



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission  
Public Hearings

Calgary

Friday, September 25, 2009  
1:54 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-2-12

## **Legislative Assembly of Alberta**

### **Electoral Boundaries Commission**

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

Dr. Keith Archer  
Mr. Peter Dobbie, QC  
Mr. Brian Evans, QC  
Ms Allyson Jeffs

### **Office of the Chief Electoral Officer**

Acting Chief Electoral Officer                      Lori McKee-Jeske

### **Participants**

Rebecca Aizenman  
John McGee Burke  
Stanley Harper

### **Support Staff**

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil
Clerk Assistant and Director of House Services	Louise J. Kamuchik
Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Robert H. Reynolds, QC
	Shannon Dean
Administrator	Erin Norton
Communications Consultant	Melanie Friesacher
Consultant	Tom Forgrave
Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

1:54 p.m.

Friday, September 25, 2009

[Judge Walter in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good afternoon. Thank you, in particular Mr. Harper, for coming here to share your views with us. We look forward to hearing them.

My name is Ernie Walter. I'm the chairman of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. With me here today: on my far right is Dr. Keith Archer of Banff; right next to me on my right is Peter Dobbie of Vegreville; Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton; and on the far end Brian Evans of Calgary.

Our task, as directed by legislation, is to make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly on the areas, boundaries, and names for 87 electoral divisions based on the latest census and population. We have to determine where to divide Alberta into 87 areas so that each Albertan receives effective representation by a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Over the next few months we will seek community input through a province-wide consultation before developing our recommendations. Through the public hearings we are going to receive the representations of members of the community, which will be very important to us.

In carrying out this work, we have to follow the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. It says that we are to make proposals for 87 electoral divisions, and that means four more than were allowed in the past election. There is the matter of the law that we are bound by, a brief summary of which is that we have to make proposals, as I've said, for 87 electoral divisions. We are limited in our time to accomplish this task. We are going, after representations made at the public hearings, to submit an interim report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by February of 2010 that sets out the areas, boundaries, and names of 87 electoral divisions. Following that, we will have a further round of public hearings, and after consideration of those inputs we will submit a final report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by July of 2010. Then it's up to the Legislative Assembly by resolution to approve or approve with alterations the boundaries and the electoral divisions for Alberta.

In doing this, the law directs us to use the sparsity and density, similarity of population as set out in the most recent census provided by Statistics Canada, which is the 2006 census, but we also have the authority to use more recent population information that is reliable. Certainly, in the case of Edmonton and Calgary and other urban centres we have that information for 2009.

In dividing the 87 proposed electoral divisions, the commission must and shall take into consideration the following:

- (a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,
- (b) sparsity and density of population,
- (c) common community interests and community organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Metis settlements,
- (d) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary,
- (e) . . . the existing municipal boundaries,
- (f) the number of municipalities and other local authorities,
- (g) geographical features, including existing road systems, and
- (h) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

The population rule in the act states that a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 per cent above or below the average population for all 87 electoral divisions. There is one exception. Up to four proposed electoral divisions may have a population that is as much as 50 per cent below the average population if three of the following five criteria are met:

- (a) the area . . . exceeds 20 000 square kilometres or the total surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15 000 square kilometres;
- (b) the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres;
- (c) there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 8000 people;
- (d) the area of the proposed electoral division contains [a First Nation] reserve or a Metis settlement;
- (e) the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the Province of Alberta.

And it does state that the municipality of Crowsnest Pass for these purposes is not a town.

In rulings the Alberta Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada have also provided guidance. They have underlined and stressed that those are the right to vote; the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; the right to effective representation; 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. These rulings as well as the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act make our guide and must guide our decisions and ultimately will guide us in the proposals that we make to the Legislative Assembly, and that is the law.

2:00

Probably the most important part of making any decisions is the public input. We believe that what we hear from you, the people who will be affected by these boundary changes, is critical to recommending a new electoral map that will ensure fair and effective representation for all Alberta.

Again, on behalf of the commission I welcome you here. We're looking forward to hearing what you have to say. We have 10 minutes for each speaker's presentation and then five minutes for questions and answers. *Alberta Hansard* is here. They will be recording, and audio recordings will be posted on the commission website. Transcripts of these proceedings will also be available. As a registered presenter or someone who isn't registered but wants to participate, we ask them for the record to identify themselves prior to starting their presentation.

Just for the record, Mr. Harper, if you'd be so kind as to give your full name so that it can be recorded in *Hansard*.

**Mr. Harper:** Stanley William James Harper.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Now we'd love to hear from you.

**Stanley Harper**

**Mr. Harper:** Well, my main concern is that I didn't understand that you had been given a directive to increase the number of representatives to 87.

**The Chair:** That's now the law.

**Mr. Harper:** It's now the law, but I would have thought that part of this committee's purpose is to see that representation is fair from the point of view of how many representatives we have compared to other jurisdictions. If you look, for example, at Canada versus other countries – the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain – we have by far a much higher level of representation than any of them. The United States has 450 people in their House of Representatives and 102 senators. We have 308 Members of Parliament and I think it's 108 senators. It looks to me like we have too many

representatives. So my point was – I didn't realize you'd been told that you had to increase it – to suggest that we should look at other territories such as Ontario, where the representation is one representative for every 100,000 people.

If you compare the distribution of population between Alberta and Ontario, they're of a similar size. There's very little difference in the north-south axis. The east-west axis, of course, is quite a bit different, but that takes care of the north-south difference. I would suggest that if we divided the population number, which you have stipulated as something like 3,270,000, by 51, you come up with something like 70,000 people being represented. I would suggest that's a more realistic thing.

One of the reasons for my thinking of this is that, as I said, I run a small business. My father started it, and I'm still working there. I do the accounts payable. I left work to come. It takes me half a week to maintain it and about three half-days to finalize it, prepare the cheques, and so on, so I'm still capable of thinking and operating. I firmly believe that we are overrepresented, and I think we should change that.

If you look at the economy in Alberta, one of the first complaints you have is that elected representatives have increased their payroll by 40 or 50 per cent. I've never had a 40 per cent increase in pay in my life, you know, in one year. If we look at the cost and what it means to the citizens if you're going to reduce it, my estimate is that it costs something in the order of \$500,000 to \$600,000 a year to have one MLA in Alberta. I don't think I can be very far off on that estimate. So if we cut it by 30 or 40 members, we would save \$15 million or \$20 million right there. That's how you are able to reduce your problems operating.

Like, our little company: we've not laid anybody off. We're hiring. We're not making any money; I looked at it yesterday afternoon, and we're in a \$3,000 loss position. But what we've done is what they're suggesting people do, and that's that you put your people on work sharing. Well, we haven't done that yet because what we're trying to do is keep the people because we have good people. In the good times we share our profits, and in our bad times – unfortunately, we're not going to have any profits to share this year. I would suggest that this same principle should apply to the civil service, that if the government is not profitable, then they should reduce their expectations of salaries. I think it's far out of line.

But my primary thought is that we don't need more members, and I think that some concern should be given to that. Like, I'm in Calgary-Elbow. I'm not sure; I think we have something like 50,000 people in that riding.

That's about it.

**The Chair:** And you're satisfied with the boundaries of Calgary-Elbow, or would you think there should be changes there if we had to accommodate more?

**Mr. Harper:** I'm more concerned with gerrymandering, where, like, in the city of Calgary we have aldermen who are complaining that they're not going to be re-elected because the boundaries have changed. They should have nothing to do with it. The elected people should have nothing to do with setting boundaries. You guys are the ones who set the boundaries.

If I were setting a boundary, I would look, first of all, at major geographical features, such as mountain ranges, rivers, lakes, something that's fairly permanent and gives you a very definite measure. From there I would go to the survey, which is your township line, your section line, your legal subdivision lines. These are all things that are built in. A last ratio, which is probably the most easily utilized, is the postal code.

Now, I don't have any idea what my postal code is, T2V and then zero or nine. I think T2V is the major section of it, and that probably has I don't know how many people. But it does make sense. It's not a geographical thing, though, but it is a population-based thing.

You folks, I would say, would be rational in your selection of boundaries and would try to make it so that it was fair for everyone involved. I realize that you have sections of the province, like the northwest corner, where you have 28,000 people represented, but with today's communication standards – like, you look at CPAC or television and news and the ease of distributing information and gathering it. We don't need to be operating on a situation we had 150 years ago for representation because people have no problem contacting. This is my first time I've ever gone to government to give an opinion or anything other than when I vote. I think I'm quite average in that record, that the vast majority of people have no realistic reason to complain. It's like I say; I'm not looking for assistance from the government to help us run our business. We're going to come out of it. All we need is a good snowfall in October, and that'll turn us from a loss position into a profit position. So pray for snow.

**The Chair:** I think the whole province is looking for rain.

**Mr. Harper:** Oh, we need moisture. Yes.

**The Chair:** If it comes in the form of snow, I'll still be happy. But would you mind answering a few questions?

**Mr. Harper:** Not at all. I'll try.

2:10

**The Chair:** Brian, do you have any questions?

**Mr. Evans:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks very much, Mr. Harper. I hearkened back to my father's feeling about government when you said that this is the first time you've ever come to government other than to vote. That was my father's credo as well. He thought that a measure of success was never going near government. But he did also recognize that he was in perhaps a different position than some people and that others did need government services. I'm sure you would recognize that as well. Everybody doesn't come from, you know, the same heritage with the same benefits and advantages or disadvantages.

I guess the question that I would ask you – and I'm not sure you've ever had occasion to think about this, but I'll ask it anyway. We have to deal with this whole issue of effective representation, as our chair has indicated in his preamble. One of the objectives of effective representation is to ensure that there aren't too many people in a given constituency so as to make it impossible for an MLA to effectively represent the people in that constituency. Our average in Alberta now, given the most current population statistics we have, is about 40,583. If I heard you correctly, you'd be very comfortable with upwards of 70,000 people per constituency. Is that just a numeric equation for you, or have you considered as well whether the 70,000, in your view, would mean that that MLA would still be able to deliver and his or her constituents would still be able to expect effective representation?

**Mr. Harper:** I think so, yes, because the elected official is not the only person. They generally have one, two, or more people to assist them, so they can use these people as a filter and group them according to their needs. Like you say, not everyone has had your luck, if you like to call it that. I don't object to paying more taxes –

that's not a problem for me or for my employees – but I do object to seeing competitors being rewarded because they are either too greedy and take too much money out of their business or they have no idea what they're doing.

You know, we have one retail outlet, and we have a warehouse space. We do wholesale and retail. We have competitors such as Kal Tire, the OK Tire stores. Kal Tire and OK Tire are both voluntary chains. Fountain Tire is partially voluntary, but they largely control all of their outlets by owning the property and so on. We are the biggest competition in Calgary for all those people because they have to match what we provide. We don't operate on the basis of low price. We operate on the basis of customer service, good products.

The smartest thing I did in my life was to apply for a Michelin franchise in 1964. I read about it. I knew they had a good product. Up to that time I'd been selling Goodyear. I found that with Goodyear I continually fought with them because they would come in in January with their program for the booking, and I would work with them. I'd say, "Okay; this is what I think I can sell," and I'd give them an order. Then they would come along in early April, and 70 per cent of the dealers hadn't bothered to put in an order. They'd come in and cut the price that they had offered me in January for this so-called good deal by 15 or 20 per cent. So I would have to fight with them to at least give me the same deal they were giving three months later, you know. With Michelin it was entirely different, and they had a far superior product. There was just no comparison. That's why we've been successful, just for doing things like that.

My father started out being a vulcanizer. When he came back from World War I, he was offered a course to be someone who checks eyes and a vulcanizing course. He took the vulcanizing course. The way he built his business was that people didn't have enough money to buy tires a lot of the time, so if you could repair them, you know, that's the sort of thing that makes some businesses more successful than others.

**Mr. Evans:** That's fine. Thanks, Mr. Harper.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Allyson or Peter, does anybody else have any questions for Mr. Harper?

**Ms Jeffs:** Well, maybe just one issue. As you know, we are set with the number of MLAs that we are to design ridings for but appreciate your comments about, you know, your general views about the size of government. I'm wondering if your perspective – just to clarify a little bit, you talked about technology helping in some of the far-flung ridings. Do you think that what you're asking is realistic in the areas outside of the major urban centres, even sort of in the rural districts and so on, in terms of enlarging the population as a general principle?

**Mr. Harper:** If you look at the number of people that attend political gatherings where the various parties have their meetings, they don't get 1 per cent of their people attending these meetings, so that has to tell you something. You know, if you go to a meeting in Calgary-Elbow, to take one I know, where you have 40,000 or whatever it is, you get 50 people out. If you have it at three different places in Alberta and your maximum attendance is 50 people, that has to tell you something. The system has got to be working, or there would be more people. If you want to see a large gathering, let's have a major problem occurring, and then you'll get attendance.

**Ms Jeffs:** All right. Thank you.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, Mr. Harper. Again, we can't do anything about the number, but certainly we hear you, and your voice is being recorded and will be transcribed in *Hansard* so that the government will have access to your opinion. Just so you and I are clear, when our report comes out in October, there is nothing that this commission can do about the numbers themselves. We have to work with 87 and divide the province up fairly based upon the suggestions that you and others have made and the statutes, looking at rivers and lakes, and trying to be rational about the divisions. If you are passionate about the issue of the numbers, you should be talking to your MLA and the government and the Premier's office directly.

**Mr. Harper:** That's been one of my problems. I've always had the leader of the party as my representative, both provincially and federally. Stephen Harper is my Member of Parliament, and I had Ralph Klein for my MLA.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Did he come to your tire shop? He probably did.

**Mr. Harper:** I don't think so. I would have known.

Alison Redford is my MLA. She's an intelligent lady and very capable. I like to see people like that in office. She makes a big sacrifice. She ran for alderman. My one daughter-in-law worked for the city of Calgary, and she had a fairly significant position. Apparently, Ms Redford has children, and she wondered how she could take the time to be an alderperson and a parent at the same time. So there are people who make a significant sacrifice in their life to serve, and I think that those people are the kind of people we want.

**Mr. Dobbie:** I guess I just want to reassure you that while we can't address your issue of the number of MLAs, we certainly do take your suggestions seriously in terms of having rational, supportable reasons for making boundaries where we do, so thank you very much for providing that input to us.

**Mr. Harper:** Thank you for the opportunity.

**Dr. Archer:** Hi, Mr. Harper. I just want to ask a question in response to a recommendation we had from another presenter earlier today with respect to your constituency of Elbow. The suggestion was that if we're looking to increase the number of people within the Elbow riding, we should look at moving the community of Kingsland into that constituency – I think that's on the southeast corner of the riding and currently is not included in Elbow – and the community of Manchester, which I think is . . .

**Mr. Harper:** It's primarily business.

2:20

**Dr. Archer:** Yeah, although she said that there was a pocket of residents, a relatively small number.

**Mr. Harper:** Yeah, there are a few. There are two apartment buildings by 58th Avenue or maybe three, and then there are some single-family homes. There might be 50.

**Dr. Archer:** Okay. So, in your view, would you concur with that view that if we're looking to add additional residents to the Elbow constituency, we should look both at Manchester and at Kingsland as possibilities?

**Mr. Harper:** Right now if you look at it from an income-based consideration, we have Kelvin Grove, Eagle Ridge, Chinook Park, I think, Lakeview, Mount Royal, Elbow Park, Roxboro, Rideau Park, all high-income areas, and it may not be fair for the people in lower income areas to be included in a place where they're a major minority. The only reason I can see for not including them is that it might be fairer if they were included in an associated area but something similar. Otherwise, I have no concern with it.

**Dr. Archer:** Okay. Thanks. Just a second question I'd look for your view on. We are going to be recommending four additional ridings and the names of those ridings as well. Would you have any advice to us with respect to the name of any additional riding within Alberta, whether it's to recognize an historical figure within the province or a particular topographical or geographical issue? If anything comes to your mind now or between now and October 13, which is the deadline for us to receive input, we'd very much be interested in hearing your view on that as well.

**Mr. Harper:** I would suggest that the names be, if possible – like, Calgary-Elbow means Elbow River. Calgary-Nose Hill would mean Calgary north on the hillside or beyond the hillside.

I have one son who lives in Panorama Hills. That's not a high-income area, and most of the people in those areas are not. I think it's fairer to give some consideration to people's minority/majority status to make it fair so that birds of a feather flock together, I guess. I think there should be some consideration to that.

**Dr. Archer:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Harper, and thank you for coming. Did you have a written submission you wanted to leave with us?

**Mr. Harper:** Well, no. I've just got notes. But I would like to get, if I could, a copy of what you read.

**The Chair:** There will be copies on the website of my opening remarks. They'll be on the website, where you could access them with technology.

**Mr. Harper:** I could do that, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Again, thank you so much for coming.

**Mr. Harper:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** All right. Is there anyone else here who would like to make a presentation or say anything further?

**Ms Aizenman:** May I add an appendix to my comments this morning, please?

**The Chair:** Certainly, ma'am. Come on forward.

**Rebecca Aizenman**

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you. It will be very, very brief.

**The Chair:** I would ask you for the record if you would give your name again so that *Hansard* has it.

**Ms Aizenman:** Certainly. Rebecca Aizenman. I live in Calgary-Elbow. We're very well represented today. On my first point,

regarding communities of interest, there's an excellent institution in Calgary called the Federation of Calgary Communities. Should you have any questions as to the boundaries of communities, their populations, I think you could get that information from that particular institution. What I'll attempt to do in my written presentation is identify those communities within the various ridings since I'm fairly familiar with a good part of the city of Calgary.

My second comment will reiterate what was heard here today. I realize you're bound by the terms of the redistribution act, but there seems to be a great deal of concern about the number of MLAs we're to have and overrepresentation. Those of us who think that way would feel more comfortable and more positive about the democratic process if this concern about overrepresentation would be included in your report. I do recognize that your mission is to redo the map of Calgary and Edmonton to include two more seats respectively for each jurisdiction.

**The Chair:** We haven't come to any determination as to where the seats will be.

**Ms Aizenman:** Okay. Fair enough.

**The Chair:** Again, thank you so much for the addition. In your written submission we're looking forward to some very helpful information.

**Ms Aizenman:** Thank you. I appreciate that comment. Thank you, people.

**The Chair:** Have a good weekend.

**Ms Aizenman:** You too, to all members of the panel.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now, is there anyone else? Yes.

**John Burke**

**Mr. Burke:** My name is John Burke, and I am here from the riding of Airdrie-Chestermere. Basically, I'm here kind of on a spur-of-the-moment thing because when I found out that you were having this, I decided to come in, have a look, and see what was coming about with the panel.

I need to say this: please break up Airdrie-Chestermere. Basically, on population alone I suggest that Airdrie with Beiseker and Crossfield deserves a representative of its own. Chestermere could probably be well included with everything from south of Beiseker all the way down to Langdon and further south to the Parkland. As a past candidate let me promise you that it was one heck of a car trip all the way around.

I suggest geographically that the redistribution of the ridings is mandatory because of the fact of the general size of Alberta. Once upon a time Airdrie was represented by Three Hills. Then they changed it. It now became Airdrie-Chestermere. I suggest that with the population increase of Chestermere and the population increase of Langdon they deserve a representative of their own, as does Airdrie deserve a representative of its own because it is now a population of about 30,000 if not 40,000-plus.

This is my submission, gentlemen and madam.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, and you're quite right. Even if we wanted to leave it as one, we couldn't. The population is such that we have to make adjustments there, significant ones.

**Mr. Burke:** Okay. Are there significant adjustments in the plans with the panel and with the department you represent?

**The Chair:** We can't have any electoral division either over 25 per cent or under 25 per cent of the average quotient. In the case of Airdrie-Chestermere it's now at 62 per cent.

**Mr. Burke:** Excuse me while my heart stops.

**The Chair:** Yeah. We have to deal with that. We've had considerable input from people in the constituency recognizing this and suggesting how we could do that, and we now have your input suggesting as to what might be the appropriate division. If you have further input you'd like to make in terms of a written submission and that, we're open to that till the 13th of October.

**Mr. Burke:** May I make the submission online, then?

**The Chair:** We have a website. If you check with the ladies at the back, they can give you everything you need.

**Mr. Burke:** Perfect. Thank you, all.

2:30

**The Chair:** Well, does anybody have any questions?

**Mr. Evans:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just one question. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Burke. Having been a candidate, obviously you do have a pretty good idea of the terrain out there. I don't think we'd have too much of a problem getting near the quotient in the Airdrie area. However, it's more of a problem with the current populations in the Chestermere area, even if you take in Langdon and that area. Is there any percentage from your point of view to looking east from Chestermere to add population? I mean, we've even looked as far east as Strathmore.

Now, having said that, the mayor of Chestermere and the deputy mayor were with us last night, and they didn't want to move as far as Strathmore because they felt that that was much more focused on agricultural production than Chestermere, but we've got to find population, and you've suggested north and south. My question is: do you think that's enough population to create a constituency, from your knowledge, and if not, does going east make some sense?

**Mr. Burke:** If you were to include Strathmore, that would increase the population. I would suggest it. Considering the fact that for the most part Langdon – and I'm assuming I am separating Airdrie from Chestermere.

**Mr. Evans:** Yes.

**Mr. Burke:** Okay. Chestermere is for the most part a rural riding anyway, okay? I mean, to be perfectly honest, not only Airdrie but if you'll also consider places like – I'm sorry. My brain just fried here a moment. West of Calgary.

**Mr. Evans:** Cochrane.

**Mr. Burke:** Cochrane. Yes, Cochrane. I mean, we're all becoming bedroom communities of Calgary anyway, so by definition their representation is going to be urban because of the fact that they are urban people representing urban ideas and values even if they are, like, a suburb community. Because of that I suggest that if everybody was going to be represented as per their need, then that by itself should, shall we say, make the decision to divide easier.

**Mr. Evans:** Okay. Thanks, Mr. Burke.

**Mr. Burke:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Allyson, any questions?

**Ms. Jeffs:** No. I don't have any questions, but thank you very much for coming up and speaking to us even on the fly. Again, I would encourage you to provide a written submission. We've asked that they be in as of October 13.

**Mr. Burke:** Understood.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Mr. Burke, just help me understand. You were going over the boundaries pretty quickly for the riding. Tom, is it my understanding that Airdrie is about 38,000 in the 2009 census?

**Mr. Forgrave:** Yes.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Yes. Okay. So 38,000 is the recent information we have for Airdrie's population. The quotient we're looking at, the average, is 40,583. So if we were to look at Airdrie city limits, it is currently 38,000, and there's anticipated growth within its existing city limits.

**Mr. Burke:** At least. From my bedroom I can actually watch Calgary move north, and I can actually watch Airdrie move south at a frighteningly rapid rate.

**Mr. Dobbie:** I wasn't able to write fast enough to capture some of your suggestions. If we go slightly beyond Airdrie city limits, is there a natural boundary that you had suggested that I just missed?

**Mr. Burke:** Not really. Because, I mean, the river, what's known as Nose Creek, literally goes through Airdrie, so that kind of takes care of that. My only suggestion was the fact that if we were to include the areas of, let's say, Airdrie as well as Crossfield as well as Beiseker, that kind of makes a triangle or actually a square if you want to include it.

**Mr. Dobbie:** So 566 would be the southern boundary.

**Mr. Burke:** Okay. Or, actually, I wouldn't even mind making the southern boundary the northern limits of the city of Calgary.

**Mr. Dobbie:** I was looking at the map, but I wasn't sure from your comments where you would see a natural southern boundary.

**Mr. Burke:** Well, a natural southern boundary would probably be the limits of the north end of Calgary, okay? Now, that could be subject to change if Calgary starts appropriating more land more into, shall we say, the Balzac area because I am including Balzac as part of the Airdrie riding. We would go as far east as the western limits of Crossfield, and that would include the northern boundary of Crossfield, and then we could square it literally to the northern boundary of Beiseker and work our way south to, I believe, 566. Yes.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Thank you, sir.

**Mr. Burke:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Do you have any questions?

**Dr. Archer:** No. No further questions. That was really helpful, both the suggestion of moving east and incorporating that broader area but also the suggestion of tying it in with some of the communities that are just east of Airdrie as well to the extent that Airdrie now seems to have enough population for its own constituency. Thanks for that.

**Mr. Burke:** I mean, it's stretching it a bit, but Crossfield is rapidly becoming a bedroom community of Calgary as well, as is Beiseker, so it's still very urban.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you very much. We really appreciate that. If you do have anything further, we have the website. You can pick up the details, and we'd be delighted to receive it.

**Mr. Burke:** Thank you, all.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Dobbie:** Including a name for the riding, again, just when you're thinking about it or canvassing people.

**Mr. Burke:** Yes. Thank you.

**The Chair:** All right. I don't believe there's anyone else, so we're going to adjourn.

[The hearing adjourned at 2:37 p.m.]



