anymore? I know we went through this with the school board and argued back and forth, and you can get 50 percent to agree and 50 percent to disagree. So I don't know what is better than picking the extremities of a riding. You know then that's where it is.

MR. GRBAVAC: So you would prefer that to something like Chinook, Bow Valley, Little Bow, or Highwood?

MR. REILING: I was just handed a suggestion: Crowsnest-Mountain riding.

MR. GRBAVAC: I guess I asked for that.

MR. REILING: You did ask for a suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make this comment. I'm somewhat summarizing the presentation of the municipality of Crowsnest Pass. You say, first of all, that you don't want any change that would make the riding any bigger. If you had your preference, you'd like to make the riding smaller like it was before. To make the riding smaller like it was before, it would have to become, I think, a special area. We presently have four special areas in Alberta, and that would mean canceling one of the special areas. The area to the east around

Macleod which was added to this constituency: where would you suggest we unload it?

MR. REILING: I think that my friend from Macleod could maybe answer that one a lot better.

THE CHAIRMAN: By using the words "unload it," I'm merely being facetious. I'm just saying: where should we transfer it to?

MR. REILING: And that's one more question you'll be able to add to your list.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're not prepared to suggest.

MR. REILING: Definitely not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thanks for coming, Mr. Reiling.

MR. REILING: Thank you very much. Now I will be able to take this down and leave it here, as they say, in the bone pile.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm advised that the next presenter is Wayne Hawthorne.

MR. HAWTHORNE: Good afternoon, hon. chairman and commission members. Thank you for the opportunity for me to address the commission with my concerns on your statements that you're considering the merger of the rural electoral divisions. I oppose any effort to merge the present Pincher Creek-Macleod riding with any additional area. At present the area is too difficult for one person to represent, and I suggest that if any change in size is considered, it should be to downsize it. As you have mentioned, we could become one of the special areas, and we would qualify under that.

Now, please don't construe my statements as my displeasure in the way that Mr. Coutts has been representing this riding. Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Coutts cannot be faulted with neglecting his job. If I was to find any fault at all with Mr. Coutts, I would say that he puts his job ahead of his health. The size, diversity, and distance from Edmonton all contribute to making this a difficult riding to represent.

In agriculture, which I represent, there are many problems that demand time from the MLA. What could be simply called by you as the cattle industry is represented by various stages. There are the cow/calf operators, the feedlot industry, and the dairy industry, all very different industries. Sheep, for example, are marketed under much different regulations than are swine, horses, broiler chickens, eggs, turkeys, or exotic animals. Each of those is marketed in a totally different way and usually under separate provincial regulation.

Cropping is represented by wheat, barley, oats, canola, flax, rye, peas, beans, lentils, corn, vegetable market gardening, and a huge variety of forage crops, to name a few. Each of those diverse crops demands individual marketing expertise and assistance in diversification. All of these are lumped under the catchall heading of goddamned farmers by our city friends.

This constituency boasts world-class tourist attractions that are constructed and maintained by the province. The main two are the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump and the Frank Slide Interpretive Centre. We also have several attractions in Fort Macleod as well as

museums in virtually every town. We appreciate the ability of these attractions to bring foreign money into Alberta, but they do require the MLA's time.

The two major highways pass through this constituency: Highway 2, dubbed the export highway, and Highway 3, providing an interprovincial corridor through southern Alberta, both requiring time and commitment from the MLA in their expansion, maintenance, and upkeep.

There are a host of town and municipal councils that demand time. They represent the towns of Claresholm, Granum, Fort Macleod, Pincher Creek, Cowley, Crowsnest Pass plus the municipal districts of Willow Creek, Pincher Creek, and Ranchland. Smaller communities are Moon River, Orton, Pearce, Brocket, and Lundbreck, each having individual concerns and infrastructure.

This constituency includes part of the Bow-Crow forest, that supplies the vibrant lumber industry through a half dozen mills and companies. The Crown land is a constant battleground in a tug-of-war between tourists, cattlemen, pseudoenvironmentalists, local citizens, hunters, fishermen, and timber harvesters. Nonresidents demand their rights to tear up all Crown land with all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, motorcycles, and four-by-fours.

This constituency is rich in natural gas and oil as well as coal, if the world market would permit the coal. Each of those industries requires time. Without a coal market in the Crowsnest Pass they are suffering high unemployment.

Westcastle has been mentioned before as being an issue that has demanded many hours and days of our MLA's time and is not yet resolved.

The flooding of the Crowsnest River, Pincher Creek, and the Oldman River created millions of dollars in damage this year in a hundred-year flood. This also caused hundreds of hours of work for our MLA, and as he says, the next hundred-year flood might come next spring.

The Oldman dam holds back the waters for dozens of communities during the dry season. It also supplies water for Alberta environment to divert through the Lethbridge Northern irrigation district. The headworks is on the Peigan reserve in this constituency.

Add to these duties the ongoing concerns in education and health, and our MLA is vastly overworked.

To members of this commission I ask that you take into consideration this widely diverse base to the economy of the Pincher Creek-Macleod constituency. We simply cannot expect one MLA to take on any more workload. That would be both unfair to the MLA and the constituents.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hawthorne. If you'll just wait, we'll find out whether there are any questions.

MR. McCARTHY: Sorry. Where are you from?

MR. HAWTHORNE: West of Fort Macleod.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe? Walter?

MR. WORTH: Yup. Your submission, in drawing attention to the diversity of the economic base of the area and the workload that places on the MLA as presently perceived, raises questions in my mind about what the role of an MLA is. Is it reasonable to expect that the MLA can be conversant with all of these economic sectors

within your community, or is it being unreasonable to expect him to be so conversant? I'd welcome your comments about what you see the role of an MLA as being. Is he a kind of economic development officer that understands the total complex picture of your constituency with expertise in each area, or does he have some other function?

2:20

MR. HAWTHORNE: To answer your question, I would say that it's not reasonable to expect any one person to be conversant in all of those industries, yet in all of those industries there are individual provincial regulations that must be adhered to, and if in any one industry we require a change or ask for a change, the route is to go through the MLA to ask for that change.

MR. WORTH: Okay. Then a supplementary, if I may. Are there some alternate routes, like going directly to the minister involved, going directly to a municipal councillor representing the district, rather than the MLA?

MR. HAWTHORNE: Protocol states, I think, that we should go through our MLA even if we're going to another minister, and there's not much to be gained by going through the municipal council if we're looking at provincial regulation.

MR. GRBAVAC: Maybe just a comment on the same point or consideration. I'm in the agriculture business. I'm in the commercial feedlot business, the cow/calf background, and sometimes I lose track of who it is that's representing me. I mean, the list is as long as my arm. I can appreciate where the MLA would have a considerable workload when he's got to deal with the Barley Commission, the Cattle Commission, the canola growers, the feedlot – I can't remember their name now – the Alberta Cattle Feeders Association, on and on and on. So, you know, I can appreciate that there's a lot of people representing a few of us, and I can appreciate where an MLA has to be conversant in some of those issues. So I tend to concur with the fact that he has to be conversant. The ideological question of whether or not all that needs to exist is another matter, I suppose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Wayne, I want to thank you for coming. I just want to ask one question. I know you're from Fort Macleod. Are you representing yourself or a segment of your constituency?

MR. HAWTHORNE: I'm a hog farmer from Fort Macleod, and I felt that I should have some kind of input on behalf of agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, everybody's entitled to input, and I want to thank you for coming.

MR. HAWTHORNE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Mr. Dennis Prince. I'm sorry, Mr. Prince, that I tried to call you a little earlier, for waking you up too early.

MR. PRINCE: That's all right. I had a chance to get psyched up. This is not my regular diet.

Mr. Chairman, members of the board, and ladies and gentlemen, I am Dennis Prince, born and raised in Glenwood, Alberta. I have

worked throughout my life in Glenwood, Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton, and Wetaskiwin, the last 30 years for the provincial government. I retired in 1992. My claims to fame have to do with raising 12 children and having 43 grandchildren now and also having been a cheese maker. I'm a cheese maker by trade. I went into the Glenwood Cheese factory right out of high school and worked there, and my 30 years with the provincial government was as a cheese specialist.

I have been asked by the mayor and council of the village of Glenwood to make this presentation, with which they are in agreement. We appreciate this opportunity. I've learned from a review of the material made available to me that a variety of very able people have had significant input into the electoral boundaries issue over a period of several years. Many of the things stated by my predecessors in this exercise are true of the Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency, and many are more true there than they are in other constituencies because we're farther away.

Our considered opinion on the matter is to agree with the final draft; that is, as the electoral boundaries presently exist. In support of this position we note the following. One, the current electoral boundaries are not illegal but comply with current legislation.

Two, the directive from the Court of Appeal was for justification of the current boundaries, which does not necessarily or even imply that a change of boundaries should be made.

Three, the ability of an MLA to effectively represent his or her constituents is determined by a number of factors, basic to which is his ability to communicate with them on an ongoing basis, which in turn is a major factor in the policy formulation of government and the legislation that may or may not be brought forward. When this opportunity of an MLA to communicate regularly with his constituents face to face on a one on one is impaired or not equal to other MLAs', then those constituents in the area concerned will not be equally represented, this notwithstanding modern technology.

Four, democracy is certainly the preferred form of government but usually requires safeguards, as we western Canadians know only too well in the Canadian experience. The majority must always prevail, but electoral boundary decisions pit numbers against the ability of an MLA to represent his constituents, and his ability in some constituencies is largely determined by elements beyond his control. Therefore, this trade-off must be weighed very carefully, which we suggest has been done by the previous Electoral Boundaries Committee.

Five, the temptation to placate the nonexistent suggestions from the court directive to make changes to the electoral boundaries must be avoided. It is too easy to do and does not take into account the spirit of the law. What is to be gained by going only halfway in solving problems when going all the way stays within the law, requires no changes, and more adequately serves the purpose?

Six, the Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency is probably as uniquely different from any other constituency as any in the province. Now, we've heard that before here, and I think we're all right. I think we're all true. We all are very unique. Some members of this constituency migrated from the United States to Alberta beginning in 1887 and continuing over the next two decades. They have been a significant factor in the development of this area with their basic philosophy of hard work and fair play.

For example, cheese has been made continuously in this area since 1887. In 1941 a cheese factory was started in Glenwood and is operational today processing 600,000 to 700,000 pounds of milk a day into cheese and whey powder. People don't believe that figure

when it's quoted, so I repeat it: 600,000 to 700,000 pounds of milk a day. Now, for you metric people that would be – well, I can't convert it immediately, but it's not near as impressive a figure, because a litre of milk is 2.2 pounds. That factory is state of the art. There is twice as much cheese made in Glenwood today in one day as was made in 30 factories in all of Alberta in a year in the 1940s and '50s.

Cardston is Alberta's cheese constituency. There is very little cheddar cheese made anywhere else in Alberta. They introduced irrigation into the area. They constructed a \$1 million temple in Cardston in 1923, which draws thousands of visitors a year. More recently, the Don Remington carriage collection was donated to the province resulting in the establishment of the Remington-Alberta Carriage Centre, which in turn draws thousands of visitors a year.

To ad lib a little bit from my outline, I guess if one wanted to describe the constituency, you'd say it was made up of Hutterites, Indians, and Mormons. There's the largest Indian reservation in Canada there, the Blood reserve, and I don't know how many Hutterite colonies, but several, and they are major contributors in the dairy business. In fact, more than half the milk in the province, I believe, is produced by Hutterite colonies.

Seven, the area has consistently sent capable representatives to Edmonton, including George L. Stringham, N.E. Tanner, Johnny Thompson, and currently Jack Ady, Minister of Advanced Education and Career Development. To divide this area up and assign it to adjacent constituencies would seriously dilute the input of these constituents into the policies and actions of their government. One may justly be concerned about the constituents' ability to maintain the keen interest and loyal support for the decisions and actions taken in Edmonton that has been characteristic and traditional of the citizens here in the Cardston constituency.

2:30

Eight, one must weigh the loss from the elimination of a long-time established constituency against the possible gains from the assignment of one or two more MLAs to an area already represented by 20 MLAs.

I'll add a number nine in there. Cardston-Chief Mountain is a border constituency, bordering on Montana, with ports of entry.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the citizens in the Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency deserve special consideration within the law when it comes to the definition of electoral boundaries in Alberta. We encourage you to leave the Cardston-Chief Mountain boundaries as they are presently drawn.

From the village of Glenwood, Mayor Doral Lybbert.

I am the presenter, Dennis Prince. I thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll just wait, then, for some questions.

MR. WORTH: I appreciate your claim to special status or being a special consideration division in the electoral system. However, there are in total 16 constituencies in this province who now can claim special consideration based on the criteria in the Act. So one of our jobs will be to determine, you know, which of these 16 constituencies that meet these criteria in whole or in part ought to be given special consideration, and you can appreciate that that will be a very difficult task for us. That's an observation.

The second is a bit of a question. You have indicated that you don't want to see the constituency divided up amongst other constituencies. What would be your reaction to having it expanded

so that it need not necessarily require special consideration to exist but could be expanded to take in a larger area and retain the core Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency?

MR. PRINCE: That would certainly be preferred to losing our identity as a constituency. That would be the preferred route to go I would say.

In terms of there being 16 other areas that could claim special, we have a very changing civilization and period of time in the history of the world and the province and the country, and maybe the law is outdated. Maybe we need 16 special areas. I suspect that it's not within the prerogative of the committee to make that recommendation, but if the committee were to hold the boundaries where they are, which in my reading of the material – and I didn't have it all. I was very interested in what Mr. McCarthy here read about the court decision. I didn't have that available to me, but it didn't change my position on what I had read from the material that I had.

If the committee were to maintain boundaries as they are with the implication that what we need are changes in the law, if these areas that are identified as justification for special consideration – why is it limited to four? What's the rationale to limit it to four?

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess we can't answer that.

MR. PRINCE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You've got to ask the MLAs that question.

MR. PRINCE: Well, that's where I'd leave it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Prince.  
Robert.

MR. GRBAVAC: Yes. Mr. Prince, I've got one question. I've read all the briefs with the exception of yours, until I got it – I believe I received it today. Is that correct? Did we receive your brief today?

MR. PRINCE: It was sent in two days ago. I just brought it here today, and I think it was copied . . .

MR. GRBAVAC: I just wanted to point out a difference between the majority of the briefs that I received from the Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency and yours. Most of them in large part agreed with what you were saying, but they also suggested that the area around Stirling could be considered for inclusion in the Cardston-Chief Mountain constituency. I was just wondering if you concur with that.

MR. PRINCE: Yes, I do.

MR. GRBAVAC: So that's a friendly amendment to your brief, or you would accept that as a friendly amendment?

MR. PRINCE: Yes, I would.

MR. GRBAVAC: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: John, any questions?

MR. McCARTHY: No.

MR. LEHANE: Dennis, earlier this afternoon you probably heard some of the presenters from Pincher Creek-Macleod. They've done an excellent job this afternoon telling us about their constituency and all of the varying types of industries and concerns that have to be dealt with by their MLA. They're a constituency that borders Cardston-Chief Mountain. Taber-Warner is another one. On the other side of that is Cypress-Medicine Hat. All three of those constituencies have populations that are significantly higher than Cardston-Chief Mountain, probably by about 6,000 each, or 35 percent higher than the 18,000 in Cardston-Chief Mountain. Can you tell me why Cardston-Chief Mountain should be given any sort of preferential or special consideration over and above those neighbouring constituencies?

MR. PRINCE: Nothing more in addition to what I've said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thanks for coming, Mr. Prince, and making your viewpoints known in respect to Cardston-Chief Mountain.

MR. PRINCE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presenter that was scheduled was Mayor Lloyd Kunkel of the village of Hill Spring, but I understand he's unable to attend, so we'll then go to Jim Folsom.

MR. FOLSOM: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, did you guys get my brief?

THE CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. FOLSOM: It's one of the later ones that came in.

I'm representing the village of Hill Spring and its rural community. Maybe I'll just go along and read this. Do you guys want to follow with me? Okay.

On behalf of the Hill Spring area I'd like to make a presentation regarding the electoral boundaries.

In the 1880s Senator Matthew H. Cochrane, noted importer and breeder from Quebec, established the Cochrane Ranche by purchasing 100 square miles at a \$1.25 per acre from the dominion government. The ranch lay between the Waterton and the Belly rivers in southern Alberta. In 1906 this ranch was purchased by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. The north end of the ranch was opened for settlement, and several small farming communities were established: Hill Spring, Glenwood, Hartleyville, Parkbend, Lone Rock.

In 1914 the municipality of Cochrane was formed with representatives of Hill Spring and Glenwood serving as members of council. The area of the MD was the land between the Waterton and the Belly rivers from Stand Off all the way to Waterton Lakes.

In the 1930s the farmers of this district joined together to form the United irrigation district. A canal system was constructed that brought irrigation water to the farmland and increased productivity and prosperity for the farm communities. In 1941 a cheese factory was established at Glenwood to serve the farmers of the UID. Mr. Prince talked a little bit about this cheese factory. It is part of the conglomerate Agrifoods, which is the largest food processing company in western Canada, and it is the second largest dairy co-op

in Canada at present. Probably within a few months it will become the largest dairy co-op in Canada.

2:40

To continue on, in 1953 the MD of Cochrane became part of the MD of Cardston. I have talked a little bit about the history of the community with the intent of establishing the ties that Hill Spring-Glenwood have with the Cardston district. The Cardston district is part of the Westwind school division, which is headquartered in Cardston. This is a new school division from three of the older school divisions. Our high school students from Glenwood and Hill Spring are bused to Cardston high school. A majority of our residents use the Cardston municipal hospital and are included in the Lethbridge regional health authority. Also, we are included in the Chinook health unit, with an office in Cardston. We are presently members of the Chief Mountain regional solid waste authority, which includes the greater Cardston-Magrath area. Because of these educational and health and governmental ties to Cardston, the majority of our residents also use Cardston banking establishments to carry on our business.

Speaking for the residents of the Hill Spring area, I request that as electoral boundaries are changed and redrawn, the historical, governmental, business, and social ties that Hill Spring has with the Cardston district be continued, and that we remain in the same electoral division as our neighbours. We do feel concerned about the proposed establishment of boundaries based on population. Our area of southern Alberta is not heavily populated. We feel that a compromise should be reached that would take into account the distances involved for a member of the Legislature to adequately represent their area. Hill Spring has a strong tradition regarding their citizenship and ties to Alberta and to Canada. We appreciate the opportunity to live and work in this province.

Now, I've added at the bottom a few things. It's been mentioned here numerous times: distances, proximity. I'm very familiar with Twin Butte, and there's not a large population out in that Twin Butte area. Going south from here you wouldn't reach any major population until you actually got to the town of Pincher Creek, because there's not a lot of population in the rural part south of Pincher Creek.

Our MLA has done an excellent job, but of course he has to deal with numerous boards, municipalities, villages. It also includes the largest Indian reserve in Canada. Similar to the U.S. Senate and House, they'd take a look at the area plus the population. As western Canadians we know what it's like to be represented. I think we need to take a look at this area plus population.

I'm a farmer. I would like representation as I am trying to produce food for the world, for Canada – it's one of the best industries in Canada – and I feel that I can only do this through proper representation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert, any questions of Jim?

MR. GRBAVAC: I would just ask Jim the same question I asked Mr. Prince. Would you have any objection to including in the Cardston constituency the community of Stirling?

MR. FOLSOM: No, I wouldn't. It was previously in our riding, and I think they took it away in the last special arrangement.

MR. GRBAVAC: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FOLSOM: They're part of our school division anyway.

MR. WORTH: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

Joe? John?

I want to thank you for coming and making your viewpoints known.

MR. FOLSOM: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next presenters, I understand, are the threesome of Robert Mitchell, Susan Aires, and Rod Zelinski. You are, as I understand, representing the MD of Pincher Creek.

MR. R. MITCHELL: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm the reeve of the MD of Pincher Creek. Susan Aires is the deputy reeve, and Rod Zelinski is a councillor. We are representing the MD. I think what I'll do is stick to my text. Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation, but really would you expect the people of Quebec to thank the province for the opportunity to vote on the separation of Quebec again? Then don't be too surprised if many people are frustrated and upset at having to go through this process so soon after last dealing with it. We thought that this issue was behind us. Some as Canadians thought that the referendum was behind us and something may have been settled. How foolish.

You are charged with once again reviewing and justifying the electoral boundaries. You cannot be any more successful than the previous commission. There will still be individuals that feel that their representation will be compromised. That is what this is about: representation. Well, there is more to representation than trying to balance the number of electors in each constituency. With the last Electoral Boundaries Commission decision the representation for this area was weakened. Granted the population numbers are not as large as some of the other constituencies, but is this the only issue? Raw numbers? We don't think so.

This is a frustrating, expensive, and divisive process. Reviewing the boundaries at this time so soon after the last review does not allow the MLA to become familiar enough with the constituency to provide fair representation. There is always a period of adjustment after the boundary changes as the MLA and residents must get to know the area, the various boards, the councils, the businesses, and the industry perspective. There must be this adjustment process before there is an understanding and thus fair representation. We are still in the adjustment process, and you are wanting to get back into the changes. Leave them alone. Let the rural constituencies become accustomed to this first round before you introduce the possibility or the reality of further changes.

This presentation hasn't spent the time to tell you of the diversification of the Pincher Creek-Macleod riding, how far it is from the government seat, the difficulties of providing responsible, reasonable representation to the huge diversities. I hope that some of these concerns that were presented in February of '92 to the panel are still available to you. For example, the travel time to Edmonton takes from productive representation; huge range of industry concerns in rural Alberta; agriculture, from ranching to intensive livestock to grain production and food processing; natural resource extraction, oil and gas, coal, and timber; water resources

management and concerns of the Three Rivers dam and Westcastle; alternate energy and the emerging technologies; recreation, integrated resource management and the Eastern Slopes concerns; the new configuration and concerns of school and hospital boards. These are all issues that are of extreme concern in this constituency right at the moment.

When you combine the uncertainties, the changing policies, and the downloading of government onto local municipalities, the one thing that we must have is continuity and consistency of our messages to and from Edmonton. We need a strong voice with a rural perspective. We support the balance between the urban and rural ridings that is now in place. This balance is what gives us the unique Alberta advantage. Leave the boundaries where they are.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

Susan, do you wish to add anything?

MRS. AIRES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rod, do you?

MR. ZELINSKI: No. That's fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you make your point very well that now is not the time to change things.

MR. R. MITCHELL: I guess that's the position we're taking. It was a frustrating, divisive process. We believe nothing can be accomplished by further adding to that. The MLA workload: you've heard lots about that. We personally don't believe that this will benefit our constituency.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert, do you have any questions?

MR. GRBAVAC: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Walter?

MR. WORTH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe?

MR. LEHANE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: John?

Thank you for coming.

Well, that covers our list. Now, is there anybody in the crowd who didn't register who would like to say something or anybody here who would like to add anything?

Go ahead, Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: Do you want me to speak in the microphone?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, if you would, please.

MR. BRADLEY: There's only one comment that I didn't cover in my presentation, because it was outside of this riding. It deals with Waterton national park. I think there are 128 electors in Waterton park. In the previous Electoral Boundaries Commission's

consideration in terms of this riding I was asked about adding Waterton park to what was in Pincher Creek-Crow's Nest. I figured out, with my political experience over 18 years and having to deal with federal parks issues with a federal member, that the workload of having a national park with 128 electors in it would take up to 10 to 15 percent of an MLA's workload, the time just to represent that interest of a national park.

I just add that to your perspective in terms of our good friends from Cardston-Chief Mountain. The people here didn't mention that in their presentation. I thought it might be some useful information for you to have, because that type of national park institution within a riding takes an incredible amount of the time of a member of the Legislature to represent, even though it's outside a provincial jurisdiction.

2:50

MR. WORTH: Well, thank you for that information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

Well, that appears to be everybody. I notice we have somebody from the media here. I assume you're from the *Pincher Creek Echo*. Are you Sherri Zickefoose?

MS ZICKEFOOSE: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank you for including this in your editorial today, encouraging people to attend this session. I was just wondering if you had anything to say. Or do you want us to buy your paper tomorrow?

MS ZICKEFOOSE: You can buy it. No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS ZICKEFOOSE: Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess that's it. These hearings are adjourned.

[The hearing adjourned at 2:52 p.m.]