



41st Parliament, First Session

The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs has the honour to present its

SIXTY-FIRST REPORT

Your Committee, which is responsible for all matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Commons, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(a)(vi), has considered the objections filed in respect of the *Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario*, in accordance with section 22 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-3, and is pleased to report as follows:

After each decennial census, the number of Members of the House of Commons and the representation of each province is adjusted in accordance with the rules prescribed by section 51 and 51A of the *Constitution Act, 1867*. An independent three-member electoral boundaries commission is then established for each province with the mandate to consider and report on the division of the province into electoral districts, the description of the boundaries and the name of each electoral district.

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* provides the rules governing the division of a province into electoral districts. The population of each electoral district must be as close as possible to the electoral quota for the province, that is, the population of the province divided by the number of Members of the House of Commons allocated to the province in accordance with the Constitution. Each commission shall also consider the community of interest, community of identity or the historical pattern of an electoral district in the province; as well as the manageable geographic size of electoral districts, in cases of sparsely populated, rural or northern regions. A commission may depart from the provincial electoral quota by plus or minus 25% in order to respect the community of interest, community of identity, or the historical pattern of an electoral district, or to maintain the manageable geographic size of sparsely populated districts. In circumstances that are viewed as extraordinary by a commission, the variance from the electoral quota may be greater than 25%.

A commission is required to hold at least one public sitting on proposed electoral districts' boundaries and names to hear representations by interested persons. After the completion of the public hearings, each commission prepares a report on the boundaries and names of the electoral districts of the province. These reports are tabled in the House of Commons, and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Members of the House of Commons have then 30 calendar days to file objections to the proposals contained in a report. An objection must be

in writing and in the form of a motion. It must specify the provisions of the report objected to, and the reasons for those objections. An objection must be signed by not less than 10 Members of the House of Commons.

After the expiration of the period for filing objections, the Committee has 30 sittings days, or any greater period as may be approved by the House, to consider the objections. The report of the commission is then referred back to the commission, along with the objections, and the minutes of the proceedings and the evidence heard by the Committee. The commission has then 30 calendar days to consider the matter, dispose of any objection, and finalise its report with or without amendment depending on its disposition of the objections.

Once all the commission reports have been finalized, the Chief Electoral Officer prepares a draft representation order setting out the boundaries and names of the new electoral districts. This is sent to the Governor in Council, who shall, within five days, proclaim the new representation order to be in force and effective for any general election that is called seven months after the proclamation is issued.

Objections

The *Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario* was tabled in the House of Commons, and referred to the Committee on February 25, 2013. By the end of the 30-day period, the Clerk of the Committee had received 63 objections. Nine objections proposed both changes to the boundaries and names of electoral districts. 21 objections included changes to boundaries only; 13 to names of ridings only. 20 “objections” expressed their support in the Commission’s Report.

General Comments

The Committee wishes to commend the Commission for its work on this difficult undertaking, given the large scale and complexity of its task.

During its hearings, the Committee discerned a consistent endorsement on the part of MPs for the Commission’s use, in certain regions, of a second round of public consultations in order to arrive at the electoral boundaries proposed in its Report. While this extra consultation is not mandated by the Act, the Committee highlights this practice for the consideration of future Electoral Boundaries Commissions as a way to mitigate potential public discontent over lack of input concerning changes to electoral boundaries made following a first and only round of public consultations. The Committee considers any such mechanism, which has as its objective to deepen public consultations, to be a worthwhile undertaking and in line with the spirit of the Act.

Members who objected to the Report generally recommended reasonable adjustments that were well thought-out, well documented and in line with the parameters of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, and in line with the flexible approach adopted by the Commission with regard to the deviation from the electoral quota. The Committee has no doubt that the Commission will find these proposals open-minded, with the general objective of effective representation of constituents by their elected federal representatives.

A number of M.P.s filed objections with the Committee in order to express their satisfaction with the Commission's Report, or to preserve their option of appearing, but that did not necessarily contain a specific objection to any of the provisions of the Report. The Committee included certain of these objections in the body of the Report in instances where the objection had a direct bearing on another MP's objection. These MPs included: Mr. Malcolm Allen, M.P. for Welland; Mr. Charlie Angus, M.P. for Timmins–James Bay; Ms. Lois Brown, M.P. for Newmarket–Aurora; Mr. Andrew Cash, M.P. for Davenport; Mr. David Christopherson, M.P. for Hamilton Centre; Mr. Jim Flaherty, M.P. for Whitby–Oshawa; Mr. Claude Gravelle, M.P. for Nickel Belt; Mr. Dan Harris, M.P. for Scarborough Southwest; Ms. Carol Hughes, M.P. for Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing; Mr. Matthew Kellway, M.P. for Beaches–East York; Ms. Kellie Leitch, M.P. for Simcoe–Grey; Mr. Brian Masse, M.P. for Windsor West; Mr. Wayne Marston, M.P. for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek; Ms. Irene Mathysen, M.P. for London Fanshawe; Mr. Gary Schellenberger, M.P. for Perth–Wellington; Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan, M.P. for Scarborough–Rouge River; Mr. Mike Sullivan, M.P. for York South–Weston; Mr. David Tilson, M.P. for Dufferin–Caledon; Mr. Glenn Thibeault, M.P. for Sudbury; and Mr. Mike Wallace, M.P. for Burlington.

The Committee also notes that the statistics found in this report, in respect of estimated regional populations or deviations from the province's electoral quota resultant from an M.P.'s proposal were, in all cases, provided by Elections Canada using current census data.

Electoral Boundary Changes

Northern Ontario

Five of northern Ontario's ten M.P.s appeared as a single panel before the committee. However, their presentations naturally group themselves around two distinct geographical areas, which will be dealt with separately below.

(a) Limits imposed by the decision to award ten ridings to the North.

If the Commission had made the decision to maintain strict conformity to the principle of representation by population, Northern Ontario would have eight districts, rather than the ten that it has been awarded. The Committee does not dispute the Commission's decision to award ten districts to the region, but the Committee thinks it is important to take note of the fact that this decision has an important implication, which—if not clearly acknowledged and carefully managed—has the potential to cause the Commission's recommended boundaries to fail to conform to appropriate considerations of community of interest, ease of service and access to MP services for constituents in some parts of the north. There is even a danger, which the Committee will outline in our discussion of Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing, of making proposals which do not conform with the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

In awarding ten seats to a region with a total population of 832,014, the Commission has created a situation in which every seat is, on average, very close to the minimum permissible limit of 25% below the provincial quota. The average Northern Ontario seat has a population of 83,201 (21.5% below the provincial quota for Ontario). This population is the *de facto* quota for the north.

This means that the amount of leeway available, to allow individual districts to drop below this *de facto* regional quota is very slight. Slight variations in population from one census to the next will have the effect of causing individual districts to drop below the 25% mark, requiring remedial action to be taken. In this case, remedial action amounts to removing communities from adjoining districts in order to boost the population of the district which has fallen below the 25%.

But as one district borrows communities from the next, cascades are created, since they too can be pushed below the 25% level. This can lead to communities being arbitrarily removed from one district, where they are easily serviced and with which they have a natural affinity, and moved into another, where M.P. services are far away and with which they have no community of interest. In short, a too-punctilious, excessively mechanical adherence to the 25% rule can result in the creation of the very situations which the decision to add two extra districts to the north was meant to eliminate.

This can be seen most clearly in the Commission's attempts to add population to Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing. All of its efforts to locate communities on the peripheries of the district met with strong local resistance, and even had they met with approval, the results would only have been to keep the district's population a few dozen souls above the magic 25% line. In the Commission's Proposal, Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing is 24.95% below the Ontario quota. In the Report, with a different set of unwilling communities appended, the district is 24.87% below the provincial quota.

At its hearings in northern Ontario, some presenters suggested, as a way of resolving this kind of problem, that the Commission adopt a separate quota for the districts in their region, thus creating greater flexibility on the downward side. The Commission quite rightly pointed out that the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* does not permit it to do this.

Another suggestion was that the extraordinary circumstances rule in the Act be applied to other electoral districts in the North. The Commission rejected this suggestion in the following words:

While the Commission is willing to recognize that electoral districts in Northern Ontario will have smaller populations than other Ontario electoral districts, it falls that after applying the extraordinary circumstances rule to the electoral district of Kenora, there is sufficient population in the balance of Northern Ontario to create nine electoral districts that are within the maximum allowable negative variance. The decision for Kenora is consistent with the emphasis in the Act on manageable geographic size for sparsely populated, rural or northern regions, and there is no need to make further use of the extraordinary circumstances rule.

The Committee respectfully disagrees with the Commission on this point. The Committee concurs with the Commission that the decision to award ten districts in the region would be impossible, if extra population had not been freed up by invoking the extraordinary circumstances rule in order to permit the electoral district of Kenora to be set at 47.30% below the provincial quota. This was sufficient for the redistribution of 2003. But changes in population in other parts of the North have had the consequence of making it impossible, in this redistribution, to simultaneously keep every

other district above the -25% cut-off, without causing problems of representation so significant that they may not be compatible with the terms of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

The Committees notes that there is no provision in the Act prohibiting the invoking of the extraordinary circumstances rule for more than one district in a province, and the Committees notes as well that all Northern Ontario M.P.s who were asked for their views on the subject indicated that it made sense to them. Finally, the Committee observes that the creation of a second electoral district in Ontario with a population more than 25% below the provincial quota has no implications for representation by population in any part of Ontario, other than the districts of the North. Any considerations in this regard were, essentially, dealt with when this Commission, in keeping with its 2003 predecessor, made the decision to allocate ten districts rather than eight to the North.

(b) Sault Ste. Marie / Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing.

Mr. Bryan Hayes, M.P. for Sault Ste. Marie, proposed changing the boundaries between these districts so that Sault Ste.-Marie would resume the boundaries awarded to it in the 2003 redistribution. His proposal would cause Sault Ste. Marie to retain several townships and geographic townships (with a total population of 6,817) which the Commission’s Report proposes to transfer to Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing.

This change (combined with the Commission’s removal of several towns from the eastern and western extremities of Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing), would change the populations of the two ridings as follows:

- Under the Commission’s report, the population of Sault Ste. Marie is 82,052 (22.7% below the provincial quota). This would rise to 88,869 (16.3% below the provincial quota).
- Under the Commission’s report, the population of Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing is 79,801 (24.87% below the provincial quota). This would drop to 72,984 (31.3% below the provincial quota).

The committee understands that under the provisions of section 15(2) of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, it is permissible to create an electoral district which is more than 25% below the provincial quota only “in circumstances viewed by the commission as being extraordinary.” However, the committee believes that the circumstances relating to these two districts qualify as being extraordinary.

For one thing, section 15 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* stipulates that it is not lawful to move a district’s population further than it already is from the provincial quota, unless this is being done in order:

- (a) to “respect community of interest or community of identity”;
- (b) to respect “the historical pattern of an electoral district”; or
- (c) “in order to maintain a manageable geographic size for districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions.”

The transfer of the relevant townships from Sault Ste. Marie transforms it into the third least-populous riding in Ontario, while simultaneously violating every single one of the criteria laid out in section 15(2): the district which is already, in geographic terms, the second-smallest in the north becomes yet smaller, the historical pattern of the electoral district is disrupted, and community of interest and identity is simply ignored. This last point is emphasized by the Commission itself, on p. 8 of its Report:

The Commission then held a public hearing in Sault Ste. Marie in order to give the public an opportunity to comment on the revised proposal. Not surprisingly, all persons who spoke, with the exception of one, were opposed to the revised proposal. Presenters suggested that, if the Commission needed to find more population, it should be taken from the Sudbury area.

Although the committee believes that the Commission's recommendation for Sault Ste. Marie does not conform with the Act, the committee nonetheless emphasizes its belief that the Commission was conscientious in attempting to locate communities, on the peripheries of Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing, which could be transferred into the district in order to raise its population high enough not to require the Commission to characterize the district's situation as "extraordinary." But one after another, these communities indicated a strong community of interest with one or another of the adjoining districts.

Even before the Commission had issued its Proposal in August 2012, Manitouwadge had indicated a preference to be part of Thunder Bay–Superior North, and the communities along Highway 11 (which had been transferred into Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing in 2003 without being consulted), had indicated a community of interest with Timmins-James Bay.

The Commission respected the wishes of these communities, and attempted, in its Proposal, to boost the population of Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing by adding some communities lying to the south and east of Sudbury. These communities indicated their profound discontent with this suggestion, and the Commission responded by issuing a revised proposal under which these communities were restored to the ridings from which they had been taken, and the townships lying to the east of Sault Ste. Marie were instead transferred into Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing. It was this suggestion which was so soundly rejected at the public meeting noted above.

If the Commission were to follow through on the boundaries contemplated in its Report for these two districts, it would be committing the same mistake for which it criticizes its predecessor. The Commission notes on p. 6 of its report:

[T]he communities along Highway 11 from the Town of Smooth Rock Falls to west of the Town of Hearst were removed from the electoral district of Timmins-James Bay and placed within the boundaries of an electoral district named Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksing. This happened without any notice to these communities. The procedure did not afford them an opportunity to appear at a public hearing or to make written submissions before the report was submitted to the House of Commons.

This Commission holds the view that those communities were effectively denied due process. They were not afforded the opportunity to consider or advise the previous commission of their views on the extent, if any, to which they had a community of interest with or historical attachment to other communities in the electoral districts to which they were ultimately assigned.

The decision to move the townships lying east of Sault Ste. Marie to Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksasing differs from the one described above only in the fact that the residents of these townships were given a chance to express their disapproval of the move, before being forced to participate in it anyway. This too would be a denial of due process.

It truly is an extraordinary circumstance that the following two circumstances have coincided:

- (a) The Commission's obligation, under section 15(2) of the *Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Act*, to not violate community-of-interest considerations in any circumstance where this has the effect of pushing any of the surrounding districts further away from the provincial quota; and
- (b) The failure of an exhaustive search to turn up any towns or townships, on any of Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksasing's peripheries, which regard themselves as having a community of interest with the riding and which therefore could be transferred into the district without falling afoul of section 15(2).

It should be noted that the change proposed by Mr. Hayes has the approval of all affected M.P.s. Based on experience, some of the other M.P.s in attendance at the May 9th meeting of the Committee were clearly worried about a new series of spillover effects. Having been adversely affected by earlier proposals, Mr. Glenn Thibeault (Sudbury), Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins–James Bay) and Ms. Carol Hughes (Algoma–Manitoulin–Kapusksasing) all made written presentations in which they warned against unanticipated changes being made to their districts.

When the discussion which ensued at the Committee's May 9th meeting made it clear that such spillovers were not being proposed by Mr. Hayes, this opposition vanished, and the proposal met with universal support. Several M.P.s, including Mr. Thibeault and Ms. Hughes, stated that they viewed the circumstances in this region as being extraordinary, and several expressed the view that the only impediment to making the adjustments that they regarded as appropriate seemed to be the unwillingness of the Commission to apply this designation to a second northern Ontario riding.

For these reasons, the Committee recommends that the Commission avail itself of the extraordinary circumstances provision to establish another electoral district that exceeds the ordinary deviation of 25%. The Committee supports Mr. Hayes' proposal, and recommends that the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

(c) Nipissing–Timiskaming and Timmins–James Bay

Mr. Jay Aspin, M.P. for Nipissing–Timiskaming, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Nipissing–Timiskaming and Timmins–James Bay. Mr. Aspin's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way: the Townships of Hudson

and Harris as well as that part of Timiskaming, Unorganized, West Part lying west of the westerly boundary of the City of Temiskaming Shores and north of the northern boundaries of the Township of Coleman would be transferred from Timmins–James Bay to Nipissing–Timiskaming.

This area is currently within the district of Nipissing–Timiskaming, according to the 2003 representation order, but the Commission’s Report would transfer it to Timmins–James Bay.

If implemented, Mr. Aspin’s suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 1,058 people from Timmins–James Bay to Nipissing–Timiskaming. As a result, the population of Nipissing–Timiskaming, which is the more populous of the two ridings, would move 1.00 percentage point closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of Timmins–James, which is less populous, would move 1.00 percentage point further from the provincial quota.

The population of Nipissing–Timiskaming would rise from 90,996 (14.33% below the provincial quota) to 92,054 (13.33% below the provincial quota). The population of Timmins–James Bay would drop from 83,104 (21.76% below the provincial quota) to 82,046 (22.75% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Aspin’s proposal is based on the community of interest that the residents of this area share with the City of Temiskaming Shores. He indicated that these communities have always been aligned with the Highway 11 corridor located in Nipissing–Timiskaming.

Mr. Charlie Angus, M.P. for Timmins–James Bay, did not object to Mr. Aspin’s proposal. He informed the Committee that he would be satisfied either way with the Commission’s decision on the matter.

The Committee supports Mr. Aspin’s proposal, and recommends that the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

(d) Northern Ontario – Final Comment

The Commission’s Report refers on two occasions to inappropriate involvement by Members of Parliament in the electoral redistribution process. What the Commission considers inappropriate is not entirely clear, but from its Report, it would seem that it considered inappropriate some statements made by a Member with respect to the ability to effectively represent constituents given a proposed set of boundaries for the riding. It also appears that the Commission called into question some correspondence sent by an association to the Commission that was initiated by a Member. The Committee did not examine the merit of the alleged “inappropriate involvement,” except to say it found that, after examining the Commission’s Report and the evidence before it, nothing inappropriate had been done by any M.P.

The Committee would like, however, to clarify the role of Members of Parliament throughout the redistribution process. As explained above, the Act provides for public consultations on a set of proposed boundaries, and then for the preparation of a Report to be tabled in the House of Commons and against which Members may file an objection. While this last stage is exclusive to Members, it does not preclude their participation in the public consultation process as any other

citizen is entitled to do. Some Members may decide not to participate in the public consultation process for reasons that are entirely their own and from which no negative inference may be drawn. Members who do make submissions at the public hearings provide electoral boundaries commissions with valuable assistance based on their unique perspective as a Member of Parliament who represent communities in existing ridings, and who would potentially have to work with the new electoral boundaries, upon these having been established. The Committee does not believe that submissions made by Members with respect to, for example, the particular challenges to effectively represent constituents given proposed boundaries, amount to inappropriate involvement.

Central South Ontario

(a) Kitchener Centre and Kitchener South–Hespeler

Mr. Woodworth, M.P. for Kitchener Centre, filed an objection to a part of a boundary between Kitchener Centre and the newly created riding of Kitchener South–Hespeler. Mr. Woodworth’s objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way:

Commencing at the easterly extension of Misty Street and the Grand River, the boundary would run westerly along Misty Street to Keewatin Avenue, run Southeast on Keewatin Avenue to Ottawa Street North, run southwest along Ottawa Street to Lackner Boulevard, run south and east along Lackner Boulevard to Fairway Road North, run southwest along Fairway Road North to Sims Estate Drive, run south and east along Sims Estate Drive to Morrison Road, run west and south along Morrison Road to the easterly extension of Quinte Crescent, run east along the easterly extension of Quinte Crescent to the Grand River, run along the Grand River to Highway 8, and run along Highway 8 to the Conestoga Parkway.

If implemented, Mr. Woodworth’s suggested change would have the effect of transferring 2,671 people from Kitchener South–Hespeler to Kitchener Centre. As a result, the population of Kitchener Centre, which is the more populous of the two ridings, would move 2.52 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of Kitchener South–Hespeler, which is the less populous would move 2.56 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Kitchener Centre would rise from 102,433 (3.56% below the provincial quota) to 105,104 (1.04% below the provincial quota). The population of Kitchener South–Hespeler would drop from 97,673 (8.04% below the electoral quota) to 95,002 (10.56% below the provincial quota).

According to Mr. Woodworth, his proposal would place undeveloped portions of this part of south Kitchener, which are slated for development, into the proposed electoral district of Kitchener South–Hespeler, a new riding, while maintaining the unity of developed, established neighbourhoods, by placing these in the proposed electoral district of Kitchener Centre.

Mr. Woodworth explained to the Committee that the residents of the part of south Kitchener where new development was occurring have differing interests and identities than the more established neighbourhoods. The latter also share common historical ties.

Under this proposal, both ridings would have a variance well within the maximum allowable deviation from the provincial quota. Further, according to Mr. Woodworth, these deviations would be in line with predicted future growth trends for that part of south Kitchener, and would leave the riding which is more likely to experience future growth with a slightly larger negative deviation from the province's electoral quota. This outcome would be in line with the Commission's Report, in which it is stated that the Commission was cognizant of projected population growth in the region surrounding Kitchener and established electoral districts in these regions of the province that provided some flexibility for such growth.

Mr. Woodworth indicated to the Committee that while his proposal did not affect the riding configurations for neighbouring M.P.s, he nonetheless consulted with them (Mr. Harold Albrecht, M.P. for Kitchener–Conestoga and Mr. Peter Braid, M.P. for Kitchener–Waterloo) and both supported his proposal. His proposal also had the support of the mayor of Kitchener.

The Committee finds Mr. Woodworth's proposal to be minor yet logical, and to be in line with rules as provided for by section 15 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*. As such, the Committee supports Mr. Woodworth's proposal, and recommends the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

(b) Cambridge and Kitchener South–Hespeler

Mr. Gary Goodyear, M.P. for Cambridge, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Cambridge and Kitchener South–Hespeler. Mr. Goodyear's objection would cause the whole of the village of Hespeler to be transferred from Kitchener South–Hespeler to Cambridge.

If implemented, Mr. Goodyear's suggested change would have the effect of transferring 24,955 people from Kitchener South–Hespeler to Cambridge. As a result, the population of Kitchener South–Hespeler, which is the less populous of the two ridings, would move 23.41 percentage points further from to the provincial quota, while the riding of Cambridge, which is the more populous, would move 23.41 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Cambridge would rise from 111,693 (5.16% above the provincial quota) to 136,648 (28.65% above the provincial quota). The population of Kitchener South–Hespeler would drop from 97,673 (8.04% below the electoral quota) to 72,718 (31.45% below the provincial quota).

According to Mr. Goodyear, Hespeler's community of interest is with Cambridge, of which it is a vital part. He indicated that in 1973, the communities of Hespeler, Galt and Preston were amalgamated under the Cambridge name. The new city spent a great deal of time and effort to bring unity to Cambridge and overcome the resistance felt by these communities to the amalgamation. Mr. Goodyear indicated that, in his view, removing Hespeler from the electoral district of Cambridge would add to this historic tension, causing further division in the city.

Mr. Goodyear indicated that as Hespeler formed part of the Cambridge riding in the Commission's initial Proposal, he had no reason to present this argument during the Commission's public consultations. He further indicated that he had conferred with his colleagues in the area concerning

the domino effect of his proposal. Mr. Goodyear stated that he felt his proposal was manageable, and in the best interests of the entire community of Cambridge.

The Committee refers Mr. Goodyear's proposal to the Commission for its consideration.

Halton, Hamilton and Niagara

(a) Haldimand–Norfolk and Brant

Ms. Diane Finley, M.P. for Haldimand–Norfolk, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Haldimand–Norfolk and Brant. Ms. Finley's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered by one concession block, at the approximate intersection of 4th Line and Oneida Road. This block would be transferred from Brant into Haldimand–Norfolk.

According to Ms. Finley, the population effects of her proposal were negligible as only one elector resided in this block.

In its Report, the Commission stated that the boundaries of the electoral district of Haldimand–Norfolk remain unchanged from the 2003 electoral boundary readjustment process. Despite this statement, the Commission proposed the above alteration.

Ms. Finley objected to this change, stating that it represented an unnecessary disruption to constituents affected by the new boundaries. In her objection, she cited the Commission's indication that it held a strong preference and intention to maintain existing geopolitical boundaries wherever and whenever possible.

In her appearance before the Committee, Ms. Finley indicated she would like to receive clarity from the Commission as to whether, in terms of official geopolitical boundaries, the one concession block belonged to Haldimand County, in which case she indicated that it belonged in Haldimand–Norfolk, or whether the concession block belonged to the Six Nations reserve, in which case she indicated the area ought to be placed in Brant.

Ms. Finley further indicated that her proposal had the support of Mr. Phil McColeman, M.P. for Brant. It was not noted whether or not Ms. Finley had presented her proposal to the Commission at the public hearings.

As this proposal seeks clarity concerning the territorial integrity of an electoral district, and has practically no ramifications on population or geography, the Committee supports it.

(b) City of Hamilton

The Committee would like to call to the Commission's attention to the fact that it received a letter signed by all of the five M.P.s who currently represent the City of Hamilton (Mr. Dean Allison, M.P. for Niagara West–Glanbrook; Ms. Chris Charlton, M.P. for Hamilton Mountain; Mr. David Christopherson, M.P. for Hamilton Centre; Mr. Wayne Marston, M.P. for Hamilton–East–Stoney Creek and Mr. David Sweet, M.P. for Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale). This letter

expressed their full support for the electoral boundaries for the City of Hamilton as presented in Commission's Report. For its part, the Committee wishes to be clear that it supports the boundaries for the City of Hamilton as proposed by the Commission in its Report and does not support any changes to these proposed electoral boundaries.

(c) St. Catharines, Niagara West and Niagara Centre

Three M.P.s filed objections concerning the proposed electoral districts of St. Catharines, Niagara West and Niagara Centre.

Mr. Malcolm Allen, M.P. for Welland, filed a submission with the Committee which stated his agreement with the revised electoral boundaries in the Commission's Report. Mr. Allen expressed a desire to appear before the Committee should any proposal have an impact on the proposed electoral district of Niagara Centre.

Mr. Allen provided information to the Committee to support his view that the revised boundaries in the Commission's Report ought to be retained. He indicated that the communities of interest of the Niagara peninsula were, in his view, configured in a north-south direction, citing as examples the Welland Canal, Highway 406, and the arterial roads and infrastructure of the region. Mr. Allen also indicated that the mayors of Welland and Port Colborne supported the Commission's revised proposal. Further, he stated that the business associations and Chambers of Commerce of Thorold and Fort Erie made submissions to the Commission at the public hearings indicating their desire to be aligned with the communities to their north, and not along an east-west axis. Mr. Allen also commented that, in his view, the south end of St. Catharines did form a community of identity with communities to its south as it had been a part of an electoral district with Welland and Thorold for approximately four decades.

Mr. Dean Allison, M.P. for Niagara West–Glanbrook and Mr. Rick Dykstra, M.P. for St. Catharines, submitted written objections to the Committee with specific boundary adjustments which differed from their ultimate oral testimony before the Committee. By the end of the Committee hearing, the two M.P.s took the view that the communities of interest of the Niagara peninsula would be best represented by retaining the current electoral boundaries (proposal one). Their second preference was for the Commission to use its initial Proposal for the electoral boundaries of the Niagara peninsula (proposal two).

Proposal one, if implemented, would have the effect of:

- Adding 1,419 people to St. Catharines; as a result the population of the riding would move 1.33 percentage points further from the provincial quota;
- Adding 35,601 people to Niagara West; as a result the population of the riding would move 3.54 percentage points closer to the provincial quota; and
- Adding 6,867 people to Niagara Centre; as a result the population of the riding would move 5.8 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

These suggested changes would have the following effect on the population of the ridings:

- The population of St. Catharines would rise from 110,596 (4.13% above the provincial quota) to 112,015 (5.46% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Niagara West would rise from 86,533 (18.53% below the provincial quota) to 122,134 (14.99% above the provincial quota); and
- The population of Niagara Centre would rise from 105,860 (0.33% below the provincial quota) to 112,727 (6.13% above the provincial quota).

Proposal one would not affect Niagara Falls.

Proposal two, if implemented, would have the effect of:

- Adding 1,419 people to St. Catharines; as a result the population of the riding would move 1.33 percentage points further from the provincial quota;
- Adding 29,030 people to Niagara West; as a result the population of the riding would move 9.73 percentage points closer to the provincial quota;
- Subtracting 489 people from Niagara Centre; as a result the population of the riding would move 0.46 percentage points further from the provincial quota; and
- Subtracting 29,960 people from Niagara Falls; as a result the population of the riding would move 13.49 percentage points closer to the provincial quota.

These suggested changes would have the following effect on the population of the ridings:

- The population of St. Catharines would rise from 110,596 (4.13% above the provincial quota) to 112,015 (5.46% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Niagara West would rise from 86,533 (18.53% below the provincial quota) to 115,563 (8.80% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Niagara Centre would fall from 105,860 (0.33% below the provincial quota) to 105,371 (0.79% below the provincial quota); and
- The population of Niagara Falls would fall from 128,357 (20.85% above the provincial quota) to 88,397 (7.36% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Dykstra submitted that just as Niagara Falls, Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie were communities of interest left whole within a riding, in his view, St. Catharines represented a clear community of interest with common concerns, and he did not want it to be separated into three ridings. Mr. Dykstra indicated that the Commission's initial Proposal, which provided for minimal boundary changes, was supported by the community of St. Catharines. He provided to the

Committee results from a survey he conducted which showed that over 1,200 respondents in his community want the current electoral boundaries to be retained for St. Catharines, while only 17 respondents supported a boundary change.

Mr. Allison indicated to the Committee that his main concern was the population disparities between the proposed electoral districts of the Niagara peninsula, citing that Niagara West would have its population decline from 115,000 individuals to 85,000 individuals. In his view, the Commission's initial Proposal provided for a better balance of populations between proposed electoral districts, as compared to its revised proposal. Mr. Allison further indicated that, in his view, the southern part of St. Catharines did not share a community of interest with Thorold and Welland.

Both proposals would also affect neighbouring ridings, and the Committee has not ascertained the views of the M.P.s from those ridings.

The Committee refers these objections to the Commission for its disposal.

Georgian Bay, Barrie and Simcoe

(a) York–Simcoe and Barrie–Innisfil

Mr. Peter Van Loan, M.P. for York–Simcoe filed an objection to a part of the boundary between York–Simcoe and Barrie–Innisfil. Mr. Van Loan's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way:

The boundary, which is the southern municipal boundary of the town of Innisfil, would shift north to 4 Line (also called Killarney Beach Road).

If implemented, Mr. Van Loan's suggested change would have the effect of transferring 4,707 people from Barrie–Innisfil to York–Simcoe. As a result, the population of Barrie–Innisfil would move 4.43 percentage points further from the provincial quota, while the riding of York–Simcoe would move 4.43 percentage points closer to the provincial quota.

The population of York–Simcoe would rise from 94,616 (10.92% below the provincial quota) to 99,313 (6.49% below the provincial quota). The population of Barrie–Innisfil would drop from 101,584 (4.36% below the electoral quota) to 96,877 (8.79% below the provincial quota).

According to Mr. Van Loan's objection, this adjustment would better reflect the personal relationships and community affinities of the people living in the area. Mr. Van Loan explained to the Committee that residents of that part of south Innisfil oriented their day-to-day activities, including school attendance, health services, sports, community groups and associations, toward communities to their south (such as, Bradford West Gwillimbury).

Mr. Van Loan submitted that residents of south Innisfil also had historical linkages to communities to the south. The municipal boundary line changed in 1991. Thus, many of the residents within what is now the southern area of Innisfil maintain significant ties to communities south of Innisfil.

Mr. Van Loan suggested that 4 Line would represent a better “watershed” in people’s behaviour, as compared to the southern municipal boundary of Innisfil.

Mr. Van Loan indicated that his proposal had the support of the majority of the population affected by the change, along with that of community leaders and Mr. Patrick Brown, M.P. for Barrie. The Committee considers Mr. Van Loan’s proposal to be modest, logical and in line with the rules provided for by section 15 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*. As such, the Committee supports Mr. Van Loan’s proposal, and recommends the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

Brampton and Mississauga

(a) Brampton South, Brampton West, Brampton North and Brampton East

Mr. Parm Gill, M.P. for Brampton–Springdale, and Mr. Kyle Seeback, M.P. for Brampton West, filed objections that would affect the boundaries of Brampton South, Brampton West, Brampton North and Brampton East.

Mr. David Tilson, M.P. for Dufferin–Caledon, also filed an objection with the Committee stating his agreement with the Commission’s Report, and expressing his desire to appear should any proposal have an impact on the proposed electoral district of for Dufferin–Caledon; neither Mr. Seeback nor Mr. Gill’s proposals would affect Dufferin–Caledon.

Mr. Seeback’s objection would cause the boundary between Brampton West and Brampton South to be altered in the following way: Northwood Park, an area described by Mr. Seeback as the neighbourhood bordered by Queen Street West, Chinguacousy Road, Flowertown Avenue, and McLaughlin Road North would be transferred from Brampton West to Brampton South.

Mr. Gill’s objection would cause the boundary between Brampton West, Brampton North and Brampton East to be altered in the following way: firstly, the area that is “west of Highway 10, along Walness Drive going west, and then north along the Brampton Orangeville Railway Line, east along Collingwood Rd, and connecting back with Highway 10” would be transferred from Brampton West to Brampton North; secondly, the area south of Sandalwood Parkway, east of Bramalea Road, west of Torbram Road, and north of Bovaird Drive would be transferred from Brampton North to Brampton East.

If implemented, Mr. Seeback’s suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 5,692 people from Brampton West to Brampton South. If implemented, Mr. Gill’s suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 6,606 people from Brampton West to Brampton North, and 15,590 people from Brampton North to Brampton East. These changes would:

- Add 5,692 people to Brampton South; as a result the population of the riding would move 5.36 percentage points further from the provincial quota;
- Subtract 12,298 people to Brampton West; as a result the population of the riding would move 7.25 percentage points further from the provincial quota;

- Subtract 8,984 people to Brampton North; as a result the population of the riding would move 8.46 percentage points further from the provincial quota; and
- Add 15,590 people to Brampton East; as a result the population of the riding would move 2.14 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Brampton South would rise from 107,364 (1.08% above the provincial quota) to 113,056 (6.44% above the provincial quota); the population of Brampton West would drop from 108,368 (2.03% above the provincial quota) to 96,070 (9.55% below the provincial quota); the population of Brampton North would drop from 105,345 (0.82% below the provincial quota) to 96,361 (9.28% below the provincial quota); and the population of Brampton East would rise from 99,712 (6.12% below the provincial quota) to 115,302 (8.56% above the provincial quota).

In support of his objection, Mr. Seeback indicated that Northwood Park has been historically linked with the downtown core of Brampton where people go for shopping and entertainment. He explained that the residents of Northwood Park were attached to the downtown part of Brampton, and that he has their support in making his objection. Mr. Seeback also noted that Northwood Park and the downtown core of Brampton were included in the same electoral districts at the municipal and provincial levels.

Mr. Seeback's proposal would affect two proposed electoral districts: Brampton West and Brampton South. The area to be included in these proposed electoral districts is currently located within the electoral district of Brampton West, whose representative is Mr. Seeback.

The Committee supports Mr. Seeback's proposal and recommends that the Commission adjust the electoral boundaries accordingly.

In support of his first proposal, Mr. Gill stated that the boundary between Brampton West and Brampton North proposed by the Commission's Report would divide the Snelgrove community into two ridings. Mr. Gill indicated that his proposed change would "keep the community of Snelgrove within the boundaries of Brampton North in order to maintain community interest and keep the community united under one riding."

In support of his second proposal, Mr. Gill indicated that a community of interest existed between the neighbourhood described above and the adjacent neighbourhoods in the district of Brampton East. He also noted that they shared the same schooling system.

Mr. Gill informed the Committee that his proposals result from demands from the local communities. He also provided the Committee with letters of support from Mr. Seeback, M.P. for Brampton West, and Mr. Bal Gosal, M.P. for Bramalea–Gore–Malton, in support of his proposals.

The Committee supports Mr. Gill's proposals, and recommends that the Commission adjust the electoral boundaries accordingly. The Committee notes that while Mr. Gill is a member of the Committee, he recused himself and did not participate in the proceedings of the Committee relating to the examination of his own objection.

(b) Mississauga East–Cooksville, Mississauga North and Mississauga Centre

Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon, M.P. for Mississauga East–Cooksville, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Mississauga East–Cooksville, Mississauga North and the newly created Mississauga Centre.

Mr. Lizon’s objection would cause the boundaries of Mississauga East–Cooksville to be as follows: the area bordered by Eglinton Avenue to the northwest, the Etobicoke Creek to the northeast, the Queensway to the southeast, and Hurontario Street to the southwest. This change would affect Mississauga Centre and Mississauga North.

If implemented, Mr. Lizon’s suggested change would have the effect of transferring 30,168 people from Mississauga East–Cooksville to Mississauga Centre; 16,852 people from Mississauga Centre to Mississauga East–Cooksville; and 8,002 from Mississauga North to Mississauga East–Cooksville. As a result, the population of Mississauga East–Cooksville, would move 5.01 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, Mississauga Centre would move 12.54 percentage points further from the provincial quota, and Mississauga North would move 7.53 percentage points closer to the provincial quota.

The population of Mississauga East–Cooksville would drop from 121,792 (14.67% above the provincial quota) to 116,478 (9.66% above the provincial quota). The population of Mississauga Centre would rise from 118,756 (11.81% above the electoral quota) to 132,072 (24.35% above the provincial quota). The population of Mississauga North would drop from 118,046 (11.14% above the provincial quota) to 110,044 (3.61% above the provincial quota).

According to Mr. Lizon, extensive development has occurred at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Hurontario Street (the heart of Cooksville). In his view, as a result of this development, the village of Cooksville no longer exists in the form that it once did, nor does it remain comparable, as a community of interest, to the villages in Mississauga of Streetsville, Port Credit or Clarkson.

Mr. Lizon proposed that the Commission use Hurontario Street as the southwestern boundary for Mississauga East–Cooksville. This is the boundary which the Commission used in its initial Proposal. Mr. Lizon indicated that Hurontario Street has historically served as a dividing line in Mississauga. He submitted that this boundary would maintain a community of interest of similar neighbourhoods constructed in the same era, and which are unique in Mississauga.

Mr. Lizon indicated that all five sitting Mississauga M.P.s supported his submission. As Mr. Lizon’s proposal remains within the deviations provided for in the Act and is supported by all M.P.s affected by it, the Committee supports Mr. Lizon’s proposal.

(c) Mississauga–Erin Mills and Mississauga Centre

Mr. Bob Dechert, M.P. for Mississauga–Erindale, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Mississauga–Erin Mills and Mississauga Centre. Mr. Dechert’s objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way:

Commencing at the intersection of the Credit River and Burnhamthorpe Road West, the northeastern boundary would run northeast along Burnhamthorpe Road West to Erindale Station Road, and run southeast along Erindale Station Road to Dundas Street West.

If implemented, Mr. Dechert’s suggested change would have the effect of transferring 10,070 people from Mississauga Centre to Mississauga–Erin Mills. As a result, the population of Mississauga–Erin Mills would move 9.48 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of Mississauga Centre would move 9.48 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Mississauga–Erin Mills would rise from 117,199 (10.34% above the provincial quota) to 127,269 (19.82% above the provincial quota). The population of Mississauga Centre would drop from 118,756 (11.81% above the electoral quota) to 108,686 (2.33% above the provincial quota).

Mr. Dechert submitted that using the Credit River as the electoral district’s northeastern boundary divided a community of identity which was based on similar home size, value, age and demographics, and which had historically been placed within the same federal, provincial and municipal boundaries. According to Mr. Dechert, communities on either side of the Credit River attended common churches/chapels/temples, schools, shopping malls, post offices, and other social activities.

Mr. Dechert indicated that all five sitting Mississauga M.P.s supported his submission. As Mr. Dechert’s proposal remains within the deviation provided for in the Act and is supported by all M.P.s affected by it, the Committee supports Mr. Dechert’s proposal, and recommends the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

City of Toronto

(a) York Centre and Willowdale

Mr. Mark Adler, M.P. for York Centre, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between York Centre and Willowdale. Mr. Adler’s objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way: the area bordered by Steeles Avenue to the north; Cactus Avenue, Peckham Avenue, and Grantbrook Street to the east, the Hydro Right of Way to the south; and Bathurst Street to the west would be transferred from Willowdale to York Centre.

If implemented, Mr. Adler’s suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 7,161 people from Willowdale to York Centre. As a result, the population of York Centre would move 4.44 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the population of Willowdale would

move 0.22 percentage points further from the provincial quota. The population of York Centre would rise from 100,277 (5.59% below the provincial quota) to 107,438 (1.15% above the provincial quota). The population of Willowdale would drop from 109,680 (3.26% above the provincial quota) to 102,519 (3.48% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Alder indicated that the boundary proposed by the Report of the Commission would divide a Jewish and Russian-speaking community into two different electoral districts. Mr. Adler stated in his objection that the proposed boundaries unduly disrupted the cohesion of these ethnic communities and adversely affected their ability to remain co-ordinated, influential and well-represented. Mr. Adler submitted a number of letters from leaders of the affected communities indicating their support for his proposal. Mr. Chungsen Leung, M.P. for Willowdale, also indicated his agreement for Mr. Adler's proposal.

The Committee notes that Mr. Alder's proposal would bring both electoral districts of York Centre and Willowdale closer to the electoral quota.

The Committee supports Mr. Adler's proposal, and recommends that the Commission adjust the boundary between the proposed electoral districts of York Centre and Willowdale accordingly.

(b) University–Rosedale, Spadina–Fort York, Toronto Centre and St. Paul's

Ms. Olivia Chow, M.P. for Trinity–Spadina, filed an objection to the boundaries of University–Rosedale, Spadina–Fort York, Toronto Centre, and St. Paul's. Ms. Chow's objection would cause the boundary between these ridings to be altered substantially; two new electoral districts would result from her proposal: University–St. Clair and St. Paul's–Rosedale, the boundaries of these new ridings are described in Appendix A. The boundaries between the ridings of Spadina–Fort York, and Toronto Centre would be altered in the following way: the area bordered by The Esplanade, and Mill Street to the north; Don Valley Parkway to the east; Gardiner Expressway to the south; and Yonge Street to the west would be transferred from Spadina–Fort York to Toronto Centre; and the area bordered by Dundas Street to the north; Yonge Street to the east, Front Street to the south, and Bay Street to the west would be transferred from Toronto Centre to Spadina–Fort York. Also, the area bordered by College Street to the north; Yonge Street to the east; Dundas Street to the south, and University Avenue to the west would be transferred from University–Rosedale to be transferred to the riding of Spadina–Fort York.

If Ms. Chow's suggested changes were to be implemented, the population of Toronto Centre would rise from 93,971 (11.53% below the electoral quota) to 99,486 (6.33% below the provincial quota). The population of Spadina–Fort York would rise from 82,480 (22.34% below the electoral quota) to 83,005 (21.85% below the provincial quota). As a result, the population of Toronto Centre would move 5.2 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the population of Spadina–Fort York would move 0.49 percentage points closer to the provincial quota. The population of the newly created riding of University–St. Clair would be 101,606 (4.34% below the provincial quota), and the population of the newly created riding of St. Paul's–Rosedale would be 95,903 (9.71% below the provincial quota).

In addition to a detailed description of the new electoral districts she is proposing, Ms. Chow's written submission to the Committee included a map with the proposed new boundaries. The changes proposed by Ms. Chow would substantially modify the electoral map south of Highway No. 401. The east-west configuration of the electoral districts of St. Paul's and University–Rosedale would be replaced by a north-to-east configuration. The electoral districts, as a result of these changes, would be renamed University–St. Clair and St. Paul's–Rosedale.

Ms. Chow's proposal is based on community of interest. The purpose of her proposal is to group together the neighbourhoods with similar demographics and economic interests, neighbourhoods with similar built form, and facing similar challenges such as poverty. She suggested that her proposal would also unite a post-secondary student community, as well as arts and culture communities. For example, she proposed that the neighbourhoods of Forest Hill, Rosedale, and Casa Loma, with high average and median household incomes, be grouped together in the proposed riding of St. Paul's–Rosedale. The proposals indicated communities of interest will be better maintained in the Italian and aboriginal communities under this proposal. She also indicated that Vaughan Road was a natural boundary line; the proposal she made used Vaughn Road for the boundary between the proposed districts of University–St. Clair and St. Paul's–Rosedale.

Ms. Carolyn Bennett, M.P. for St. Paul's, sent a letter to the Committee strongly objecting the proposal formulated by Ms. Chow. She stated her support for the boundaries as proposed by the Commission and indicated that the boundaries proposed by Ms. Chow would divide natural neighbourhoods. She also indicated that there was no public support for such a proposal. She expressed the view that it would be inappropriate to make significant changes to electoral boundaries at this stage of the process where public consultation can no longer take place.

The Committee refers Ms. Chow's proposal to the Commission for its consideration.

(c) Toronto Centre and Spadina–Fort York

Mr. Bob Rae, M.P. for Toronto Centre, filed an objection to parts of the boundary between Toronto Centre and Spadina–Fort York. Mr. Rae's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way: the area bordered by The Esplanade, and Mill Street to the north; Don Valley Parkway to the east; Gardiner Expressway to the south; and Yonge Street to the west would be transferred from Spadina–Fort York to Toronto Centre; and the area bordered by Dundas Street to the north; Yonge Street to the east, Front Street to the south, and Bay Street to the west would be transferred from Toronto–Centre to Spadina–Fort York.

If implemented, Mr. Rae's suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 5,515 people from Spadina–Fort York to Toronto Centre. As a result, the population of Toronto Centre, which is the more populous of the two ridings, would move 5.2 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of Spadina–Fort York, which is less populous, would move 5.2 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Toronto Centre would rise from 93,971 (11.53% below the electoral quota) to 99,486 (6.33% below the provincial quota). The population of Spadina–Fort York would drop from 82,480 (22.34% below the electoral quota) to 76,965 (27.54% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Rae's objection proposed to move further south from The Esplanade, and Mill Street to the Gardiner Expressway the southern boundary of Toronto Centre. This change would prevent the St. Lawrence neighbourhood from being divided. Mr. Rae indicated that the very active St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association comprised a community of interest, and that the boundary proposed in the Report would split the association and the St. Lawrence market.

The proposal made by Mr. Rae would transfer population from Spadina–Fort York to Toronto Centre. The riding of Spadina–Fort York has a –22.34% deviation from the electoral quota, and the change proposed by Mr. Rae would result in a deviation higher than the one permitted by the Act. To “compensate” Spadina–Fort York for this loss of population and to keep it within the authorized variance, Mr. Rae proposed to move the area between Dundas Street, Yonge Street, Front Street, and Bay Street into Spadina–Fort York. Mr. Rae explained that there was a high rate of mobility in this downtown community, and would equally fit in either electoral districts. However, according to the census data provided by Elections Canada to the Committee, this change would not be sufficient and the population of Spadina–Fort York would still be below the maximum deviation allowed by the Act.

The Committee notes that Mr. Rae and Ms. Chow's proposals, in relation to the boundaries of the proposed electoral district of Toronto Centre, do not contradict one another. Indeed, Ms. Chow expressed agreement in principle with the suggestion put forward by Mr. Rae, but was concerned about the resulting population and deviation from the electoral quota.

The Committee recognizes that Mr. Rae's proposal addresses a legitimate community of interest consideration, however, the Committee cannot support this proposal as it results in a deviation from the provincial quota for Spadina–Fort York, which exceeds the limit for deviations, in ordinary circumstances, as set out in section 15 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

(d) Eglinton–Lawrence, St. Paul's and York South–Weston

Mr. Joe Oliver, M.P. for Eglinton–Lawrence, filed an objection to the boundaries between Eglinton–Lawrence, St. Paul's and York South–Weston.

Mr. Oliver's objection would cause the boundaries between these ridings to be altered in the following way: the area bordered by the Highway No. 401 to the north; Allen Street to the east; Eglinton Avenue to the south; and the Canadian National-GO Transit Railway to the west would be transferred from Eglinton–Lawrence to York South–Weston; and the area bordered by Eglinton Avenue, Yonge Street, and Broadway Avenue to the north; Mount Pleasant Road and the southern boundary of Mount Pleasant Cemetery to the east; St. Claire Avenue East to the south; and Strathearn Road, and Bathurst Road to the west would be transferred from St. Paul's to Eglinton–Lawrence.

If implemented, Mr. Oliver's suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 30,887 people from Eglinton–Lawrence to York South–Weston, and 54,587 people from St. Paul's to Eglinton–Lawrence. As a result, the population of Eglinton–Lawrence would move 22.31 percentage points further from the provincial quota, the population of York South–Weston

would move 29.08 percentage points further from the provincial quota, and the population of St. Paul's would move 51.39 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Eglinton–Lawrence would rise from 113,150 (6.53% above the provincial quota) to 136,850 (28.84% above the provincial quota). The population of York South–Weston would rise from 116,606 (9.79% above the provincial quota) to 147,493 (38.87% above the provincial quota). The population of St. Paul's would drop from 103,393 (2.10% below the provincial quota) to 49,396 (53.49% below the provincial quota).

The purpose of Mr. Oliver's proposal is to unite the Forest Hill community into one electoral district. He indicated that the communities of the Upper and Lower Village of Forest Hill have "close cultural, religious and community ties" and noted the strong ties between Forest Hill and the Jewish community.

The change respecting the boundary between Eglinton–Lawrence and York South–Weston was presumably proposed so that the population of Eglinton–Lawrence would remain within the parameters authorized by the Act. However, as the numbers above indicate, Eglinton–Lawrence would nonetheless be above the authorized 25% deviation authorized under the Act. Moreover, the deviation of York South–Weston and St. Paul's would also be beyond the authorized deviation under the Act.

Mr. Oliver's proposal was met with significant objection from other Members. Ms. Carolyn Bennett, M.P. for St. Paul's, in a letter to the Committee referred to the changes proposed as "drastic," and Mr. Mike Sullivan, M.P. for York South–Weston, objected to Mr. Oliver's proposal based on the community of interest criterion; he also informed the Committee that, if the changes proposed by Mr. Oliver were implemented, the electoral district of York South–Weston, would be above the allowed deviation of 25%, which, as the numbers above indicate, is indeed the case.

The Committee cannot support Mr. Oliver's proposal as it results in deviations from the provincial quota for Eglinton–Lawrence, York South–Weston, and St. Paul's, which exceed the limit for deviations, in ordinary circumstances, as set out in section 15 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

(e) Don Valley West and University–Rosedale

Mr. John Carmichael, M.P. for Don Valley West, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Don Valley West and the newly created riding of University–Rosedale.

Mr. Carmichael's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way: the neighbourhoods known as Bennington Heights (bordered by Moore Avenue to the north, Bayview Avenue to the northeast, the railway to the southeast, and the Moore Park Ravin to the southwest) and Governor's Bridge (bordered by Bayview Avenue to the north, northeast, and east, the Moore Park Ravine to the south and southwest, and the railway to the northwest) would be transferred from University–Rosedale to Don Valley West.

If implemented, Mr. Carmichael's suggested changes would have the effect of transferring 1,421 people from University–Rosedale to Don Valley West. As a result, the population of Don Valley West would move 1.33 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of University–Rosedale would move 1.34 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Don Valley West would rise from 98,859 (6.92% below the provincial quota) to 100,280 (5.59% below the provincial quota). The population of University–Rosedale would drop from 99,566 (6.26% below the provincial quota) to 98,145 (7.60% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Carmichael's proposal is based on community of interest. He indicated that most residents of Bennington Heights and Governor's Bridge travel to Leaside, located in Don Valley West, for their shopping, entertainment, sports, parks and other public services, such as schools. Mr. Carmichael informed the Committee that, at the municipal level, Bennington Heights and Governor's Bridge have been historically, and remain, linked with the northeast communities located in the district of Don Valley West. He also indicated that the Moore Park ravine forms a natural barrier between these neighbourhoods and Rosedale, and that the only direct connection between Bennington Heights and Governor's Bridge and the proposed electoral district of University–Rosedale was via a footbridge.

Bennington Heights is currently, that is according to the representation order of 2003, within the district of Don Valley West, and Governor's Bridge in the district of Toronto Centre. The latter electoral district would be divided into two electoral districts by the Commission's Report: the proposed electoral district of Toronto Centre and that of University–Rosedale. The current M.P. for Toronto–Centre, Mr. Bob Rae, observed during his appearance before the Committee that some residents of Governor's Bridge identified themselves with Rosedale but did not object in stronger terms.

The Committee supports Mr. Carmichael's proposal to the Commission, and recommends the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

Scarborough

(a) Scarborough – General Comments

Six M.P.s filed objections to ridings in the City of Scarborough. Two of these, Mr. Dan Harris, M.P. for Scarborough Southwest and Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan, M.P. for Scarborough–Rouge River filed submissions which indicated their agreement with the Commission's Report.

Four of these, Mr. Corneliu Chisu, M.P. for Pickering–Scarborough East, Ms. Roxanne James, M.P. for Scarborough Centre, Mr. Jim Karygiannis, M.P. for Scarborough–Agincourt, and Mr. John McKay, M.P. for Scarborough–Guildwood, filed objections to the boundaries of the ridings of the City of Scarborough. Their objections (henceforth referred to as "Ms. James' proposal") would cause the boundaries of these ridings to be altered in the following way:

- The Commission’s initial Proposal for the proposed electoral boundaries for the ridings of Scarborough would replace those proposed in the Commission’s Report, with the modifications set out below;
- The Bendale community (approximately situated between Midland Avenue, Bellamy Road, Highway 401 and Lawrence Avenue) be transferred into Scarborough Centre from Scarborough–Guildwood;
- The southeast area known as South Cedarbrae (McCowan Park below Lawrence Avenue, running south along Danforth Road to its intersection with Eglinton Avenue) be transferred into Scarborough–Guildwood from Scarborough Centre;
- The electoral district of Scarborough Southwest retain its current boundary configuration.

In its consideration of M.P.s’ objections, the Committee has endeavored to provide the Commission with a “before” and “after” analysis of the effect on population of ridings affected by a given proposal. In this case, however, the Committee is unable to do so as five of the six ridings differ significantly between the Commission’s Report and Ms. James’ proposal (the exception being Scarborough Southwest, which would remain unchanged from its current configuration). For example, Scarborough–Guildwood, a riding included in Ms. James’ proposal cannot be compared to a riding as proposed in the Commission’s Report as, in the Commission’s Report, Scarborough–Guildwood was divided between two neighbouring ridings and ceased to exist. The following analysis may, nonetheless, be of use to the Commission:

Under the Commission’s Report:

- Scarborough–Agincourt has a population of 101,411 (4.52% below the provincial quota);
- Scarborough East has a population of 99,981 (5.87% below the provincial quota);
- Scarborough Centre has a population of 111,503 (4.98% above the provincial quota);
- Scarborough–Rouge has a population of 102,270 (3.71% below the provincial quota); and
- Scarborough–Wexford has a population of 101,840 (4.12% below the provincial quota);

Under Ms. James’ proposal:

- Scarborough–Agincourt has a population of 104,499 (1.61% below the provincial quota);
- Scarborough East has a population of 102,646 (3.36% below the provincial quota);
- Scarborough Centre has a population of 101,850 (4.11% below the provincial quota);
- Scarborough–Guildwood has a population of 106,930 (0.68% above the provincial quota); and
- Scarborough–North has a population of 101,080 (4.83% below the provincial quota);

Scarborough Southwest has a population of 108,693 (2.33% above the provincial quota) under both the Commission’s Report and Ms. James’ proposal.

The Committee recognizes the difficulties that the Commission faced in readjusting the City of Scarborough's electoral districts. Every sitting M.P. from Scarborough appeared before the Committee. The Committee has heard that a Scarborough riding must span Highway 401 at some point; that substantial population growth has occurred in Scarborough, although not necessarily uniformly throughout; that communities of interest and identity, both new and historic must be maintained; that a split municipality riding is not in the best interest of Scarborough residents; and that Rouge Park is a jewel of the city.

In testimony before the Committee, the subject of political influence during the public hearing stage of the electoral boundaries readjustment process, along with other more strongly worded allegations against the Commission, was broached by one M.P. The Committee would like to state unequivocally that nothing in the record suggests bias or any other improper behaviour on the part of any member of the Commission, and it strongly dissociates itself from the views of the M.P. who accused the Commission of wrongdoing as well as from his effort during the Committee hearing to represent that a colleague M.P. shared his view.

The Committee lastly notes the appearance of Mr. Harris before the Committee. Mr. Harris provided useful information concerning Scarborough to the Committee, while also stating his support for the Commission's revised electoral boundaries proposal.

The Committee refers the objections filed by the M.P.s from the City of Scarborough to the Commission for its consideration.

(b) Scarborough East, Scarborough–Rouge, Scarborough–Agincourt, Scarborough Centre and Scarborough–Wexford

Mr. Corneliu Chisu proposed the boundaries for Scarborough East in what concerned the Rouge Park area be those in the Commission's initial Proposal, as these boundaries respected the unity of established communities, along with natural and historic boundaries. In Mr. Chisu's view, this proposal also acted as a natural interface between Scarborough East and Pickering–Uxbridge in terms of major transportation considerations.

According to Mr. Chisu, the new and vibrant communities in east Scarborough, north of Highway 401, shared similar interests and identities with those south of Highway 401. In its Report, however, a riding in east Scarborough no longer straddles Highway 401. Mr. Chisu suggested that the employment of the 401 as a boundary to the ridings in the Durham region acted as an illogical and artificial obstacle.

Mr. Chisu submitted that the Commission had, in its initial Proposal, addressed his constituents' main concern, which was that they did not wish to see a riding split between the cities of Pickering and Scarborough.

Mr. Chisu indicated that his proposal to employ the Commission's initial Proposal for the electoral boundaries in Scarborough was supported by two Toronto city councillors (Mr. Raymond Cho and Mr. Ron Moeser).

During Mr. Chisu's appearance before the Committee, he indicated his support for Ms. James' electoral boundaries proposal. For the effect on the population of the ridings of Scarborough resulting from Ms. James' proposal, please refer to the General Comments section for Scarborough.

(c) Scarborough Centre, Scarborough East, Scarborough–Rouge, Scarborough–Agincourt, and Scarborough–Wexford

In Ms. James' view, the Commission's revised boundary proposals set out significant changes which affect the majority of Scarborough, and cause disruption, confusion and division to the most mature and well-established communities. In her view, the Report does not take into account natural, historical boundaries. In Ms. James' view, boundary changes ought to occur in the east and northeast of Scarborough, as this was the area of new development and growing population.

Ms. James also indicated that, in her view, no real connection exists between the communities to the north and south of Highway 401, in Scarborough–Wexford, with respect to demographics, issues, or common interests. Instead, in her view, commonality exists to the north and south of Highway 401 along the Rouge River Valley.

According to Ms. James, the Commission's initial Proposal was overwhelmingly logical. In her view, it solved what she considered to be the two areas of concern for Scarborough, namely the large population of Scarborough–Rouge River, and the split municipality riding of Pickering–Scarborough East. It also left the remaining four Scarborough ridings more or less intact.

As such, Ms. James proposed that the Commission employ its initial Proposal, with certain modifications. For more details on this proposal and its population effects on the ridings of Scarborough, please refer to the General Comments section for Scarborough.

Ms. James' proposal was supported by Mr. Chisu, Mr. Karygiannis and Mr. McKay, along with the Scarborough Museum, the Midland Park Community Association and a number of constituents. It was not supported by Ms. Sitsabaiesan, and it did not have an effect on Mr. Harris' riding.

(d) Scarborough East, Scarborough–Rouge, Scarborough–Agincourt, Scarborough Centre, and Scarborough–Wexford

According to Mr. McKay, the current riding of Scarborough–Guildwood, along with the current west Scarborough ridings, keep intact coherent, stable, historic communities. The Commission's initial Proposal presented modifications to the configuration of these ridings which Mr. McKay considered to be modest.

Mr. McKay considered the Commission's Report to be unreasonable (as the changes it proposed occurred after the public consultations had been concluded), dramatic, counter to the desires of the community, and disruptive to a dozen or so communities of interest across Scarborough. In his view, this disruption had occurred in order to accommodate two communities in the east.

Mr. McKay also indicated that, in his view, the riding to straddle Highway 401 ought to be in the east of Scarborough, as there was intercourse between the north and the south by virtue of the location of community centres, traffic flows, and interest in Rouge Park.

During Mr. McKay's appearance before the Committee, he indicated his support for Ms. James' electoral boundaries proposal. For the population effect on the ridings of Scarborough resultant from Ms. James' proposal, please refer to the General Comments section for Scarborough.

(e) Scarborough–Rouge

Ms. Sitsabaiesan provided information to the Committee as to reasons why, in her view, the revised boundaries for Scarborough–Rouge ought not to be further readjusted. She indicated that, in her view, Malvern was a vibrant and diverse community of interest that should not be divided into two ridings. Malvern was, according to Ms. Sitsabaiesan, identified by the City of Toronto as a priority neighbourhood, where community leaders have been working for decades to build a sense of community, and fight for funding to enhance support services and programs. In Ms. Sitsabaiesan's view, this effort would be eroded should Malvern be split in half, as per the Commission's initial Proposal.

According to Ms. Sitsabaiesan, Malvern and Morningside Heights represented interconnected communities of interest and ought to be kept in the same electoral district. The reasons Ms. Sitsabaiesan cited for this included that residents of these communities shared health centres, recreation centres, high schools, shopping centres, a major public library, and public services such as immigration, health care, and child and youth programs. She indicated that dividing either community in two, or from each other, would create disproportionate challenges to its residents

Ms. Sitsabaiesan also indicated that, in her view, Malvern and the communities north of Highway 401 shared few common interests and needs with the communities south of Highway 401. In her view, having a proposed Scarborough–Rouge riding straddle Highway 401 would not make sense.

Ms. Sitsabaiesan stated that her submission at the Commission's public hearings to keep Malvern and Morningside Heights united and within the same electoral district was not objected to by either Mr. McKay or Mr. Chisu at that time.

Ms. Sitsabaiesan indicated that the response from these two communities to the Commission's Report was extremely favourable. It was also supported by Mr. Dan Harris, M.P. for Scarborough Southwest.

Ms. Sitsabaiesan did not support Ms. James' electoral boundaries proposal.

(f) Scarborough–Agincourt, Scarborough East, Scarborough–Rouge, Scarborough Centre and Scarborough–Wexford

Mr. Karygiannis based his objection on three main points. These were: that Highway 401 should not be breached in Scarborough–Wexford as it is viewed by his constituents as a major piece of infrastructure that forms the southern boundary for the community of Agincourt; that Agincourt has

an established, historic community of interest with north Scarborough, while its links to Wexford, to its south, are weak; and that under the Commission's Report, the CP Marshalling Yards acts as a barrier that would isolate a section of residents, south of McNicholl Avenue and east of McCowan Road, from the rest of the proposed electoral district of Scarborough–Rouge.

Mr. Karygiannis indicated to the Committee that the Commission's revised electoral boundaries were opposed to in virtual unanimity by his constituents (he cited that he had received over 700 emails, 448 voice drop responses, 300 questionnaires, and 100 attendees of a town hall meeting), along with the M.P.P.s for Scarborough–Agincourt, and Scarborough–Rouge River, a local city councillor, and two local Toronto District School Board Trustees.

In this respect, the Committee also notes that it cannot vouch for how many of the communications tabled by Mr. Karygiannis were received after inflammatory comments were attributed to him in a Scarborough newspaper article. As such, the Committee is not aware of whether such comments had the effect of motivating some constituents to respond to Mr. Karygiannis' invitation to them to provide their input on the Commission's proposal.

During Mr. Karygiannis' appearance before the Committee, he indicated his support for Ms. James' electoral boundaries proposal. For the population effect on the ridings of Scarborough resultant from Ms. James' proposal, please refer to the General Comments section for Scarborough.

Eastern Ontario

(a) Ottawa–Orleans, and Rideau–Carleton

Mr. Royal Galipeau, M.P. for Ottawa–Orleans, filed an objection to a part of the boundary between Ottawa–Orleans and Rideau–Carleton. Mr. Galipeau's objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way:

Commencing at the intersection of Frontier Road with Devine Road, the boundary would run southwesterly along Devine Road and its southwest projection to Ramsayville Road, and then run northwest along Ramsayville Road to Highway 417. The boundaries remain otherwise as proposed by the Commission in its Report.

If implemented, Mr. Galipeau's suggested change would have the effect of transferring 431 people from Rideau–Carleton to Ottawa–Orleans. As a result, the population of Rideau–Carleton, which is the less populous of the two ridings, would move 0.41 percentage points further from the provincial quota, while the riding of Ottawa–Orleans, which is the more populous would move 0.41 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Ottawa–Orleans would rise from 119,247 (12.27% above the provincial quota) to 119,678 (12.68% above the provincial quota). The population of Rideau–Carleton would drop from 89,522 (15.71% below the electoral quota) to 89,091 (16.12% below the provincial quota).

According to Mr. Galipeau, a well-established social connection exists between Orleans and Carlsbad Springs. He indicated that the primary language spoken by residents of Carlsbad Springs

was French, and that the children of this area mainly attend French-language schools in Ottawa–Orleans. Mr. Galipeau indicated that, presently, Carlsbad Springs is divided among three electoral districts, and that this community, in his view, needs to be consolidated into one electoral district in order to strengthen its voice and improve its representation.

Mr. Galipeau indicated in his objection that the Commission had informed him that it would be willing to favourably consider a proposal that merged Carlsbad Springs into Ottawa–Orleans, provided it was a simple option.

The Committee supports Mr. Galipeau’s proposal, and recommends the electoral boundaries be adjusted accordingly.

(b) Kingston and the Islands, and Lanark–Frontenac

Mr. Ted Hsu, M.P. for Kingston and the Islands, and Mr. Scott Reid, M.P. for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington, appeared together. The two M.P.s agreed that the boundary between Lanark–Frontenac and Kingston and the Islands, as laid out in the Commission’s Report, splits a community of interest. However, the two M.P.s presented the Committee with different solutions for this problem. Neither proposal causes any domino effects.

Mr. Hsu proposed that Kingston and the Islands retain its current (2004) boundaries. In practice, this would involve transferring all parts of the city lying north of Highway 401 from Lanark–Frontenac. If implemented, 8,321 people would be moved into Kingston and the Islands, with the result that its population would rise from 116,996 (10.15% above the provincial quota) to 125,227 (17.9% above the quota). As well, the population of Lanark–Frontenac would drop from 98,409 (7.35% below the provincial quota) to 90,178 (15.1% below the quota).

Mr. Reid proposed that the part of Kingston lying south of Highway 401 and east of the Cataraqui River be transferred from Kingston and the Islands to Lanark–Frontenac. If implemented, 12,881 people would be transferred to Lanark–Frontenac, with the result that its population would rise from 98,409 (7.35% below the provincial quota) to 111,290 (4.78% above the quota). The population of Kingston and the Islands would drop from 116,996 (10.15% above the provincial quota) to 104,115 (1.98% below the quota).

Mr. Hsu presented the following arguments as to why his proposal would best respect community of interest: Kingston has, since Confederation, been represented within a single district. In his view, the representation of the City of Kingston would be enhanced if the entire city was placed in one electoral district. In its initial Proposal, the commission had retained such a configuration for Kingston and the Islands. Mr. Hsu indicated that he had provided the Commission with a written submission supporting this approach.

Mr. Hsu submitted that the City of Kingston represents a community of interest and identity based on social, economic and cultural ties. He indicated that residents north of the 401 received public services, attended school, worked, and participated in clubs and leagues, to the south of the 401, and vice versa.

Mr. Hsu indicated that his proposal had garnered the support of over two dozen constituents and the M.P.P. for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Reid noted, in his oral presentation, that Mr. Hsu was correct that the Commission had split a community of interest by using Highway 401 as a dividing line. However, he was of the view that Mr. Hsu's proposal was unlikely to meet with the Commission's approval, because it left the two ridings with widely varying populations.

Mr. Reid presented the following arguments as to why his proposal reflected community of interest: All of rural Kingston would be kept united within a single riding. The municipal district of Rural Kingston will include territory on both sides of Highway 401, following the 2014 redistribution of municipal council districts. Mr. Reid's written objection included an email from the city councillor from this district, supporting his proposed boundaries.

As well, the historic rural community of interest and identity of Pittsburgh Township would be kept within one riding. Prior to amalgamation with Kingston, the entire area east of the Cataraqui River was called Pittsburgh Township. Mr. Reid indicated that, in order to add sufficient population to the riding containing the City of Kingston in past boundaries readjustments, the township had been repeatedly divided between two federal ridings. This division of a natural community of interest had finally been corrected in the 2004 boundary readjustment, but the community would be divided again, if Highway 401 was used as the riding boundary. Mr. Reid submitted an email from the city councillor for Pittsburgh District on Kingston City Council, supporting his proposed boundaries.

The Committee notes that while Mr. Reid is a member of the Committee, he recused himself and did not participate in the proceedings of the Committee relating to the examination of his own objection, and that filed by Mr. Hsu concerning Lanark–Frontenac and Kingston and the Islands

(c) Bay of Quinte, and Hastings–Lennox and Addington

Mr. Daryl Kramp, M.P. for Prince Edwards–Hastings, filed a motion which contained two separate objections. Both objections were to a part of the boundary between Hastings–Lennox and Addington, and Bay of Quinte.

The first objection would cause the boundary between these two ridings to be altered in the following way: Ward 2 (or that section of the City of Belleville which lies north of Highway 401), would be removed from Hastings–Lennox and Addington, and added to Bay of Quinte.

If implemented, Mr. Kramp's suggested change would have the effect of transferring 8,310 people from Hastings–Lennox and Addington to Bay of Quinte. As a result, the population of Hastings–Lennox and Addington, which is the less populous of the two ridings, would move 7.83 percentage points further from the provincial quota, while the riding of Bay of Quinte, which is the more populous would move 7.83 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

The population of Bay of Quinte would rise from 109,488 (3.08% above the electoral quota) to 117,798 (10.91% above the provincial quota). The population of Hastings–Lennox and Addington

would drop from 92,528 (12.88% below the provincial quota) to 84,218 (20.71% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Kramp brought forward this first proposal on behalf of the City of Belleville. He indicated that while this proposal was supported by the City of Belleville, it did not serve the interests of the citizens of Hastings–Lennox and Addington.

Mr. Kramp’s second proposal would cause the boundary between Hastings–Lennox and Addington, and Bay of Quinte to be altered in the following way: an area described as follows (commencing in Stirling, the area in Quinte West to the east of Highway 14 from Stirling running in a southeastern direction along said highway, to its intersection with Wallbridge Loyalist Road, running south along Wallbridge Loyalist Road to Highway 401) to be transferred from Bay Quinte to Hastings–Lennox and Addington.

If implemented, Mr. Kramp’s suggested change would have the effect of transferring 1,965 people from Bay of Quinte to Hastings–Lennox and Addington. As a result, the population of Hastings–Lennox and Addington, which is the less populous of the two ridings, would move 1.85 percentage points closer to the provincial quota, while the riding of Bay of Quinte, which is the more populous would move 1.85 percentage points closer to the provincial quota.

The population of Bay of Quinte would fall from 109,488 (3.08% above the electoral quota) to 107,523 (1.23% above the provincial quota). The population of Hastings–Lennox and Addington would rise from 92,528 (12.88% below the provincial quota) to 94,493 (11.03% below the provincial quota).

Mr. Kramp indicated that this proposal was requested by the affected community. Mr. Kramp noted that both proposals presented challenges and would not be readily accepted by either proposed electoral district.

The Committee recognizes that Mr. Kramp’s proposals address a legitimate community of interest consideration, however, the Committee does not support either of Mr. Kramp’s proposals.

Haliburton, Peterborough and Northumberland, and Durham Region

Mr. Erin O’Toole, M.P. for Durham; Mr. Barry Devolin, M.P. for Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock; Mr. Rick Norlock, M.P. for Northumberland–Quinte West; Mr. Colin Carrie, M.P. for Oshawa; and Mr. Dean Del Mastro, M.P. for Peterborough, filed objections to the boundaries of Oshawa, Oshawa–Durham, Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, Peterborough, and Northumberland–Pine Ridge.

Their objections would cause the boundaries of these ridings to be altered in the following way:

- The area bordered by the boundary of the Whitby riding to the west, Winchester Road to the north, Simcoe Street to the west, Conlin Road to the north, Ritson Road to the east, and Taunton Road to the south would be transferred from Oshawa–Durham to Oshawa;

- The area bordered by Boundary Road to the north, the current boundary between the ridings of Durham and Northumberland–Quinte West to the East, Lake Ontario to the south, and the Commission’s proposed boundary between Oshawa–Durham and Northumberland–Pine Ridge to the west would be transferred from Northumberland–Pine Ridge to Oshawa–Durham;
- The Township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen would be transferred from Peterborough to Northumberland–Pine Ridge;
- The Township of Cavan-Monaghan would be transferred from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock to Peterborough; and
- The Township of North Kawartha, and the Township of Galway-Cavendish and Harvey would be transferred from Peterborough to Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock.

If implemented, these suggested changes would have the effect of:

- Adding 6,559 people to Oshawa; as a result the population of the riding would move 6.18 percentage points further from the provincial quota;
- Adding 8,303 people to Oshawa–Durham; as a result the population of the riding would move 7.82 percentage points further from the provincial quota;
- Subtracting 1,207 people from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock; as a result the population of the riding would move 1.14 percentage points closer to the provincial quota;
- Subtracting 3,316 people from Peterborough; as a result the population of the riding would move 5.40 percentage points closer to the provincial quota; and
- Subtracting 10,339 people from Northumberland–Pine Ridge; as a result the population of the riding would move 6.67 percentage points further from the provincial quota.

These suggested changes would have the following effect on the population of the ridings:

- The population of Oshawa would rise from 125,771 (18.41% above the provincial quota) to 132,330 (24.59% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Oshawa–Durham would rise from 115,395 (8.64% above the provincial quota) to 123,698 (16.46% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock would drop from 110,182 (3.74% above the provincial quota) to 108,975 (2.60% above the provincial quota);
- The population of Peterborough would drop from 115,269 (8.53% above the provincial quota) to 111,953 (5.40% above the provincial quota); and

- The population of Northumberland–Pine Ridge would drop from 107,840 (1.53% above the provincial quota) to 97,501 (8.20% below the provincial quota).

The changes they proposed are based on community of interest, and historical patterns of electoral districts in the area. As illustrated above, these changes would also result in populations in each given electoral district within the plus minus 25% authorized deviation under the Act, and would be in line with the flexible approach taken by the Commission in regards to the deviation from the electoral quota. Each M.P. made a separate proposal, with its own merit, but as a group, the M.P.s all agreed with one another's proposals. Their combined proposals would also affect no other electoral districts.

(a) Oshawa and Oshawa–Durham

Mr. Carrie proposed to enlarge the riding of Oshawa to its northwest. Mr. Carrie's proposal is based on community of interest arguments. This change would keep as many parts of the City of Oshawa as is possible within the riding of Oshawa. It would also group together into one riding the campuses of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology.

(b) Oshawa–Durham and Northumberland–Pine Ridge

Mr. O'Toole's main proposal was to keep the municipality of Clarington as a whole within the electoral district of Oshawa–Durham. Clarington is currently located within the electoral district of Durham; the Commission's Report proposed to transfer part of it into the electoral district of Northumberland–Pine Ridge. The Commission attempted to keep Clarington undivided, but stated that it was near impossible to do so (Report, p. 32). Mr. O'Toole indicated that his proposal would keep the community of Clarington undivided, and avoid transferring part of the city into an electoral district that it has no historical ties with. He also indicated that his proposal has garnered large public support.

Mr. O'Toole also supported and repeated the request made by Mr. Carrie to keep as much of the City of Oshawa and the campus of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology as possible, in the electoral district of Oshawa.

The Committee would like to compliment Mr. O'Toole's appearance before the Committee. His PowerPoint presentation, which included maps, stated concisely and explained clearly his and the proposal of all Members in the region.

(c) Northumberland–Pine Ridge and Peterborough

Mr. Norlock proposed two changes to the boundaries of the electoral district of Northumberland–Pine Ridge. First, like Mr. O'Toole, Mr. Norlock suggested that the municipality of Clarington be kept in its entirety within the district of Durham–Oshawa. Second, Mr. Norlock submitted that the township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, which in the Commission's Report is located in the riding of Peterborough, be transferred to the Northumberland–Pine Ridge riding. He indicated that this "change would sustain the socioeconomic relationship between the township and

Northumberland county.” He added that there “are many financial, business and educational ties which connect these communities of interest.”

(d) Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, Peterborough

Mr. Devolin proposed adjustments between the electoral districts of Peterborough and Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock. The first part of his proposal would move the township of Cavan–Monaghan from the district of Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock to the district of Peterborough. He informed the Committee that the municipal council would be in favour of such a change. The second part of his proposal would move the township of North Kawartha, and the township of Galway–Cavendish and Harvey from the district of Peterborough to the district of Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock. Mr. Devolin informed the Committee that these rural townships are currently and have been in the riding of Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock for a long period of time.

(e) Peterborough, Northumberland–Pine Ridge, and Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock

Mr. Del Mastro’s objection proposed adjustments to the boundaries of the riding of Peterborough. First, he agreed with Mr. Norlock that the township of Havelock–Belmont–Methuen should be transferred from Peterborough to the district of Northumberland–Pine Ridge. He noted that this change would bring together, into the same riding, the three eastern townships of Peterborough County. Secondly, he also agreed with Mr. Devolin on boundaries changes between the ridings of Peterborough and Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock.

As stated above, the deviations from the provincial quota that would result from the M.P.’s proposals are as follows: –8.20%, 2.60%, 5.40%, 16.46%, and 24.59%. The Committee notes that while a deviation of 24.59% is high, the Committee feels that community of interest sufficiently justified it in the circumstances. It is also in line with the approach taken by the Commission for other regions and electoral districts in the province.

The Committee supports the proposals made by Mr. O’Toole, Mr. Devolin, Mr. Norlock, Mr. Carrie, and Mr. Del Mastro, and recommends that the electoral boundaries be readjusted accordingly.

Name Changes

(a) Ancaster

Mr. David Sweet, M.P. for Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale, filed an objection proposing that the name of the electoral district of Ancaster be changed to Ancaster–Dundas–West Hamilton. He indicated that this name would be more appropriate as it would include the three historically-distinct communities included in the electoral district.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(b) Aurora–Richmond Hill

Mr. Costas Menegakis, M.P. for Richmond Hill, filed an objection with respect to the name of the electoral district of Aurora–Richmond Hill.

Mr. Menegakis proposed that the name of the riding be changed to Aurora–Oak Ridges–Richmond Hill. He indicated that a reference to the Oak Ridges community in the name of the riding would better reflect the geographic and historic realities of the riding and its community of interest. It would also underline the importance of this community for the riding and assert its unique and distinct identity.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(c) Barrie–Oro–Springwater

Mr. Bruce Stanton, M.P. for Simcoe North, filed an objection proposing that the name of the proposed riding of Barrie–Oro–Springwater be changed to Barrie–Oro Medonte–Springwater.

Mr. Stanton informed the Committee that the new riding would include most of the Township of Oro-Medonte which is composed of both of the historic communities of the Township of Oro and the Township of Medonte. Accordingly, Mr. Stanton suggested that the name of the riding include the names of both original communities.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(d) Don Valley East

Mr. Joe Daniel, M.P. for Don Valley East, filed an objection with respect to the proposed name for the electoral district of Don Valley East. He suggested that the name of Don Valley South would better reflect the riding with its new boundaries as proposed by the Report of the Commission.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(e) Durham–Oshawa

Mr. O’Toole suggested that the name of the proposed electoral district of Oshawa–Durham be changed to Durham, which is the name of the current riding. Mr. O’Toole indicated that only a small part of Oshawa would be in the electoral district, and that by naming one community in the riding and not others, the name would exclude important and historic communities of the riding. He stated that the name of Durham is inclusive of all communities in the riding. Mr. Carrie, M.P. for Oshawa, supported the name change.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(f) Lanark–Frontenac

Mr. Scott Reid, M.P. for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington, filed an objection which contained a name change that related to his electoral boundary change proposal. For further discussion with respect to the electoral boundaries aspect of Mr. Reid's proposal, please see the entry in this report entitled Lanark–Frontenac under the section for Eastern Ontario.

In his electoral boundary proposal, Mr. Reid proposed to readjust a portion of the northeastern boundary between Kingston and the Islands and Lanark–Frontenac in order to place the parts of the City of Kingston east of the Cataraqui and south of Highway 401 into the electoral district of Lanark – Frontenac. Should the Commission agree to do so, Mr. Reid indicated that his proposed name change would make sense as, by geography, more than half of the City of Kingston would be included in the Lanark–Frontenac riding. The name change would recognize those parts of Kingston as full participating partners in the new riding.

Mr. Reid's riding name change is tied to his electoral boundary change. In the event that the Commission agrees with Mr. Reid's boundary change, then the Committee fully supports the Commission adopting his riding name change.

(g) Leeds–Grenville

Mr. Gordon Brown, M.P. for Leeds–Grenville, filed an objection to propose that the electoral district of Leeds–Grenville be renamed Leeds–Grenville–Thousand Island and Rideau Lakes. He indicated that the riding encompasses most of the Canadian portion of the Thousand Islands and of the Rideau Lakes, and that the riding should be correctly identified as the home of the Thousand Islands in Canada. He also referred to *An Act to amend the Canada National Parks Act (St. Lawrence Islands National Park of Canada)*, S.C. 2013, c. 2, recently enacted by Parliament, which corrected an historical inaccuracy by changing the name of the St. Lawrence Islands National Park of Canada to Thousand Islands National Park of Canada; the Park is included in the district of Leeds–Grenville. Mr. Brown referred to the Senator from the area who has identified the area as Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes. He finally noted the historical importance of the Thousand Islands and Rideau Canal.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(h) Markham–Stouffville

Mr. Paul Calandra, M.P. for Oak Ridges – Markham, filed an objection proposing that the name of the electoral district of Markham–Stouffville be changed to Markham–Stouffville–Rouge Valley. Mr. Calandra indicated that the name of Markham–Stouffville–Rouge Valley would better reflect the geographic composition of the riding, and that it would recognize, at the national level, the ecological significance of the Rouge Valley watershed.

Mr. Calandra's proposal is supported by the City of Marham, which requested, by resolution, that the name of the riding be changed to Markham–Stouffville–Rouge Valley.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(i) Mississauga East–Cooksville

Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon, M.P. for Mississauga East–Cooksville, filed an objection which contained a name change that related to his electoral boundary change. For further discussion with respect to the electoral boundaries aspect of Mr. Lizon's proposal, please see the entry in this report entitled Mississauga East–Cooksville under the section for Brampton Mississauga.

In his electoral boundary proposal, Mr. Lizon indicated that extensive development had occurred at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Hurontario Street (the heart of Cooksville). In his view, as a result of this development, the village of Cooksville no longer existed in the form that it once did, nor did it remain comparable, as a community of interest, to the villages in Mississauga of Streetsville, Port Credit or Clarkson.

Mr. Lizon's proposed boundary change would split the village of Cooksville between Mississauga East–Cooksville and Mississauga Centre. As such, he proposed that Cooksville be dropped from the electoral district's name, and that it be renamed Mississauga East.

Mr. Lizon's riding name change is tied to his electoral boundary change. In the event that the Commission agrees with Mr. Lizon's boundary change, then the Committee fully supports the Commission adopting his riding name change.

(j) Mississauga North

Ms. Eve Adams, M.P. for Mississauga–Brampton South, filed an objection to the name of the proposed electoral district of Mississauga. Ms. Adams proposed instead that the electoral district be named Mississauga–Britannia–Malton.

In support of her proposal, Ms. Adams submitted to the Committee that the historic communities of Malton and Britannia deserved to be recognized as important constituent parts of the proposed riding. She indicated that both communities long pre-dated the creation of the City of Mississauga. Ms. Adams also stated that Malton played an important role during the Canadian war effort, and that this community featured streets such as Lancaster and Victory, in order to preserve and celebrate this important period of Canadian nation-building. In her view, the proposed name change would allow the communities within the riding to honour its local history.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(k) Mississauga South

Ms. Stella Ambler, M.P. for Mississauga South, filed an objection to the name of the proposed electoral district of Mississauga South. Ms. Ambler proposed instead that the electoral district be named Mississauga–Lakeshore.

Ms. Ambler indicated that her proposed name better describes the character and the uniqueness of the community. She noted that the riding’s entire southeastern boundary bordered Lake Ontario. Ms. Ambler stated that the lakefront was a defining feature for the community, and served as a commercial centre, and gathering place for a number of important community events. She also noted that two out of the three main community centres in South Mississauga made reference to the lake (Port Credit, and Lakeview).

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(l) Mississauga West–Streetsville

Mr. Brad Butt, M.P. for Mississauga–Streetsville, filed an objection to the proposed name of Mississauga West–Streetsville.

Mr. Butt proposed that the electoral district maintain its current name of Mississauga–Streetsville. He provided the Committee with the following reasons for the name change: that 80% of the new riding remains the same as the current riding; that Mississauga ridings are not generally described by points on the compass but rather by names of neighborhoods; that the new electoral boundaries are actually more descriptive of the “Streetsville” name than are the current boundaries; that the current name is well known and would avoid confusion (i.e. to maintain continuity); that the proposed name is shorter; and that Mississauga–Streetsville better describes the historical heart of the region.

Mr. Butt’s objection was supported by the M.P.P. for Mississauga–Streetsville.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(m) Northumberland–Pine Ridge

Mr. Del Mastro proposed that the name of the electoral district of Northumberland – Pine Ridge be changed to refer to “Peterborough” explicitly in order to reflect that the riding included a part of Peterborough County.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(n) Oakville South

Mr. Terence Young, M.P. for Oakville, filed an objection proposing that the name of “Oakville” be maintained for the electoral district to be designated as Oakville South according to the Commission’s Report. Mr. Young indicated that keeping the name of Oakville would help voters to identify the riding, as it included most of the City of Oakville. He also stated that keeping the same designation for the district would be logical as the Commission did not propose any changes to the boundaries of the riding.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(o) Ottawa–Orleans

Mr. Royal Galipeau, M.P. for Ottawa–Orleans, filed an objection which contained a name change and an electoral boundary change. For further discussion with respect to the electoral boundaries aspect of Mr. Galipeau’s proposal, please see the entry in this report entitled Ottawa–Orleans under the section for Eastern Ontario.

Mr. Galipeau submitted a written objection to the Committee which suggested that the Commission change the name of Ottawa–Orleans to Orleans.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(p) Peterborough

Mr. Del Mastro proposed that the name of the electoral district of Peterborough be changed to Peterborough–Kawartha to recognize that both the City of Peterborough and the City of Kawartha Lakes are located in the riding.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

(q) Renfrew–Pembroke

Ms. Cheryl Gallant, M.P. for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, filed an objection proposing that the electoral district’s name be kept unchanged; the Commission’s Report renamed the electoral district for Renfrew–Pembroke despite having recommended no changes to its electoral boundaries. Ms. Gallant indicated that: “Change for the sake of change is not a valid reason to do so”, and that it would be reasonable to keep the name of the riding as its boundaries remain unchanged. She noted that Nipissing portion of the riding has strong community of interest with the other communities in the district; at the same time, she underlined the importance for Nipissing to be recognized in the name of the riding.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(r) Rideau–Carleton

Mr. Pierre Poilievre, M.P. for Nepean–Carleton, filed an objection proposing that the new electoral district of Rideau–Carleton be renamed Carleton.

The Commission's Report would divide the existing riding of Nepean–Carleton into two new electoral districts: Nepean and Rideau–Carleton, with the latter including the region historically known as Carleton County. Mr. Poilievre indicated that it would therefore be logical to designate this new riding Carleton. He also indicated that while the Rideau River flows through the middle of the new electoral district, many of the communities in the riding are not located close to the Rideau River and that Carleton suffices as a name for the riding.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding's name be changed accordingly.

(s) Scarborough East

Mr. Corneliu Chisu, M.P. for Pickering–Scarborough East, filed an objection which contained a name change that related to his electoral boundary change. For further discussion with respect to the electoral boundaries aspect of Mr. Chisu's proposal, please see the entry in this report entitled Scarborough East under the section for the City of Toronto.

In his electoral boundary proposal, Mr. Chisu submitted that the Commission ought to revert to the boundaries proposed by the Commission in its initial Proposal for Scarborough East, in what concerned the Rouge Park area. Should the Commission agree to do so, Mr. Chisu proposed the name Scarborough East be changed to Scarborough East–Rouge Park in order to emphasize the importance of Rouge Park to Scarborough, as a newly created urban national park.

Ms. Roxanne James, M.P. for Scarborough Centre, also filed a name change objection for the proposed electoral district of Scarborough East, along with an electoral boundary change. For further discussion with respect to the electoral boundaries aspect of Ms. James' proposal, please see the entry in this report entitled Scarborough Centre under the section for the City of Toronto.

Ms. James, for her part, agreed with Mr. Chisu that the Commission ought to employ the electoral boundaries it proposed in its initial Proposal. Should the Commission agree to revert to its initial Proposal, Ms. James suggested that Scarborough East be renamed Scarborough Rouge in order to more accurately reflect the ecological and environmental area of Rouge Park, including the river valley.

The Committee notes that the proposals put forward by Mr. Chisu and Ms. James differ in terms of the actual proposed name, but agree in the substance of the suggestion.

The Committee refers this proposal to the Commission for its consideration.

(t) University–Rosedale and St. Paul’s

Ms. Olivia Chow, M.P. for Trinity–Spadina, filed an objection to the boundaries of University–Rosedale, Spadina–Fort York, Toronto Centre, and St. Paul’s. As a result of her proposal, the ridings of University–Rosedale, and St. Paul’s would be substantially changed. Ms. Chow’s proposal also proposed new names to the new ridings respectively as follows: University–St. Clair and St. Paul’s–Rosedale. These name changes reflect the modifications she proposed to the boundaries.

Ms. Chow’s riding name change is tied to her electoral boundary change. In the event that the Commission agrees with Ms. Chow’s boundary change, then the Committee fully supports the Commission adopting her riding name change.

(u) Vaughan–Thornhill–Markham

Mr. Peter Kent, M.P. for Thornhill, filed an objection with respect to the proposed name for the electoral district of Vaughan–Thornhill–Markham. This district would include most of the territory of the current riding of Thornhill, and Mr. Kent proposed that that the name “Thornhill” be maintained for the electoral district. Mr. Kent indicated the historical contribution to the York region of the Thornhill community, which is now included in the City of Vaughan and the City of Markham.

Mr. Kent informed the Committee that his proposal is supported by the Members from the York region, and by citizens of the City of Vaughan and the City of Markham.

The Committee fully supports this proposal, and recommends that the riding’s name be changed accordingly.

Conclusion

In accordance with subsections 22(3) and 23(1) of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, the *Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario*, the objections, the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Committee will be returned and referred back to the Commission for its consideration of the matter of the objections.

A copy of the relevant *Minutes of Proceedings* ([Meetings Nos 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 80, 81, 82 and 83](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

JOE PRESTON
Chair

Appendix - Chow

University–St. Clair

University-St. Clair’s geographic boundaries are proposed to be: the north side of Dundas St. W. from Ossington Ave. to University Ave. The west side of University Ave. between Dundas St. W. and College St. The north side of College St. between University Ave. and Bay St. The west side of Bay St. between College St. and Charles St. W. The north side of Charles St. between Bay St. and Jarvis St. The north side of Mount Pleasant Rd. between Jarvis St. and Bloor St. E. The north side of Bloor St. E. between Mount Pleasant Rd. and Church St. The south side of Church St. between Bloor St. E. and Yonge St. The south side of Davenport Rd. between Yonge St. and Bathurst St. The west side of Bathurst St. between Davenport Rd. and Vaughan Rd. The west/south side of Vaughan Rd. between Bathurst St. and Winnett Ave. The west side of Winnett Ave. between Vaughan Rd. and Eglinton Ave. W. The south side of Eglinton Ave. W. between Winnett Ave. and Dufferin St. The east side of Dufferin St. between Eglinton Ave. W. and Rogers Rd. The north side of Rogers Rd. between Dufferin St. and Oakwood Ave. The east side of Oakwood Ave. between Rogers Rd. and Holland Park Ave. The north side of Holland Park Ave. between Oakwood Ave. and Winona Dr. The east side of Winona Dr. between Holland Park Ave. and Davenport Rd. The south side of Davenport Rd. between Winona Dr. and Ossington Ave. The east side of Ossington Ave. between Davenport Rd. and Dundas St. W.

St. Paul’s– Rosedale

St. Paul’s-Rosedale’s geographic boundaries are proposed to be: the north side of Davenport Rd. between Bathurst St. and Yonge St. The north side of Church St. between Yonge St. and Bloor St. E. The north side of Bloor St. E. between Church St. and Mount Pleasant Rd. The west side of Mount Pleasant Rd. between Bloor St. E. and Rosedale Valley Rd. The north side of Rosedale Valley Rd. between Mount Pleasant Rd. and Bayview Ave. The west side of the Don Valley River between Rosedale Valley Rd. and Pottery Rd. The west side of Bayview Ave. between Pottery Rd. and Moore Ave. The south side of Moor Ave. between Bayview Ave. and Mount Pleasant Rd. The west side of Mount Pleasant Rd. between Moore Ave. and Broadway Ave. The south side of Broadway Ave. between Mount Pleasant Rd. and Yonge St. The east side of Yonge St. between Broadway Ave. and Eglinton Ave. W. The south side of Eglinton Ave. W. between Yonge St. and Winnett Ave. The east side of Winnett Ave. between Eglinton Ave. W. and Vaughan Rd. The north/east side of Vaughan Rd. between Winnett Ave. and Bathurst St. The east side of Bathurst St. between Vaughan Rd. and Davenport Rd.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Standing Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site
at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>