



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs**

---

PROC • NUMBER 076 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, May 9, 2013**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Joe Preston**



## Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Thursday, May 9, 2013

• (1000)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC)):** I call this meeting to order.

We will continue our study of electoral redistribution in the province of Ontario. We have a couple of witnesses today who want to share their thoughts with us about their ridings.

Mr. Sullivan, would you like to go first? You get five minutes to tell us your intriguing story, and then we'll ask you very hard questions.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee as it examines the final report of the federal electoral boundaries commission for Ontario, and I want to thank the commission itself for the excellent work it did in trying times with not being able to please everybody.

I'm appearing before you not as a complainant, but in response to an objection filed by the member for Eglinton—Lawrence, who seeks to transfer some 30,000 people from the western part of his riding to mine. I am here to object to his objection.

As you know, the commission for Ontario started its work in February last year with a mandate to fit 15 new ridings into the province. It had to respect geographical boundaries, community of interest, and try to limit variations in population to plus or minus 25% of the provincial target quotient of 106,213 people per riding, which is between 79,660 and 132,776 people.

The Ontario commission provided a proposal on possible riding boundaries in July of last year for broad public consultation, held hearings in October and November, including two days in Toronto, and presented its report to Parliament this past February. I participated in this process and made both a written and oral presentation to the commission. As you know, the commission recommended the status quo for both our ridings, which is a recommendation I support and my colleague from Davenport also supports.

It was not until I received notice of this committee's hearing that I became aware that the member for Eglinton—Lawrence had proposed something affecting my riding of York South—Weston. He did not consult with me or any of the communities I represent, and according to the commission itself, he did not propose this measure to the commission during its public hearings.

It was a total surprise to find out that there was an objection that would affect my riding and how significant a proposal it was. I'm disappointed that the member for Eglinton—Lawrence is not here today to speak to you about his proposal and give me the ability to respond to his concerns. I understand that Mr. Oliver will be providing you with written material to back up his objection, but I would ask for the opportunity to be able to review his material and respond to these arguments prior to this committee's making a recommendation.

My objection to the proposal being advanced by the member for Eglinton—Lawrence is based on two of the principles that guided the commission in its work. First, it creates a riding, my riding of York South—Weston that would greatly exceed the variation permitted for the population of ridings in Ontario. Second, it would join neighbourhoods that have no community of interest with York South—Weston.

The area of Eglinton—Lawrence that Mr. Oliver suggests should be transferred to York South—Weston lies between the CNR railroad tracks on the west, along Eglinton Avenue on the south, Allen Road on the east, and Highway 401 on the north.

This area, according to the 2011 census, is home to 30,887 people, nearly one-quarter of my current riding. The addition of this area to my riding would create a federal electoral district of 147,493 people, which is 138% of the target population quotient for Ontario, well above the 125% guideline. It would create the largest riding in terms of population in Ontario. There's no justification for this.

Second, there is no community of interest for the neighbourhoods between the CNR tracks and the Allen Road in the Eglinton—Lawrence and the communities I represent west of these railway tracks. This was a factor recognized by the commission in its report when it considered proposals affecting our mutual boundary of the railroad tracks.

Indeed, the municipal electoral boundary for the City of Toronto between ward 12 in the east part of my riding adjoining ward 15 on the west side of Mr. Oliver's riding is the CNR railroad tracks. These tracks are a significant physical barrier dividing these communities, penetrated only by Lawrence Avenue, Castlefield Avenue, and Eglinton Avenue over a 3.7 kilometre length.

It is absurd to suggest adding 30,000 people to a riding that is already within 10% of the provincial quotient as my riding of York South—Weston is. To bring us back to that target population quotient would have a large domino effect on neighbouring ridings, basically, redoing the commission's work in Toronto.

There is no justification for this. Mr. Oliver is trying to solve a problem the commission has already dealt with and, instead, is creating more problems than can be reasonably dealt with by this committee today. I would ask therefore that this committee reject Mr. Oliver's objection to the commission's recommendation regarding Eglinton—Lawrence on the basis that it artificially joins to York South—Weston neighbourhoods with whom there is no community of interest and, in so doing, creates a riding that is far too large, exceeding the commission's guidelines for appropriate riding population.

I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

• (1005)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

Yes, what would you like?

**Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC):** It has been the normal practice of this committee if we have discussions that involve the boundaries between riding A and riding B to have both people here at the same time.

Am I to assume that Mr. Oliver was not invited, or is it the case that he chose not to come? If he isn't coming to this meeting, is he coming to a later one?

**The Chair:** He was invited. He sent a written recommendation and has chosen not to appear.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I see. Okay, that answers the question. Thank you.

**The Chair:** All right.

We're going to get to questions and answers after. I'm going to let Mr. Adler do his bit first.

Mr. Adler, you're up for five minutes, please.

**Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

I'm very happy to be here today. I'm not used to sitting on this side of the committee table—

**The Chair:** You'll get a feel for what it is like now.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** I will have a new appreciation for the role of the witness from here on in.

I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here today.

I also want to thank the electoral boundaries commission. They have a very difficult task at hand, and I truly appreciate the hard work they put in.

However, I am proposing a very minor change to the riding of York Centre. The current proposal is to carve off the portion from Bathurst Street to Yonge Street, from Steeles on the north and south at the hydro right-of-way, which is just north of Finch, and put that portion into the riding of Willowdale.

My objection is based on a number of factors, one being population, the other being community of interest. I'll get into all of these in a second. What we're proposing essentially is to move the boundary from Bathurst Street and to include it within York Centre east to Peckham Avenue, and then from Peckham Avenue south as it curves around and then goes straight south to the hydro right-of-way.

It's taking back roughly 5,000 people. Under the proposal of the electoral boundaries commission, we're currently at 100,000, so this would put us closer to the 106,000-person target.

My understanding is that Willowdale has about 110,000 under the electoral boundaries commission's proposal. Taking away 5,000 would bring them down roughly to their target of 106,000.

This is the most compelling of the reasons why that area should remain within the riding of York Centre, and that's community of interest. There was 100% community of interest support for this argument. The riding specifically has a large concentration of Russian-speaking voters. York Centre has the largest number of Russian-speaking people of any riding in the country. And these are people from not just Russia but from the countries of the former Soviet Union. By carving off, by making the eastern boundary Bathurst Street, we're segregating a large number of those Russian-speaking people. We also have the third-largest Jewish population of any riding in the country. It would also segregate a lot of Jewish people into the riding of Willowdale and interfere with the community of interest.

I have letters of support from a variety of community groups in the area that I'm requesting be placed back within York Centre. This is all in your packages. They include the Canadian Association of World War II Veterans from the Soviet Union, the Russian Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Russian Canadian Education and Recreational Centre, the Toronto Russian Film Festival, Rabbi Sean Gorman of the Pride of Israel Synagogue, the Jewish Russian Community Centre of Ontario, the *Russian Express* weekly newspaper, Rabbi Milevsky from congregation B'nai Torah, and Archpriest Sergei Rasskazovskiy. They all are in support.

In terms of the effect that it will have on Willowdale and the opinion of my neighbouring colleague, MP Chungsen Leung, he is in complete support. I have a letter outlining his total support, which has been distributed to the committee and is now being translated, I understand, and which you will have by the end of committee. It's a letter that both of us have signed. He is in total support of what I am proposing here.

It has absolutely no domino effect whatsoever. It's a minor change that we're proposing that both MPs agree upon. It meets the community of interest criteria. It meets the population criteria, and I think it should be included back within the riding of York Centre.

Thank you.

• (1010)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Adler.

Mr. Reid, you're first for the questioning of the witnesses.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I have five minutes, I'm assuming?

**The Chair:** Let's go for seven minutes. We'll try to do one round of seven minutes and see if that's going to do it for us.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** All right.

I'm going to start with Mr. Adler.

I apologize to Mr. Sullivan. I'm in an awkward position where I only have your facts.

Mr. Adler, I've been looking at the map of the proposal for Toronto versus the map for the boundaries commission's final report submitted to us. Last week we dealt with the fact that in the Scarborough area, which is to say east of Victoria Park Avenue, there was a complete redrawing of the boundaries between the proposal and the report. But in the area that is bounded on the east by Victoria Park Avenue, on the west by the boundary with Mississauga, on the north by Steeles Avenue, and on the south by the 401, I could be wrong but it looks to me like no changes whatsoever have occurred between the proposal and the report. The proposal and the report are identical.

I realize you would not be in a position to answer that for everybody in the region, but am I correct that in the case of the riding of York Centre, the boundaries do not change between those two documents?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** I think you're looking at the riding of Willowdale.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Yes, both Willowdale and York Centre appear to have identical boundaries in the proposal—

**Mr. Mark Adler:** In the proposal, yes, absolutely.

The commission did have hearings in Toronto, to which we sent a number of community representatives to appear. The representatives sat there all day and were not heard. The reasoning was that the commission just ran out of time and had just allowed for the one day.

Our objections weren't even heard at that point—ergo, the lack of any significant change within those boundaries.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I just want to be clear on the exact proposal.

The current boundary between York Centre and Willowdale is the only change that appears to be made to the boundaries of York Centre. So the rectangular area that's north of the transmission line, east of Bathurst Street, south of Steeles Avenue, and west of Yonge Street is the only change that the boundary commission proposed making?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** That's correct.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay.

Essentially what you're proposing in so many words is taking the western half of that rectangle and moving that western half from Willowdale, where the commission is moving it, back into York Centre where it currently is.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Yes.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay.

Obviously you can see where I'm going. I am left with the impression that the boundaries commission was unable to hear concerns about the initial proposal—the community of interest issues — at the hearings, and therefore would have been unaware at this point of this kind of concern.

The next question I have is about the population variance of the two ridings under the boundary commission's recommendation currently before us versus what you're recommending. What are the changes to each of the two ridings, please?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Under the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission proposal, it leaves us at 100,000 and leaves Willowdale

at 110,000. We're asking for 5,000 back, which would bring us to 105,000 and take Willowdale down to 105,000.

● (1015)

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay.

The member for Willowdale is Mr. Leung. Have you consulted with him?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Yes, we have a letter of support from him. As I said during my presentation, it's being translated into French right now and will be made available to all of the members very shortly—probably by the end of committee today. I have his full support in this proposal.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay, thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Madame Latendresse.

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse (Louis-Saint-Laurent, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Preston.

I thank both of you for your comments. It has been enlightening. I think your proposals are rather clear.

My first questions are for Mr. Adler.

[English]

I'm a little concerned about what you just said, that that people went and couldn't be heard. It's the first time we've heard something like that in the committee.

[Translation]

I think the proposal you made today is logical. We want something that is very close to the quotient. Your proposal would bring the two ridings closer to the electoral quotient. You have the support of the community as well as the two members of Parliament.

Could you tell us why the commission decided to transfer this part of your riding to the riding of Willowdale?

[English]

**Mr. Mark Adler:** I don't know what their reasoning was.

However, it's quite clear that they were not aware of the demographics of the riding, understandably so. As I indicated earlier, when our representative went to present, I understand there were a lot of objections that day and I guess they were just overwhelmed and didn't commit enough time. Our representatives couldn't be heard. Even during that process, our objections to a community of interest in particular weren't made apparent to them when they went into their second round of redrawing the boundaries. So there was no change as a result.

In terms of community of interest, the argument, I think you'll agree, is very compelling. Population is also very compelling, I would think, because it brings both within the desired number.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** As a Russian speaker myself, I'm happy to read those letters and to be in support of the Russian Canadians in your riding.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Thank you. You'll have to visit York Centre.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Mr. Sullivan, do you know approximately how many people would be affected by the proposed change to add a part to your riding?

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** According to the census, it's a little over 30,000 people.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** And your riding right now has how many people?

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** In the proposal, we are already over the quotient. We are at 114,000, so it would put us way, way over.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** That would mean that your riding would exceed the quotient by a lot.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** Absolutely. It would be the largest in Ontario.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Basically that was my question. I know Mr. Cullen has some questions as well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen, go ahead.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Sullivan, I want to talk about the process a bit because this is an unusual thing for the committee as well.

The submission by an MP of a substantial change and then his not testifying has put you, I would suggest, and maybe this committee, in an awkward position, because we don't have the arguments on the other side as to why such a big change would be required.

I'm trying to understand what the impact would be if the commission went ahead and listened to Mr. Oliver's suggestions. Were those suggestions made at any point in the process up until now?

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** As far as we can tell, there were never any written or oral submissions from Mr. Oliver to this effect, or to any effect, regarding his riding.

In the commission's process, the first time that we became aware of it was from the letter written to the clerk. It's not dated, so I'm not exactly sure when it was sent to the clerk. I'm assuming that's the only document. The chair did say there was a submission from Mr. Oliver, so I don't know if there's a second document, but I have not seen a second document.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** The domino effect you talked about is something that this committee is also seized with, because what we will essentially do is to report what you have told us today. Mr. Adler has made some arguments about communities of interest and the committee will likely see those communities of interest and report that to the electoral boundaries commission.

Mr. Sullivan, with your case, and with Mr. Oliver's case, which has now implicated you, the challenge will be for the committee to decide under what basis we should support or give much acknowledgment to the idea of a 30,000-person shift from one electoral boundary group to another, and what the implications would be in the cascade across the other parts of Toronto.

You said something in your testimony about having to rewrite the map of Toronto—at least that end of Toronto. To move 30,000 is a big move. What would be the implications for south York Centre or any other ridings adjacent to the impacts if Mr. Oliver's suggestions were taken in?

• (1020)

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** I can't predict what the impacts would be, but I can't imagine that it would be left, that the riding I represent in an urban area, with its significant growth potential, would somehow now be at 138% and growing, without there being some easement somewhere.

So that easement requires—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Right, so that Etobicoke Centre be involved.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** —a shift to York Centre, Etobicoke North, Etobicoke Centre, Davenport, and Trinity—Spadina, all of which about my riding. The abutments to my riding are at hard physical boundaries: the Humber River, the 401 highway, railroad tracks to the east, and railroad tracks to the south. By their very existence, these are dividers of communities of interest.

There are very few places where you can cross any of those boundaries. Unlike the Allen Road, which Mr. Oliver suggests is a natural boundary and has roads across it all the way down its length so that there is plenty of connection between those two communities, there is virtually no connection between the piece he would like to hive off and my riding.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I hope Mr. Oliver affords himself the opportunity to come and testify, as you two and many others have done, because as it stands, it's hard to... These are all about justifications and the committee is trying to understand what the rationale is to recommend change.

Mr. Adler has made I think a pretty substantive case and has talked to the member from Willowdale. Is that right, Mr. Adler?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** That's right.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** And has his support.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Those are the things the committee is looking for, and the letters of support from various interest groups.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Chair.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I apologize for not having thought of this earlier when I asked my question. I just realized that as I was driving in this morning and listening to CBC, the first story on the news was that Minister Oliver is in London speaking about a natural resources issue. My guess is that's the reason he's not here. I forgot that.

I'm not sure how to deal with this, because it may be that he wants to make a presentation. I know there are all kinds of issues of fairness to Mr. Sullivan, who would then not be present for it. But I just think that an awareness on our part of the reason he's not here, that he's on another continent, would be relevant.

**The Chair:** I was going to cover that at the end of the meeting, but I'll cover it now since it's been brought up. We do have a fairly detailed letter from Minister Oliver. I had more than one quick conversation with him about scheduling. He is out of the country a lot. Ministers of the crown have been hard to get here at the table. We've had a few, but those who need to travel in particular have not been here.

He said that his letter was fairly explicit. It was sent to all members of the committee. So it's not like you have no information from Minister Oliver on what he's suggesting. I recognize that you can't ask questions of him, but that's why Mr. Sullivan is here, and I think the committee will need to do what the committee has done when we have a conflict between two MPs.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** On that point of order, Chair, are there other accommodations that can be made for travelling members to be able to phone in?

**The Chair:** Absolutely. We could sit in the summer.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I didn't actually say that in my suggestion, Chair, but I'm open to it. I wouldn't want to delay the entire electoral boundaries process for one minister who's travelling. The—

**The Chair:** Which is why he has said to us, "I've written a letter and please let it—"

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** But I think my point to Mr. Sullivan, and the cause for Mr. Reid's intervention, is that when a member makes what one would have to say is a pretty significant suggestion and change, not just to another riding, but potentially to other ridings, that would be better supported if the member were able to answer some of the questions that I and other committee members have for him. A phone call works, regardless of where you are in the world. The committee can accommodate that.

If a member wanted to phone into this hearing today and make a case and receive questions from us, we could do it like we do on other committees, I'm assuming.

**The Chair:** We certainly could. This committee has not set that up and has not done it. The minister had suggested, when we invited him here, to just use his testimony.

•(1025)

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Marie-France Renaud):** His office promised to send more information in writing. We should have it today or tomorrow and then translate it.

**A voice:** That's not useful to us at all.

**The Chair:** All right?

Thank you.

On the same point of order?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.):** [*Inaudible—Editor*] is there not a deadline to submit this kind of question?

**The Chair:** There's a deadline for a member to submit their objection with some thoughts as to what their objection is, but we've allowed many members to come to the committee with information such as community of interest verification and those types of things.

No, we've allowed members to come and, if you will, add to their testimony while they're here.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Because we had a case before of a member—I don't know who he was, but a colleague—and you said it was too late.

**The Chair:** Well, Pat Martin... If I'm not mistaken, we've had more than one member who, well after the date for that province to file an objection, wanted to file an objection.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** And Mr. Oliver did that—

**The Chair:** He sent us his original objection well within the timeline.

Mr. Dion, it's your time for questions. I know you weren't here.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I wasn't here. I was in the House at the request of my whip.

**Some voices:** Oh.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I understand, though, that we have a typical case, with Mr. Sullivan that saying he's pleased with the current request of the commission. He is here to say, don't change it.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** Exactly.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** And Mr. Adler is coming with a change that is supported by a neighbouring colleague—

**Mr. Mark Adler:** That's correct.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** —that is within the range of the demographic request and will help two communities to not to be split.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** That is correct.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** So that's a good summary of what was said when I wasn't here?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Menegakis, you have four or five minutes please.

**Mr. Costas Menegakis (Richmond Hill, CPC):** I'm very quick.

Mr. Chair, I want to weigh in on Mr. Oliver's situation. To be fair, we have told all members as a committee, first of all, that they need to meet a deadline to get their paperwork in, which he did. We've also given all members an option as to whether they want the presentation they give to us to stand as is, or whether they would like to appear. Some of have said "No, I've put it in writing and that will speak for itself" and that there's no need for them to appear here.

It wouldn't be fair not to weigh the importance of written submissions from members, simply because they're not here, for whatever reason they choose not to come here. As with this case with the minister, it's not like he's ignoring us. He feels that he has submitted his case with sufficient evidence to support it. It's clear in this instance that there's no agreement between the two members of Parliament who are affected.

That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Yes. And we've certainly had that in the past, whether they both sit here or one's made a written submission and the other has not.

Great. Are there any further questions from the committee?

Mr. Cullen, by all means.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I have a question for Mr. Sullivan. Referring to Mr. Menegakis' point, I agree, but typically when members have chosen only to write a submission, they've been offering only very small changes—often a name change or justification. My only point is that as in any court, which we are not, but in any committee trying to understand evidence, the to and fro of why and the justifications are important. I wonder if Mr. Sullivan can make a comment as to the process. That's what I was asking Mr. Sullivan about. What process did he use at the hearings?

We heard from Mr. Adler that some people weren't heard, which I find a bit worrisome. Maybe we can ask Elections Canada about that.

Here's my point. If you wanted to move 30,000 constituents out of one riding into another, if Mr. Oliver or whoever had seen the maps and members in his constituency, he would probably come and testify at least at the commission, or get some written testimony in there to say that 30,000 people need to move out and make a really large riding to the west of him. But that choice was not made then. The choice is now made through writing to us. But as a process, it's very difficult for the committee to say we have all the arguments, pro and con, because we don't. We only have one side and it's only one-directional.

Mr. Sullivan.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** I did appear before the commission, because the original proposed boundary was different from my riding. I did appear. Many individuals in my riding also appeared, and other politicians appeared to suggest, first, that the riding was okay the way it was and didn't need to change, but also to defend communities of interest. As I understand it from the commission, Mr. Oliver did not make any submissions pro or con, none whatsoever, regarding the chunk that he is now proposing.

Another concern I have is that the clerk has indicated that he will be preparing additional written submissions, to which I would request from this committee that I be put in a position to respond when they are submitted. I'm not sure how much time you have to do this.

•(1030)

**The Chair:** Not much.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan:** I'm not sure what your timing is for allowing him to make more written submissions than the one letter that's here, but I certainly would want the opportunity to be able to read it, to digest it, and to respond to it and, if necessary, to provide evidence.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Chair—and I suppose this is through you—I'm not sure how we handle this in a sense, because at the committee we try to get through the reports once we've heard the testimony.

Mr. Sullivan has requested that, if further arguments are made—and I think you indicated earlier in the meeting that we would try to accommodate that—it gets a bit cumbersome. I appreciate that ministers have to travel. We all have to travel a bunch. Normally you have the two MPs who are disagreeing sitting beside each other and you can start to wade through the pro and con arguments and the committee members can figure it out for themselves.

But the letter-writing process for a significant thing—not a name change or a block or whatever it's been in the past—makes it very difficult to understand what Mr. Sullivan's role is going to be if Mr.

Oliver says a community of interest is going to be affected and that that's why 30,000 people have to come out. The committee then has to have Mr. Sullivan back to ask if that's a community of interest. What is the evidence for that in support, pro or con? It's going to be somewhat cumbersome, while trying to be respectful of the minister's travel schedule and his other things.

If we can get him on the phone, let's do that. That might simplify things entirely and speed things up for us.

**The Chair:** I'm troubled by what we're talking about. In every case, when two MPs do not agree about a change, we have handled this in a similar fashion. We admit that they don't agree, and we move on and suggest that the commission takes its own thought process on that. I see no difference if one member is writing and one member is sitting here, or both are sitting here to argue with each other. I certainly don't want to give away what we've done in private deliberations, folks, but I think we're making a bit of a—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Mountain out of a mole hill?

**The Chair:** —mountain out of this one mole hill. We've got one member suggesting one thing, another member suggesting another, and I think we'll report back to the committee that we heard from two members.

Mr. Dion, do you have comments on this point?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I do, on this one.

Mr. Chair, I agree with you that we should do nothing to prevent Mr. Oliver having the same ability as other colleagues, but the point I think Mr. Cullen is making is that it's a huge change. I'm not sure if it's even within the request of the [*Inaudible—Editor*], although I think what he's proposing may make another riding too big. I'm not sure of that, but it's likely. Also, it's affecting not only Mr. Sullivan's riding, but St. Paul's as well, Dr. Bennett's riding.

**The Chair:** According to what I've read from Minister Oliver's thing, his only suggestion is to take back a piece of Eglinton—Lawrence that he currently represents. That's all he's saying. He doesn't really get into the demographics of it, but he just suggested that piece over to a certain—

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** My understanding is that it will also affect St. Paul's. I may be wrong. But because he's proposing a huge change, I think it would be fair that we also offer to write a letter to the colleagues affected in response to his last-minute letter, to explain to them—

**The Chair:** But as this committee does, that's exactly what we will do.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** That's what I'm proposing, that we make sure all of the colleagues affected have an opportunity to respond to his request.

**The Chair:** Sure.

Mr. Reid.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I'm now being handed a letter from Minister Oliver to our—

**The Chair:** This is a submission you were all sent as part of this study.



**Mr. Scott Reid:** All right, but does he refer in this to the letters he's talking about submitting? To me that is different from his saying later on that he's going to throw something else in as well.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**The Clerk:** The letter we just gave everyone is the original submission of his objection. Since then we've invited him to appear. He's travelling now, so he can't be here. He has promised to send more documentation.

• (1035)

**The Chair:** We could offer you no more information than that, and what I've already shared. I think it has to stand on what it is, as we've allowed testimony to stand as it's been given.

Who do I have on my list? Mr. Reid.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I just did the thing I was going to do.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. You've done all you needed.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Does anyone else have a short question for our two witnesses before we excuse them?

All right.

Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Adler, thank you for coming and making your points today. It's been very helpful to us.

We will suspend for a minute or two while we get our next panel.

• (1035)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1040)

**The Chair:** We will resume our study of the electoral redistribution of the province of Ontario. Welcome to all our guests this morning.

Mr. Hayes, I understand that you got out of your other committee to make it here. They know which committees are more important around this place.

It's good to have you all here. You will each get five minutes worth to tell us your story, and then we'll ask you very tough questions about it.

Mr. Hayes, you're going first this morning.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes (Sault Ste. Marie, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Is it okay to begin?

**The Chair:** Yes, please.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** The initial report of the electoral boundaries commission proposed no changes to my riding of Sault Ste. Marie. That was anticipated. There should not have been any changes to my riding of Sault Ste. Marie. The population was 89,000, which is well below the provincial quotient already.

The final report of the boundaries commission proposed changes to the riding of Sault Ste. Marie and reversed almost every other recommendation it had initially made with respect to Sudbury, Timmins—James Bay, Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, and Nipissing-Timiskaming.

The reasons for the reversal of those changes were really twofold. The commission determined that, based on consultations in those communities, there was no longer a community of interest. That was evident in Sudbury, Timmins—James Bay, Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, and North Bay, and they also stated that there was inappropriate involvement by two members of Parliament.

A quotation from the report plainly and simply stated:

The advice received at those public hearings, combined with the inappropriate involvement of at least two Members of Parliament, persuaded the Commission to conclude that the status quo, with a few minor boundary adjustments, is the best solution it can achieve for Northern Ontario.

One of those minor boundary adjustments was to remove a portion of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie and place it within the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking.

Based on doing that, a hearing was conducted in Sault Ste. Marie. That was probably the final hearing that was conducted. It was thrown together fairly hastily, and it was done on a Monday morning, as I recall, at 11 o'clock. I think there were 12 people in attendance at the hearing. It was very clear from those in attendance that they do not agree that their community of interest falls along Highway 17. It's very clear, and they were very persuasive that their community of interest is in fact Sault Ste. Marie, without a doubt. Many of them commute to Sault Ste. Marie. They do their banking in Sault Ste. Marie. They do their shopping in Sault Ste. Marie. They work in Sault Ste. Marie at Essar Steel Algoma and various other employers.

I should point out that those people in attendance were representing other individuals as well. They were there representing people who couldn't come. It's my understanding that there were petitions presented, stating that they want to remain in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie. There were resolutions passed by three municipal townships, stating that they wanted to stay within the riding of Sault Ste. Marie.

It was not political at all. I might add that one of the resolutions came from Jody Wildman of St. Joseph Island, who is the reeve of that part of the Island. He is a well-known NDP supporter. His father, Bud Wildman, was the member of provincial parliament for the longest time. This is not political in any way, shape, or form. He himself said that St. Joseph Island should remain as part of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie.

The second point I want to make is just in terms of service to constituents. All these places that are removed are within a 40-minute drive of Sault Ste. Marie. The way it's happening now, if they have to become a part of the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, whose riding office is housed in Elliot Lake, the result will be an-hour-and-a-half to two-hour drive for many of these constituents to go to a constituency office, when many of them are in Sault Ste. Marie on a weekly basis as it stands.

My final argument is that, if the commission allows this to move forward after it has openly recognized that there was inappropriate involvement by two members of Parliament, it is condoning that involvement and in fact rewarding it, which to me is an insult to those constituents in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie who are presenting the exact same arguments that the other ridings presented in terms of community of interest. The boundary commission is refusing to accept the community of interest argument in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, but it is in the others.

In terms of a solution, I believe a much better solution, given the geographic size of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing at approximately 100,000 square kilometres, is for the commission to invoke the extraordinary circumstances rule in the act to accommodate a population below the maximum negative variance from the provincial quota, similar to what it has done in many ridings, including Kenora. That is a much more reasonable approach, and that is the solution I propose.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

●(1045)

**The Chair:** Ms. Hughes, would you like to go next.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing, NDP):** Bonjour. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to speak. During the electoral boundary process, I attended both meetings, one in North Bay on the original proposal and the second in Sault Ste. Marie, which was added after the commission put forward an alternative proposal.

I am certain it was a difficult task for the commission to create riding boundaries for northern Ontario that make mathematical and geographic sense. The need to draw up a second proposal reflects how challenging that was.

The physical geography and population density have to be balanced by what can reasonably be expected of any single member of Parliament, and what level of representation can be seen as the most balanced and fair for constituents. That means that in northern Ontario the boundary commission was not able to look only at numbers, as is possible in truly urban areas.

I brought to the commission a schedule of the outreach clinics my office runs so that people who prefer to approach their MP for help in person can do so, and showed how the placement of my constituency offices help maximize my ability to service the constituency. I have one here that I will be able to submit afterwards.

I believe the commission listened to the concerns and opinions presented to them, and the recommendations put forward show that they have done a good job of balancing the criteria. Additionally, they managed to maintain a semblance of continuity that will help minimize confusion among constituents across the region.

I understand there are people on both sides of this proposal, but I feel that if the overarching desire is to increase the number of voters in AMK, the final recommendation is the proposal that will likely do the least harm.

The changes made by the commission mean that the north shore boundaries of the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing

more closely match the boundaries of the provincial Algoma-Manitoulin constituency along the north shore area.

I would also like to mention that from the beginning of the process, before I met with the commission, I was in touch with constituents and municipal officials to determine the wishes of the people who would be affected. Throughout my presentations to the commission, I encouraged them to maintain the status quo and grant a population exemption to AMK.

Given its current size and distance, the end results have to ensure that ridings be designed with serviceability in mind and fairness for constituents. I do believe it is important for the decision to reflect that Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing is made up of numerous similar-sized communities and beholden to none of northern Ontario's biggest cities.

This was the reason cited when the riding was created during the last round of redistribution, and it still makes sense today. It works to the advantage of the many small towns that receive equal representation under the current boundaries, which could be jeopardized if the riding were to skirt Sudbury as was originally proposed. This would also have put three members of Parliament in the city of Greater Sudbury, which would disadvantage the small communities, as I mentioned.

In conclusion I believe it is important to adopt a different mindset when considering the distribution of ridings in northern Ontario. We have to acknowledge that there is more to consider than mere population, and reflect how physical geography sets out certain challenges that define the ability of an MP to service a constituency.

It should also be noted that I did discuss the possibilities of boundary changes with the member from Sault Ste. Marie prior to the North Bay hearing, and did speak with him again after the Sault Ste. Marie one, given that he was not in attendance at either of them. I also suggested that he might want to make a submission. I'm not sure if he did that.

Finally it is important for this committee to consider the fact that any changes to Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing will cascade in two directions and cause considerable reorganization of constituency boundaries from the north shore of Lake Superior through to the Quebec boundary.

I urge you to weigh all these elements as you come up with your final recommendation.

Is there any more time?

●(1050)

**The Chair:** Thirty seconds.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** That's good then. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Super. Thank you very much.

Monsieur Thibeault, you have five minutes.

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault (Sudbury, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the members of the committee for giving me the opportunity to come forward today and speak to the proposed boundaries for northeastern Ontario.

As you may be aware, when this process started last year the chief concern of the majority of northern Ontarians was keeping 10 federal ridings in the north. Northern Ontario represents 87% of Ontario's land area. So although the population of the ridings in the region is below the national average, it is important to keep 10 ridings in order to ensure effective representation.

I will use my own riding of Sudbury as an example of why this is so important. Although Sudbury is the largest city in northern Ontario, it has no passport office, and recently the CIC office in Sudbury was closed. This means that my office acts as a de facto immigration office and processes thousands of passport applications each year. So MPs in northern Ontario form a vital link between Canadians and the federal government, regardless of which party we represent.

I was therefore very happy that the proposal released by the Ontario commission in the fall of 2012 took this into account and kept 10 ridings in northern Ontario. However, there were a number of concerns with where the riding boundaries had been placed in the initial proposal, particularly in northeastern Ontario.

For example, the removal of Lively, Whitefish, and Naughton from the Sudbury riding did not reflect the fact that these communities are part of the city of Greater Sudbury, and it would have isolated them from the rest of the proposed Algoma—Manitoulin—Killarney riding.

The boundary between Timmins—Cochrane—James Bay and Nickel Belt—Timiskaming would have created an artificial divide between a community of interest of farmers and people associated with agriculture. The ridings of Timmins—Cochrane—James Bay and Nickel Belt—Timiskaming would have become larger both in terms of geography and population than the large ridings they replaced, making them almost unserviceable.

The removal of the Kapuskasing—Hearst region from the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Killarney would have placed it in a riding in which it had no political or community history.

The commission held public hearings in Sudbury, New Liskeard, North Bay, as well as Kenora and Thunder Bay. MPs from those areas all attended. The commission also offered a second round of public meetings in Sault Ste Marie to look at other options, and I would like to thank the commission for doing so. I also note that Mr. Hayes did not appear at any of these public hearings, even when changes were suggested to the rural region that is part of the Algoma provincial riding.

In each of these hearings, in northeastern Ontario it was clear that an overwhelming majority of constituents did not feel that the proposal put forward would provide representation equal to or better than the status quo. We thank the commission for listening to the citizens and mayors of northeastern Ontario regarding the problems that the original proposal would have created for the region.

The final report of the commission corrects the majority of these concerns, and as the report itself states, the final recommendation was made on account of the advice received at those public hearings. The NDP MPs in the region participated in the public hearing process within the guidelines drawn up in the 2004 report by

Elections Canada, which lays out the rights of MPs to participate in the public hearing process. These read:

Members of the House of Commons are not by any means excluded from this process of public involvement. Indeed, it is recognized that they will invariably have strong views on both the names and boundaries of the proposed electoral districts. Therefore, members of the House of Commons are not only allowed to appear before a commission at the public hearings, but the legislation also provides the opportunity for them to object to the proposals of any of the boundaries commissions.

Any changes to boundaries in the region will have a significant knock-on effect on all ridings in northern Ontario. Let me repeat that: Any changes to the boundaries in the region of northern Ontario will have cascading effects that will affect the area from White River—north of Lake Superior—to the Quebec boundary. I therefore support the report of the boundary commission and would ask this committee to call for no changes to the boundaries for northern Ontario.

I thank, again, the boundary commission for their excellent work in what can be sometimes a thankless and difficult task, especially when you're looking at northern Ontario. And I thank you all for having me here today.

•(1055)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Thibeault.

Mr. Angus, for five minutes, if you would, please.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm pleased to be here today to speak to the boundary proposal to move the rural townships of Harris and Hudson into Timmins—James Bay. The move reflects the opinions that were given at the public hearing held in New Liskeard on October 15, 2012, on the need to maintain the continuity of rural communities along the Highway 11 corridor.

I support the boundaries commission's recommendation for this change. However, I have spoken with the member for Nipissing—Timiskaming about his desire to keep these townships within the present boundaries. I will defer to the boundaries commission either way on these matters and will be satisfied with the result.

I am also here, however, in response to Mr. Hayes' claim that political interference in the boundaries commission has unfairly impacted his region. Mr. Hayes is referring to references made in the federal electoral boundaries commission report for Ontario of February 23, 2013, where the commission referenced two examples of alleged inappropriate actions on my part.

The first was this:

The Member of Parliament for Timmins—James Bay submitted that the community of interest among farmers and people associated with agriculture in the farming area west and north of the City of Temiskaming Shores flowed north along Highway 11, and that there was no community of interest with people involved in agriculture in the electoral district of Nickel Belt.

My involvement was in the form of a public hearing in New Liskeard, where I read a statement into the record. I will quote from the record of what I stated that day:

Cutting a line through Timiskaming will be very detrimental. This will be the third time in just over 10 years that Timiskaming has been substantially affected by dramatic riding changes.... Under the new changes, the line has been arbitrarily moved vertically along Highway 11 so that Englehart will now be in the Nickel Belt riding, while its neighbouring community of Tomstown will be in Timmins—Cochrane—James Bay.

Thus, residents in one community will be a 20-minute drive from their MP office, while their neighbours are 300 km from their MP.... It makes no sense from a geographic or economic point of view.

Moving Timiskaming into Nickel Belt will create numerous problems for the agriculture community of Timiskaming. There are no historic or economic lines of continuity between rural Timiskaming and the Sudbury region.... People in Nickel Belt overwhelmingly see themselves as part of the greater Sudbury region. Timiskaming, however, is part of a growing farm community that is anchored on Highway 11.

The second objection that the boundaries commission referenced as inappropriate actions was also stated in the report:

The member also expressed concern about the ability to serve constituents effectively if the communities along Highway 11 from the Town of Smooth Rock Falls to west of the Town of Hearst were included in the electoral district.

I will therefore read the statement that I gave to the commission:

I know it is not the mandate of the boundaries commission to concern itself with MP staffing and budgets. However, the boundaries commission needs to reflect on the impact of an additional six communities, some as much as 300 km from our existing office, being added to the riding. As no other ridings in the north other than Nickel Belt—Timiskaming are being asked to assume such dramatic new responsibilities, I argue that this recommendation creates an unnecessary imbalance between the smaller urban ridings and the larger rural ridings.

The riding of Timmins—James Bay is already bigger than Great Britain. The northwest rural riding of Kenora has a population that is 40% less than the proposed Timmins—Cochrane—James Bay riding. The new Nipissing riding will have a population that is 11% smaller than the new riding and a land mass that is a mere 4% of the size of my expanded riding. The urban riding of Sudbury will have a population smaller than Timmins—Cochrane—James Bay, while my riding is being asked to assume 17,000 more kilometres of distance and six new communities. There is no reason for such obvious disparities within the ridings of northern Ontario.

The position that I presented was echoed by over 1,000 submissions of citizens, town councils, and municipal organizations. Justice Valin and his commission ultimately agreed with these objections. I am satisfied that the new boundary proposal represents the larger interests of citizens in our region, and that further changes at this late hour would only create a ripple effect across a number of ridings.

I thank the boundaries commission for its excellent work. It is a hard task to fix the issues in northern Ontario, and people were certainly vocal in responding to the problem, with their initial proposals. However, the true test of fairness is noted in the commission's willingness to listen to the issues and attempt to find a balance, given the problems of the vast geography of northern Ontario. I support its recommendations.

●(1100)

**The Chair:** Mr. Aspin, could you finish us off?

**Mr. Jay Aspin (Nipissing—Timiskaming, CPC):** Thank you, Chair. I'd like to thank the members of the committee. It's a pleasure to be here with my northern colleagues today.

My recommendation is very simple. I'll give you a little background. Under the first proposal, essentially my riding of Nipissing—Timiskaming was cut in half and it was proposed that the Timiskaming portion be realigned with Nickel Belt. As others have indicated, this caused considerable consternation. That portion of

Timiskaming has always been aligned with the Highway 11 corridor, and that was the major objective I received as well.

Under the second proposal, everything was moved back from Nickel Belt to my riding—everything except the northern border. By the northern border, I submit that the townships of Harris, Hudson, and several unincorporated townships.... When I talked to residents in that portion, several people approached me and mentioned two factors. They are aligned with the Highway 11 corridor, and further, they are aligned with Temiskaming Shores. That's really their community of interest.

As Mr. Thibeault has pointed out, it's more or less the situation of Lively to Sudbury. It's the same situation in these cases. They're very small townships but, nonetheless, their community of interest is Temiskaming Shores. So it's very simple, Mr. Chairman. All I'm saying is that not everything was put back; indeed, those particular townships weren't put back. In accordance with the wishes of the residents, I am requesting that they be put back. I took it upon myself to call the Reeves of the two townships, and they concurred. I had a discussion with Mr. Angus, who indicated that he doesn't have a problem with it, so I'm asking that this portion be reallocated to Nipissing—Timiskaming.

As for participation, Chair, call it naïveté on the part of a first-time member, but during the first proposals I thought that we as MPs were to stand back and let the public provide the input. As MP Hayes has indicated, that's why I stood back and didn't comment. I let the people comment.

With this second proposal, I'm here to convey the wishes of the residents that they would like to realign. So it's very simple: just put back the townships, and I'd be happy.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Aspin.

We have a seven-minute round.

Mr. Reid.

●(1105)

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I noted that two of the commentators, Mr. Thibeault and Ms. Hughes, both observed that Mr. Hayes had not been present at the earlier round of hearings. I gather there was an interim round with that special Sault Ste. Marie meeting.

You didn't say it outright, but I got the sense from the subtext there that because Mr. Hayes had failed to be present at that time, his testimony today should be given less weight as a consequence. Is that what you're saying? Either of you can answer or both, if you wish, but don't take too long.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** That's not what I'm saying at all.

I indicated I had a discussion with Mr. Hayes about the changes. When it came to North Bay, Mr. Hayes said that there were no changes to his riding, so he had no interest in being there, and I only spoke to him afterwards with respect to Sault Ste. Marie. I assumed he would be there because it was in his own backyard, and I don't know the reasons why he wasn't there.

As I said, he could have made a submission. I have no idea if he did or not. So I indicated I did attempt to be there. I did speak to Mr. Hayes prior to going to North Bay, looking at a better solution because I knew that the changes that were being proposed did not align properly with the riding, and he indicated that he wanted to keep St. Joseph Island because his best man was from there.

I can tell you that I did speak to some of the mayors on St. Joseph Island.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** That's great. Just hang on a second, Ms. Hughes. The question I asked you was whether you had felt that his testimony should be given less weight on this account—

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** And I said no.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** And you answered that. I'm glad you said that. I just wanted to get that confirmation.

Mr. Thibeault, do you concur with her on that point?

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** The reason I brought up that point in my speech was the importance of appearing and having the discussions throughout the process. We would have concerns if there were an 11th-hour pitch to change things that would have cascading effects throughout the north.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

I just want to be clear about this. A similar situation happened vis-à-vis the boundary between my own riding. What was Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington will become Lanark—Frontenac and the City of Kingston. Ted Hsu, the MP to the south of me, did not appear at the boundaries commissions hearings because no changes were made to his boundary. When he came here—and I did a presentation side by side with him—I made a point of saying that I thought it was perfectly reasonable for him not to appear. Who would appear when it appears that nothing is going to change and the commission is leaving your boundaries alone? That has been a pattern that is widespread and is perfectly reasonable.

Therefore, I want to ask Mr. Hayes the question. Am I correct that the initial boundaries did not change your riding in any way?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** That is correct.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay. The second question I want to ask is about Mr. Thibeault's concern that there will be cascading effects on other areas. Am I correct that this is not in fact what you're proposing? Your change would result in Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking being below the 25%, which is normally the cut-off, but no other riding would be changed. There would be no cascades.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** That is absolutely correct.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Thank you. I wanted to get that clear.

I did some math. I just took the boundaries originally proposed by the commission, and then I subtracted the past population of your

riding from what it is now under the proposed changes. I added that number to Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, with the result that they go from 79,801 down to 72,984. Is that, in fact, the population you're suggesting for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** That is the current population, and that is what I'm suggesting, given its size. I believe we should invoke that rule.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** All right.

I have limited time, which is why I keep hustling along all the people who are answering.

Just to be clear about this, northern Ontario has always been a vexing problem for the Ontario commissioners. This time around as well as last time around, the obvious problem has been how do you deal with the fact that you have such an enormous swath of territory? The second problem they have is that this is not the same as the problem you face with a rural riding like the one I have in southern Ontario, which is very large—not by your standards, but by the standards of, say, Toronto—and also populated throughout. I gather that in the north you have two kinds of ridings. You have the ones that have some agriculture, but you also have cities of very substantial sizes, which, in the end, will constitute the lion's share of a particular riding. Other ridings have vast amounts of space and extremely widely spread communities that are sometimes only accessible by water and air.

Am I correct in asserting that your riding—which would now, under the change that you're proposing, still be below the provincial average but be closer—is essentially an urban riding with a rural outlying area, and Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking for the most part is a riding consisting of widely scattered communities without a very large urban centre?

• (1110)

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** That would be correct, yes.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay. What I'm getting at here is that it seems to me that there is a reason for the commission to consider that in the very largest ridings, of which there are really only four in northern Ontario, it might be reasonable to go beyond the 25% to make such a declaration.

I want to ask if you are explicitly recommending that they invoke this particular part of the act that allows them to go beyond the 25% number, in the case of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I am explicitly recommending that, sir, yes.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Okay. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Perfect.

Madame Latendresse to start, for seven minutes in total.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all of the witnesses who testified today.

I would like to better understand what happened at the special meeting, at the public consultation that was held in Sault Ste. Marie. Were changes to the electoral map proposed?

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** Yes.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Mr. Hayes, when the meeting in Sault Ste. Marie was held, did the proposal on the table affect your riding?

[English]

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Yes, that affected my riding. The new proposal on the table would remove a portion of my riding, about 7,000 constituents. I'm at 89,000, and it was going to remove a portion of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, down to 82,000. Those constituents would be placed in the adjacent riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung.

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** As Mr. Reid mentioned, one of the problems in northern Ontario is that it is difficult to find a balance and to get all of the ridings as close as possible to the quotient, but still having a relatively reasonable geographic size. Mr. Angus's riding is obviously an exception. The problem is that the commission managed to find a way for all of the ridings concerned—except Kenora—to respect the limit set out in legislation, which is 25%. That is the situation.

Mr. Hayes, you proposed that Ms. Hughes' riding exceed the limit. I think that her riding currently has 74,000 people. The 25% limit, for Ontario, would be 79,000 people. Is that true?

[English]

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Let's very clearly understand why I'm proposing that. It's because this is the request of the constituents who are being removed from the riding of Sault Ste. Marie. They are impacted. Sault Ste. Marie is very clearly their community of interest. As the commission stated, because of everything that happened it was going to leave things as the status quo except for a minor adjustment.

As far as I'm concerned, it should have left things as the status quo. It was perfectly fine before for the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung to have the population it did. I believe it's geographically large enough that it should fall under that same component.

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** There is something else that is very important to us. There must be a consultation among MPs and colleagues, and we want everyone's support. I understand that your proposal would have us exceed the limit in the legislation, but you also do not have Ms. Hughes' support for your proposed changes.

Is that true?

[English]

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** In all honesty, Madam Hughes actually recommended that herself in one of her proposals to the commission, so she was supportive of it at one time.

It was the commission that said that it's not possible. So I guess my challenge is to the commission. Why isn't it possible, given the geographic size of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung?

Madam Hughes supported that at one point in time, and I would like to see her support it today.

• (1115)

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** I will let Ms. Hughes respond.

[English]

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Sure.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** I simply want to add the following.

In the beginning, I asked for an exemption at all of the sessions. The commission's representatives kept telling us that their mandate did not allow them to grant another exemption to any riding in northern Ontario. That is what they told us.

When it was a matter of the communities in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, I told them that if I could not get an exemption, their second suggestion would surely be the best for the riding to ensure that people are properly represented.

As I said, we do not expect people to come into the office, because the distances are long. As a result, my assistants travel to the communities to hold community meetings.

That said, I spoke to the mayor of St. Joseph Island. He wanted his city to remain in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, and that was mentioned to the commission. However, I have always maintained that the best solution was the status quo.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** I have a very simple question for Mr. Aspin.

Approximately how many people will your proposal affect?

[English]

**Mr. Jay Aspin:** The lion's share, as I mentioned, would be the townships of Hudson and Harris. I don't have the population, but I do know that there are 737 voters in total.

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Not many, then.

[English]

**Mr. Jay Aspin:** Yes. It's very small.

[Translation]

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Okay.

That is all for me. Mr. Cullen may have the rest of my time.

[English]

**The Chair:** You have one minute left, if one of your colleagues would like to take it up.

Madame Turmel.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** I have a question for Mr. Hayes.

You mentioned that there was a change between the first and second hearings. When you learned about these changes, did you decide to send a brief? You decided not to appear, even though there were changes. I would like to know why.

[English]

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** No, Mr. Aspin made it perfectly clear.

I did not participate in the hearing in Sault Ste. Marie. I did not send a brief to the hearing in Sault Ste. Marie; I sent a brief after the fact. I chose not to appear in Sault Ste. Marie or in North Bay, because as far as I was concerned, I didn't want to put myself in a position of political interference.

This whole process, from what I understood, was supposed to be non-political, with no political influence, and that's the route I chose to take. I just took a back step and let the grassroots constituents do what they had to do.

That's the way I chose to go about it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Monsieur Dion, for seven minutes.

[Translation]

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

Thank you to all of my colleagues.

I would like to be sure that the committee has very clear understanding of what is going on.

If I'm not wrong, Madame Hughes has difficulty with the proposition of Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Thibeault has difficulty with the proposition of Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Angus has difficulty with the proposition of Mr. Aspin....

No? You have no difficulty at all?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** No difficulty at all; and I would have supported Mr. Hayes, but the boundary commission told us that they would not allow an exemption for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapus-kasing. They said it was not going to be allowed and that we had to divide up the population. That's why they came back and they were adamant.

Our only opposition to Mr. Hayes' proposition right now is that because they said they refused to recognize an exemption, even though Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapus-kasing is very challenged, someone is going to have to make up that population, and that's what they told us.

That's why we're here. We don't object overall to the idea, but we are within the constraints of what the boundary commission told us.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** So Mr. Aspin's view is not objected to by anyone.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** No.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Okay: good to know.

**An hon. member:** Way to go, Jay.

**An hon. member:** Hello, neighbour.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** But if I'm not wrong, Madame Hughes, you have the same view as Mr. Angus. You wouldn't object to Mr. Hayes' proposition if the commission were open to making an exception to have your riding below the 25% quota.

• (1120)

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** That does not change the population of the other ridings. I think that is reliable. Mr. Hayes said that it would take 45 minutes by car to get to his office and about an hour to get to the Elliot Lake office. We do not expect people to come to our office. We go to them.

However, I can tell you that with the change this would make to Mr. Angus's riding, it would take three hours for people from Hearst to drive to Timmins.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I am a bit lost. What are you talking about?

If the commission agreed to give your riding an exemption, allowing it to be at 29.55%, below the provincial quota, you would not object to Mr. Hayes' proposal.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** No, but are you taking into account the fact that the towns of Manitowadge and Pic Mobert were transferred to Thunder Bay?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I am completely lost.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** The commission is suggesting that we remove two communities from my riding and transfer them to Thunder Bay. Do your figures take into account that the communities will return to Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapus-kasing?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** The 29.55% represents the status quo.

[English]

The current electoral district of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapus-kasing has a census population of 74,828 persons.

Is it the proposal of Mr. Hayes to have 74,828 persons, 29.55% below the provincial quota? Is that what you're proposing for Madame Hughes' riding?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** That is what I'm proposing, yes.

[Translation]

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Do you object to that?

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** No. That is what I asked the commission, but as I said, it removed two communities and that will affect Thunder Bay.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** In that case, Mr. Thibeault and Mr. Angus, why would you not say that you support Mr. Hayes and that you want an exemption for your riding?

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The problem is that the boundary commission was clear. So, at this hour I would love fantasy but I'm living in reality.

[Translation]

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** No, but—

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Kenora has an exception. Kenora has a population 40% smaller than my riding, and I have numerous fly-in communities. But they said they would not make a second exception.

With the fact that they've already moved communities out of Algoma and moved them over to Thunder Bay, we are dealing with a cascading effect.

We support the boundary commission. We understand their parameters, so we're not asking them to rewrite the rules they engaged in. We're saying that given that this was their mandate, we accept their recommendations.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** I understand.

So, if the committee wrote in its report that you prefer what the commission has proposed, unless it is ready to revisit its rule that no exceptions should be made for Madam Hughes' riding, would that be fair? Would that represent what you think, or not?

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** We all, at all of our sessions, asked for the status quo for AMK, because the way the commission divvied up AMK when they brought out their propositions—so much so that we had Coniston, which was on the east side of the City of Sudbury, in AMK—it really changed the way we could represent all constituents in northern Ontario.

We asked that at every single commission meeting. They said that they would not look at any other status quo propositions or proposals.

What they've proposed now is the best option for all of northeastern Ontario.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Mr. Hayes, if the commission is not willing to revisit its view that one exception is enough, and Madam Hughes will not have an exception, what are you proposing then?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I'm probably not going to go there and interrupt everybody with the cascading clause, because as far as my constituents and I are concerned, the excess population, if it were required for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung, should have come out of Sudbury, because the Sudbury area had the larger population.

That was proposal that everybody was fighting, and I accept that fight. So I'm not going to fight that.

What I'm asking the group here to do is to ask the electoral boundaries commission to revisit and invoke the extraordinary circumstance rule. That's what I'm asking to happen, to leave my riding as the status quo.

As you've heard, all of the members asked for the status quo for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung, and that's what I'm asking for too, the status quo for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung.

• (1125)

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Your colleagues are saying that it's very unlikely that the commission will change its mind.

If the commission doesn't change its mind, should the ReadyMap that the commission came out with be the one?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** If the commission doesn't change its mind, sir, then this is done. I will accept the decision. I don't believe I would have a choice.

**The Chair:** You have four seconds, three seconds—

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I hope I've been helpful.

**The Chair:** You did very well.

Mr. Armstrong, you have five minutes, please.

**Mr. Scott Armstrong (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will quote from page 8, paragraph 3, lines 11, 12, and 13, of the report:

The advice received at those public hearings, combined with the inappropriate involvement of at least two Members of Parliament, persuaded the Commission to conclude that the status quo, with a few minor boundary adjustments, is the best solution it can achieve for Northern Ontario.

Mr. Angus, I think you mentioned that one of the people they said had acted inappropriately was you.

Does anyone know whom they're referring to, or what they're referring to in that? What specifically did they say was inappropriate?

That's kind of unprecedented. We haven't heard any evidence from any commission like that.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I can only go from what was in the report. There were two references to me.

One was my suggestion, my firm belief, backed by the mayors of Timiskaming...the farm community moved along Highway 11...and wasn't connected to Sudbury.... He said that was one example.

The second one was the ability to serve constituents in the northern part, given the size of the riding.

The third one he referenced was when he said that all of the mayors in the north supported it, and Madam Hughes actually said that they don't, because the mayors didn't support it.

I can't speculate beyond that, but what I find interesting is that he accepted the objections, because there were over a thousand objections made based on similar arguments. I think Justice Valin did the right thing; he heard the suggestions.

I don't know what was inappropriate about mentioning the Highway 11 corridor. This is the whole discussion we've all been having here, and I think we're all in agreement on it.

But we think they did a good job under the circumstances, because northern Ontario is obviously a very difficult piece, given its vast geography and its vast differences in some areas in terms of cultural, economic, and historic ties.

**Mr. Scott Armstrong:** So your contention, Mr. Angus, is that when they talk about inappropriate involvement they are referring specifically to your testimony? There were no other actions taken by any other MP other than that testimony they would refer to as inappropriate?



**Mr. Charlie Angus:** All I can refer to is the report of February 23, 2013, where he laid out what he thought were the examples of inappropriate behaviour. The Highway 11 corridor is an agricultural corridor that connects Val Gagné, Matheson, Cochrane, up to Kapuskasing, down through Timiskaming, and that there is no connection over to Sudbury....

To be fair there is a bit of a rural belt around the Sudbury area. What I contended with Justice Valin at the time was that we do not have any real historic ties agriculturally. And we are actually in a boom.

You might not be aware of this, but northern Ontario's booming right now in agriculture, and it's coming out of Timiskaming and moving up through Matheson. I had actually presented two maps showing the differences between agriculture in the proposed riding and agriculture under the present riding. You could see that if you cut the line, the northern part would become much smaller agriculturally, and it wouldn't be politically connected. That was the concern we raised.

**Mr. Scott Armstrong:** But, Mr. Angus, many MPs testified to the Ontario commission, but this is the only reference in the report that someone acted inappropriately. If it were just testimony that you made, I would point out that many MPs also provided testimony to the commission these same commissioners did not agree with. How do we reconcile the fact that there was a reference to inappropriate behaviour of MPs just in this particular area?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Again I think it's interesting. If you look at the report he references that, and he references the issue of service to constituents. He said that to him was inappropriate.

I think the problem for Justice Valin....This is why this needs to be put in context. In 2004 during the last boundary ridings adjustment, we had a member of Parliament who told the communities not to get involved, that it would get fixed at the last stage, and there were no submissions made, and Timiskaming disappeared as a riding. When the new riding boundary proposal came in that Timiskaming would become part of a much different riding, people were very upset. When Justice Valin came into the region, we had a very large turnout. People were very organized because they had been through this before.

I think he thought that he was coming to try to fix the solution. He was certainly surprised by the response from all the mayors, all the agricultural groups, all the citizens and, at the end of the day, he agreed. This is what he said, that he listened to those objections and he agreed with them. I think this is the measure of a good report, that when you hear from people that there are serious problems with a recommendation, you listen to them.

He listened, and at the end of the day I think it's unfortunate that he felt it was inappropriate to talk about issues of services to constituents, but within the 2004 electoral guide for involvement, it says that it's expected that MPs will participate. MPs will have strong opinions, and I certainly have strong opinions about the farming community of Timiskaming.

• (1130)

**Mr. Scott Armstrong:** So what you're contending is that it wasn't your testimony, but the attitude and the intensity with which you protested?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I can't speculate. I'm only going on the evidence.

**The Chair:** Mr. Armstrong, thank you. Your time is up. I thought I was invisible there for a second.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Scott Armstrong:** No one's ever accused you of that.

**The Chair:** I must have been turned sideways.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Thanks, all, for the testimony. I'm trying to understand one particular thing.

Mr. Hayes, you said that you would like the commission to reconsider the low population requirement that Canada has in legislation, the 25% below. You want them to reconsider. They said they won't.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** They didn't tell me that, and I haven't seen that in writing, sir. So....

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It said: "For the reasons outlined earlier in this Report, that option was no longer possible."

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I don't think they outlined that specifically. What did they say? Maybe you can relate to me specifically what they said about invoking the extraordinary circumstances rule. Why is it no longer possible?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Mr. Thibeault, you had some comment about this idea of AMK getting another special exemption. You said that the commission had made some comment to that end.

Can you enlighten the committee, and maybe Mr. Hayes as well?

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** Sure. What I mentioned at committee was that when we were looking at the original proposals brought forward by the electoral boundaries committee, we asked for that special exemption for AMK.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** The same one Mr. Hayes is asking for now?

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** This is the one Mr. Hayes is asking for. We were told outright that it would not happen, that Kenora has that exemption due to extreme circumstances, and that they would not be looking at that at all. That was said numerous times because a colleague and I were there. I can't speak for my colleague, but I did hear it numerous times.

I'm sure that Mr. Angus, along with Ms. Hughes, could also state that. That's part of why I thought it was important to outline that my friend, Mr. Hayes, was not at those meetings, because he could have brought that forward as well at that time.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Mr. Hayes, you mentioned the idea of political interference. When Mr. Thibeault, Mr. Angus, or Ms. Hughes made that intervention, to talk about a special requirement for AMK, was that political interference in your view?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Absolutely not. They were at the riding, they were at the hearings. They had a choice to be there and could say what they wanted. I'm not suggesting that there was any political interference. All I'm saying is that I chose not to go to the hearings, because it was supposed to be a grassroots hearing and it was supposed to be non-political. So it was my choice, purely.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Right, I just wanted to make sure. You're not insinuating, then, that the interventions of your colleagues were political interference.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Of course not. Any insinuations that are made are in the report. Those are not my insinuations, and I don't know what's behind the insinuations in the report of the boundaries commission. I have no idea; I have read what you've read.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes, and it would take incredible insight to divine what the commissioners are actually thinking at any given time when they write a report. This committee is going to get no further along that path than anybody else has.

The challenge I have is that you've indicated that there isn't a domino effect if we were to make these changes you're suggesting. I'm not sure how that's possible. Your colleagues have spoken in exact contradiction to that idea. Just to set expectations right for my colleagues: what we do is hear your testimony and then try to report it back to the boundaries commission as best we can. Our experience has been that, the more compelling the testimony, the more unified the testimony, the better the chances that the commission hears us. Divided testimony, contrary testimony, opposing views from the members of Parliament—these all make the argument weaker. It doesn't seem like we can arrive at any potential consensus amongst you today.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I think we have arrived at a consensus: we all agree that Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking should have been status quo.

The boundaries commission has said they will not invoke the special clause, but I have not seen it anywhere in writing. What I'm asking the committee to do is to ask the boundaries commission to invoke the special clause. That's what I'm asking because I have not seen it legislated. All we've done is heard it verbally. I have gone on record as saying that, if they choose not to invoke the extraordinary circumstance rule, then so be it. I accept the decisions that have come forward from the boundaries commission. To me, it's very simple.

• (1135)

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** We asked for the status quo for AMK because every riding in northern Ontario was being affected by these changes to AMK. They have stated through the commission that they will not invoke that special status. If they do not invoke that special status, we're happy with the way things are. The work that the boundaries commission has done works for almost everyone in northern Ontario.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** You see, this is where I'm confused because, Mr. Hayes, it is in the report. It was more than verbal. It reads.

For the reasons outlined earlier in this Report, that option was no longer possible. As part of its decision to retain 10 electoral districts for Northern Ontario, and after accepting a population for the electoral district of Kenora that is substantially below the maximum negative variance permitted by the Act, the Commission was determined to create nine additional electoral districts, each with a population falling within the maximum allowable negative variance.

They're saying it in black and white, not verbally.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** But they're not saying that they won't consider invoking the clause again.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes, they are.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I don't believe that. You're a lawyer; I'm not. I believe you're a lawyer, anyway. It's a question of interpretation.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I take that personally, sir. I am not a lawyer. No offence.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen, you're well over.

Mr. Reid.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Yes, I just want to state for the record that I too am not a lawyer.

**The Chair:** Can the chair get in on this?

Go ahead.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I'm inviting Mr. Scott to contribute anything he may wish on this subject.

Look, we're having a debate here that I think misses the point. At the bottom of page 5 and the beginning of page 6, the commission devotes three paragraphs to the subject of invoking the extraordinary allowance beyond the 25% number, as permitted by the act. The commission recognizes that the act does not specify that you can have only one such riding per province. They go on and give some explanation and then say that the decision for Kenora is consistent with the emphasis of the act on manageable geographic size for sparsely populated rural northern regions. There is no need to make further use of the extraordinary circumstance rule.

There have been discussions about whether they're married to that. I would suggest to the committee that we'll find out whether they're married to it if we make a recommendation to them to change it. They either will accept the unanimous view of this panel of MPs, or they will say no, that they stand by what they said earlier. The way to find out is to ask them, and that's what I would encourage the committee to consider doing in its report.

**The Chair:** As Chair, would the panel here be unanimous in having this committee ask for what Mr. Hayes has suggested?

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** I want to indicate that we certainly had asked for this throughout the process, and the commission was very clear to us at each of the hearings that this was not an option for them, that they didn't have the mandate. What I would caution you on, or what I want to introduce, is something that I said to Mr. Dion.

If you're indicating that you're going to leave the status quo, then there will be a ripple effect on Thunder Bay as well, because Manitowadge and Pic Mobert were actually cut out of this new proposal and put into the Thunder Bay riding.

**The Chair:** If we're for the status quo, wouldn't it leave your riding as it was?

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** But it will now affect the population base in Thunder Bay. That's what I'm saying.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** All right, so we would need to know that was happening.

Mr. Angus, be very quick.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The one thing the committee has heard about from all of us is the issue of serviceability in such a massive rural region. Kenora has the exemption. Kenora and my riding are the only ones with special fly-in communities, but I also have an urban base.

The issue is that we were told it wasn't possible. I don't know why it's not possible. It was frustrating, because we felt that it was a clear message. We weren't asking for it in each of our ridings; we were saying that we had one large rural riding. We asked for it. We were told no. But it is perfectly reasonable to ask the commission to look at that, and then we will live with the results.

**The Chair:** We believe as a committee we have super powers, so we'll try.

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** I know, Mr. Reid, you have a confused look on your face. What you're hearing about right now is that the northeastern side of Ontario and the effects that are happening there. We can't forget that Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing also affects and hits Thunder Bay—Superior North.

•(1140)

**Mr. Scott Reid:** The part that is confusing me is this, Mr. Thibeault, and maybe you can explain it, or Ms. Hughes could unconfuse me.

I've recognized that Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing describes a horseshoe around Sault Ste. Marie, but what I don't see is how Thunder Bay is affected. If only the boundary between Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing were adjusted, that would cause AMK to drop below the 25%. But no point of its border with Thunder Bay—Superior North would undermine the change in the proposal.

How again does it affect the population of Thunder Bay—Superior North? That is still unclear to me.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** If you want to maintain the status quo, that will be the population that would remain in Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing. The commission has removed two communities from my riding and put them into Thunder Bay, which means that if you

removed that population base from the Sault, I would be even lower than the amount you're quoting now.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** I'm sorry, I should skip back to Mr. Hayes and ask him if he was talking about making that change as well, or if he was only talking about—

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Initially, I wasn't considering that change, because, quite frankly, it didn't affect my riding. Hearing the arguments, I think we'd probably have to make that change, and Manitowadge and the other small one would have to go back to Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** And that would raise Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing above the number that I quoted to you of—

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** Yes, I think it would bring them up to 74,000, or something like that.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** It's about 1,100 people all told, to 2,000?

**Mr. Bryan Hayes:** I believe so. I'm going by memory.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Forgive me, but what would that drop the population of Thunder Bay—Superior North to? Does anybody know?

Actually, I know, because I happen to have the report here. On page 74, it says the population there is currently 82,827. It would go down to more or less 81,000, something like that.

**The Chair:** We're talking about 2,000 people. Am I right, Mrs. Hughes?

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** Yes. I don't have the exact number but I'm inclined to think it's probably a couple of thousand. Again, this is the ripple effect.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** But now I understand what the ripple effect we're talking about is.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** Where would that put Thunder Bay in percentage terms after that? I've always said that I wanted to keep Manitowadge and Pic Mobert. I know there were over 70 submissions from Manitowadge saying that they wanted to stay in Thunder Bay, and Pic Mobert said that they wanted to stay in Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing, because they're closely tied to White River for their economic activities.

**The Chair:** We're talking of the status quo. It's where it is today.

**Mr. Scott Reid:** Where it is right now as of the boundaries they currently represent with their current population. Okay.

**The Chair:** Right, absolutely. So if we ask for the exemption and ask for the status quo, we would get exactly—

**A voice:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** But we don't know what our colleague from Thunder Bay thinks about that.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'll let the committee decide as we write the report. I'll quit trying to sum it up.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. member:** Welcome to our world.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes:** Well, I can give you some comments with respect to Mr. Hyer.

**The Chair:** We have finished our time.

We are going to finish now, and thank you for your participation today. It was very enlightening in some areas that I hadn't heard about in a long time. We thank you for coming.

We'll suspend for a minute while we change panels. Thank you.

• (1140) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1145)

**The Chair:** I will call this meeting back to order. We will commence a further portion of our study of the changes to the electoral boundaries in Ontario.

We have another great panel with us now. We'll give each of you five minutes to state your points, and then we'll ask you very hard questions.

Have you decided amongst you who might go first?

Mr. Dechert, you've been appointed. You're first.

• (1150)

**Mr. Bob Dechert (Mississauga—Erindale, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, colleagues.

I very much appreciate your providing this opportunity for me to make a presentation on the proposed boundaries for the new riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills.

I want to point out a typographical error in my letter to the committee dated March 22. In the fourth paragraph, it says, "While I appreciate the diligent work of the Commission, in my view the proposed western boundary...". It should read "eastern boundary" of the proposed riding, instead.

With that change, I'd also like to point out that the presentation I'm about to make to you is also supported by all other members of Parliament from Mississauga.

**The Chair:** We love to hear that. You may leave now.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Okay.

The current eastern boundary of the riding of Mississauga—Erindale, which I've had the privilege to represent since 2008, is Mavis Road, which is a major artery in the central part of Mississauga. The riding of Mississauga—Erindale is one of the largest ridings in Canada by population. I believe the statistic I heard most recently was it's about the fifth largest by population. So obviously it needs to be reduced in size, although I'm very sad to lose the opportunity to continue to represent certain of those constituents, going forward. They've all been just a pleasure to represent in the House of Commons.

The commission, in its first iteration, proposed boundaries for the new riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills. It's a slight change to the name, and that is probably to indicate that there was a historical community of Erindale Village, which is now largely but not completely deleted from the riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills. The first boundary was to be Mississauga Road, which is obviously a very important artery in the city of Mississauga. However there is a small portion of that between Mississauga Road and the Credit River, which was left out in the first iteration. The commission in its wisdom chose to move the eastern boundary a bit further east, not bringing in too many more residents but a few more, and made it actually the Credit River. So that added perhaps 2,000 or 3,000 people, I believe.

My submission would be to move the eastern boundary just a bit further east on an argument primarily of community interest, which would then keep residents who go to school, go to their places of worship, shop, and socialize together in the same electoral district. Most of the houses on either side of the Credit River in Mississauga were built at the same time primarily by the same developers and are currently fair market valued in the same value range.

My suggestion would be to make the eastern boundary proceed east along Burnhamthorpe Road to the intersection of Erindale Station Road and then south to Dundas Street, which is the current and future southern boundary of the riding.

Is that legible to everyone on the maps, or shall I come up and point them out? I'd be happy to go to the screen.

**The Chair:** There is a pointer there somewhere. Point it out.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Okay. Never having been a university professor, I'm not all that adept.

The current boundary is here, Mavis Road. The first suggestion was here, Mississauga Road. The revised proposed boundary is the Credit River, this meandering line here, and my suggestion would be to proceed along Burnhamthorpe Road—it's essentially here to here—to Erindale Station Road. These houses here are very similar to these houses here. As I will tell you in my presentation, there are churches on either side of the Credit River that service both communities; and there are schools on either side of the boundary that service both communities; post offices, shopping malls, etc.

• (1155)

**The Chair:** You're getting close to the end of your time.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Sorry, let me speed up then.

The current suggestion by the electoral commission puts the new riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills at 10.34% over the provincial quota. My suggestion, the proposal I'm making today, would put it at 18.97% over the provincial quota, which is certainly within the range of quotas at which other electoral districts in the province have been determined.

Let me just quickly tell you the schools that are on either side. There's Erindale Secondary School, which is on the west side of the Credit River but services students coming from the neighbourhoods on the east side of the river. There's The Woodlands School, which is on the east side of the Credit River and draws students from the west side of the Credit River. There is St. Peter's Anglican Church, which is on the west bank of the Credit River and draws largely from the historical communities that are quite old—40 or 50 or more years old—on the east side of the river. Loyola Catholic Church, which is on the west side of the Credit River, again draws in people from the east side of the river. The Dunwin Gurdwara, the temple of the Sikh faith, is on the west side but draws people from both sides, and the Erindale Bible Chapel and the Erindale United Church are on the east side of the river but again draw residents from both sides of the river.

I could tell you about the beautiful shopping malls, the new Target store, Mr. Chair, and the wonderful and very helpful and service-oriented Canada Post office, but perhaps I can bring that out in my questions.

**The Chair:** You didn't tell them about the Giant Tiger.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Oh yes, and there's a Giant Tiger store. Thank you for your attention.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Lizon, would you like to go next? Five minutes, please.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon (Mississauga East—Cooksville, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

As I indicated in my letter, I would like to make a submission with regard to the western border of the riding that's being proposed.

In the first proposal, the first round, the commission proposed that the western border would go along Hurontario from the current border, the Queensway, all the way to Eglinton, and eastward to Etobicoke Creek.

This part would be unchanged.

The current proposal is that the western border goes from Queensway north along Mavis to Central Parkway. Then it goes along Central Parkway east, and then north to the 403, and then along the 403 to Eglinton, and continues up.

I strongly believe, Mr. Chair, that the first proposal, after the first round, the commission got right. I think it was the right approach, and that is my submission.

**The Chair:** To the computer people, can we put the proposal up here?

Go ahead, Mr. Lizon.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** Hurontario is the main road in Mississauga, and actually geographically divides Mississauga into eastern or western parts, which is reflected in all the addresses. All the streets that run east-west, east of Hurontario, would have "east" in their address.

The commission's report makes reference to the village of Cooksville being unified under the report stage proposal. However, I can tell you, Mr. Chair, that due to the development at the main

intersection of Dundas and Hurontario, this village does not exist anymore. It doesn't exist in the form that others do in Mississauga—Streetsville, Port Credit, or Clarkson. Years ago, of course, Mississauga contained several villages that were separate entities, but Mississauga grew. When I moved there, the population was about 320,000, Now we are close to 800,000. There's not much land left for development.

Therefore, it makes more sense for us to use Hurontario, which has historically been a dividing line in Mississauga, as the border. Furthermore, although there will be condos in both ridings in Mississauga, Mississauga East has many long-term development neighbourhoods built in the 1950s and 1960s, which are unique to the city and represent a community far different from the many condo buildings that will be constructed.

Also, if we look back to before the last redistribution, the western border was Hurontario.

Mr. Chair, I propose that the new riding be named Mississauga East instead of Mississauga East—Cooksville. It makes perfect sense. I would like to add that all the current sitting members in Mississauga agree with my submission.

Thank you very much.

• (1200)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Butt, would you like to go next?

**Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I bring you good news.

I don't propose any changes to the boundaries for the new Mississauga West—Streetsville riding that is proposed on the second map. In fact, I even have the agreement of the member of provincial parliament for the area as well, should Ontario decide to continue to adopt the federal boundaries, as they currently do. The local MPP is supportive of what the commission has proposed.

The only suggested change that both the MPP and I would ask you to consider is that we don't see any reason why the name of the riding has expanded from what it currently is, Mississauga—Streetsville, to Mississauga West—Streetsville. He and I would both support dropping the "West" and just leaving the name as it is.

In the proposal, 80% of the new riding is the same as before. We're simply adding the Meadowvale Village part, which is the northeast quadrant of the proposed riding. That's the new part; everything else would stay exactly the same as it currently is. For the sake of continuity and understanding among most of the residents who will not have the boundaries changed, I think it makes sense to leave it as Mississauga—Streetsville. That would be my submission.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Butt.

Ms. Ambler, it's great to have you with us today.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also bring some good news.

I think my request is simple as well.

It has to do with the name of the riding. I'm quite pleased that there was only a small change to the boundaries, and I'm in agreement with it. The suggestion, which I'm hoping you'll agree to, is to change the name of the riding of Mississauga South to Mississauga—Lakeshore.

The reason I'm asking for that change is that I believe that is a more descriptive name. I think it better describes the character and the uniqueness of the community. You can see from the map that the southern border completely borders Lake Ontario.

When I first arrived here in Ottawa, I didn't realize how few people here knew that Mississauga South was on the lake. Of course, in Mississauga we all know this. In the greater Toronto area everyone knows that the southern part of Mississauga is on the lake, and that the Credit River runs through it as well. But when you leave town, you realize it could be any other GTA riding that happens to be in the southernmost part of the city.

The water is a defining feature for those of us who live in South Mississauga. It's a commercial centre, it's a centre for festivals, it's a place where people meet, eat, walk, stroll, bike, and spend time with their families. Events are held there: the Canada Day parade, the Mississauga Waterfront Festival, Buskerfest, the Southside Shuffle. The all happen around the lake on Lakeshore Road, the main street that goes through all the villages. The three main community centres in South Mississauga are Clarkson, Port Credit, and Lakeview. As you can see, two of those three names refer to the fact that water is a big part of who we are.

I ask that you consider helping me to show the unique nature of Mississauga South to those who don't live in the GTA and Mississauga, by allowing the name of Mississauga South to change to Mississauga—Lakeshore.

• (1205)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Butt, did you have one quick thing to say?

**Mr. Brad Butt:** I want to add that the other member of Parliament from the Mississauga area, Eve Adams, the member of Parliament for Mississauga—Brampton South, has been working with all of us on this. I want to get on the record that she supports all of the changes that all of us have recommended. So the five MPs from Mississauga are all on board with today's recommended changes, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chair:** I spoke to Ms. Adams as recently as yesterday. She's putting forward a name change, but she thought she would save this committee some time by not coming forward.

We thank her for that.

Mr. Lukiwski, you have seven minutes.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC):** Thank you, and thank you all for appearing.

I think Mr. Butt just answered my first question. Is there any disagreement among any of you about any of the proposals we've heard this morning? You're all in total agreement?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Do you have you any, or have you heard of any, disagreements from any of the stakeholders in your ridings, whether they be individual constituents, community associations, municipal councillors, or that type of thing?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** I have not. Sir, may I address Mr. Lukiwski?

Two city councillors who represent the relevant areas of Mississauga—Erin Mills, that is, Councillor Ron Starr of the city of Mississauga, Ward 6, and Councillor Sue McFadden, Ward 10, both spoke to the commission directly in favour of, not exactly the same eastern boundary, but the community of interest that is between the communities on the east side and the west side of the river. They made exactly the same arguments and are in agreement with these proposals.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** As an ancillary question, if there is no opposition that you know of, do you have any support in demonstrated forms that you've identified at the hearings?

Any other—

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Their testimony is, I think, on record before the commission, and there were several other members of the local community who said largely the same thing.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Okay.

Mr. Butt.

**Mr. Brad Butt:** To the best of my knowledge, the Mississauga city council and Mayor Hazel McCallion endorse these boundaries and have been consulted on the very minor geographic changes that are proposed for these two ridings. Even our own city council is on board with what's being proposed.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Thank you for that.

You mentioned that Ms. Adams is also fully supportive of the recommended changes.

Beyond the five of you, are there any other ridings or any other members of Parliament that would be affected by the changes you are recommending?

**Mr. Brad Butt:** No, there are not, sir.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** No.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Okay.

Is this the first time that you have had an opportunity, or the first time that you are making this argument, or did you present the same suggestions at the public hearings that the commission held?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** I did not appear before any commission.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** Mr. Lizon.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** I did not. However, after the first set of maps was released—and as I said, I fully agreed with them—there was a submission made that we agreed with the proposal for the new riding. That was, of course, changed in the second round, but I am proposing those in the original round and I fully agree with this, and we don't have anybody disagreeing with it.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** I'm just trying to be clear. Will it be the first time that the commission has heard the recommendations you're making today, if they appear in our report?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Yes.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** Correct.

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski:** The reason I say that, just for your information and edification, is that it has been the practice of this committee that, if we have unanimity among members of Parliament, then in the report that this committee will eventually submit, it usually recommends those changes. If, however, we find that there is a disagreement among members who are making proposals, then we can only report exactly what we've heard, and obviously the commission, in any event, will be making the final determination. But there is a big difference between this committee recommending the changes that you're presenting to us, or just stating that you have an opinion, but another member has a different opinion. So I think it's important for our analyst to know that you're all on the same page here.

Beyond that it's fairly straightforward. I really don't have any comments beyond that, unless any of my colleagues do.

With that, Chair, I think we're done on this side.

• (1210)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madam Latendresse, you have seven minutes, if you can use them.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** Thank you.

Thank you, everyone, for your testimony today. I think you have made good points.

I would like to ask a few questions about the minor changes you want to propose. Do you know how many people that will affect, and how close or far from the electoral quotient that will put you?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** In terms of the riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills, the commission's proposal of the eastern boundary being the Credit River adds 10.34% over the provincial quota. The proposal that I'm making today would result in the riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills being 18.97% over the provincial quota.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** That's 18.9%?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Right, that is 18.97%.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** In my case, the change would result in dropping the provincial quota from 14% over what is proposed by the commission to almost 10%. It was 9.99% over the provincial quota.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** You would both be happy with that?

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** Correct, yes.

**Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse:** I don't really have any more questions.

I don't know if Mr. Scott or Madam Turmel have any more to add?

That was pretty straightforward, and I thank you for it.

**The Chair:** You see, when you come with great presentations, our work's a lot easier.

Thank you very much.

Monsieur Dion, for seven minutes, please.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]...given directions that we understood everything well, because I don't think it's very complicated.

Madame Ambler and Mr. Butt, you are proposing the status quo?

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Yes.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** You're pleased by that.

You have no difficulty with the changes that Mr. Dechert and Mr. Lizon are proposing?

**Mr. Brad Butt:** No.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** None.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Are your two changes within the allowed quota?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** I believe they are, sir.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** The question is, do you have strong support from the communities affected by these changes?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** In my case, sir, I haven't looked at the poll-by-poll results, but it's very mixed.

These are—

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** No, I'm not speak about your electoral results. Just generally—

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Sorry. You're talking about the proposal—

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** —are the people pleased by the changes you're proposing?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Yes, sir.

As I mentioned to Mr. Lukiwski, at the time that the commission held its hearings, a number of local residents made similar presentations. The boundary that they proposed was slightly different and would have resulted in the new riding being over the allowable quota.

But in terms of the community of interest arguments, they were exactly the same. That is, the houses are the same; the people who live in those houses have lived in those houses since they were constructed; and they go to school and to church and they shop in the same places.

• (1215)

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** Mr. Chair, as I mentioned in my presentation, there were submissions supporting what I am asking for today. However, there is an issue that I've mentioned of the village of Cooksville, but as I described, this is not really an issue because the village of Cooksville does not exist in the same form as the villages of Clarkson, Port Credit, or Streetsville.

It has completely changed since both the city hall and central library moved to Square One years ago. Therefore the whole development and capital around the main intersection of Dundas and Hurontario have changed the face of the village.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** I'd like to say something in respect to the proposal for the riding of Mississauga Centre, which we haven't discussed, which is the new riding that has been created in Mississauga.

The way the city of Mississauga has developed—and people may not know this if they're not familiar with Mississauga—is that the city retained a significant amount of empty land right at its city core for the purpose of high-rise development. That high-rise development is going on now.

That area of the city is expanding rampantly in population terms, and there are currently 35 20-storey or more condominium buildings that have been approved by the city council, which will add approximately 50,000 new residents over the next five years in that new riding in Mississauga's centre. That's where the growth is going to go in Mississauga, going forward.

In the riding in Mississauga—Erin Mills, virtually all the land has been developed, and that would be the case for all the other ridings in Mississauga.

So it's that new riding, Mississauga Centre, which may look to the committee like it's a bit low at the moment in terms of its quota, but I believe it's over the provincial quota, in any event. You can be sure that riding will increase substantially over the next five years.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** And it will start with which percentage again?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Sorry? I'm not sure I have that information on the Mississauga Centre riding.

I can just check and see if I have it.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** I believe it's currently 11% over quotient.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** If I may, Mr. Chair, I would like to indicate that in the proposed boundaries of the riding of Mississauga East, there is still room for new development. A new development will also increase the current population to the higher level.

It's not only Mississauga Centre that will be affected by new development.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Okay.

Now that your propositions are made public, will some people be surprised and send letters of protest to this committee, saying that they weren't aware and they don't agree, and so on?

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Sir, with respect to the eastern boundary of Erin Mills, my understanding is, and it's on the commission's report, that the presentations that were received—and there were several from residents in the affected area of the community from Mississauga—Erin Mills—were all very supportive of what I have proposed.

I believe there was one presentation from an individual who is the current Liberal riding EDA president, who asked that the boundary be made further west, to the street of Erin Mills Parkway. But that was the only one that would be different from what I'm suggesting today.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** If I may add something, Mr. Chair, I mentioned before that the riding of Mississauga East existed in more or less those borders before the last redistribution.

[Translation]

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Gill, whatever time you'd like, apparently.

**Mr. Parm Gill (Brampton—Springdale, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I would just like to put this on the record, and for you to make a note, of how cooperative all the MPs from the Region of Peel have been.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Parm Gill:** On Tuesday it was the Brampton and Caledon MPs who appeared, and today it's Mississauga. It's wonderful to see the cooperation. Maybe you can use us as an example for other panels appearing in the future.

**The Chair:** I'm sure the whole committee will write that into their report: the cooperation of the Region of Peel and Mississauga.

**Mr. Parm Gill:** I'm not sure if it has anything at all to do with the Region of Peel MPs being Conservatives or anything, but it's something that—

**An hon. member:** You may have lost half your audience there.

**The Chair:** Would you like to keep digging this one?

**Mr. Parm Gill:** My question is this. It's wonderful to see that all of you are in agreement with the proposal, and I understand that you have the support of all colleagues and, obviously, the community. So based on your proposal and your recommendation, I'm assuming that your proposal would best represent your community's interest.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** I believe it does, Mr. Gill.

But as I pointed out in my comments earlier, the housing stock on the east and west sides of the Credit River, which I'm suggesting should be in the same electoral district, was built between the mid-1950s and the mid-1970s. I have pictures here. The median price is around \$670,000. Obviously, because of the types of houses involved, there are the same kinds of families there. They shop, go to school, and worship in similar places, which are distributed pretty equally on both sides of the Credit River.

There are many points of crossing of the Credit River—it's not the Mississippi. There are actually nice bicycle and walking paths along the Credit River, which everyone uses with their families and their pets.

The new housing stock farther east of the boundary is much more modern. It was built in the early 2000s right up to the present. It consists primarily of very large condominium buildings, which have an average price of around \$209,000. The people there are generally not families with children, but smaller family units.

● (1220)

**Mr. Parm Gill:** Mr. Butt.

**Mr. Brad Butt:** The one very positive thing I've heard about the proposed new boundaries for Mississauga—Streetsville is that Old Meadowvale Village—that piece at the far northeast corner of the new proposed riding—has been in a different riding, but at the local level there's a lot of interaction between Old Meadowvale Village and the old village of Streetsville, which is presently in my riding.



I've actually heard a lot of very favourable comments about the fact that those two areas will now be represented by one federal member of Parliament and, if the province decides to go the same route, by one provincial member of Parliament. I mention this because there are often a lot of similar events, similar issues and discussions on heritage preservation of properties and so on there.

So that was actually a very positive recommendation of the commission, to bring Old Meadowvale Village into the Mississauga—Streetsville riding. We've had a lot of positive feedback about that.

**Mr. Parm Gill:** Mr. Lizon.

**The Chair:** Oh, sorry.

Monsieur Lizon.

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon:** [*Inaudible—Editor*] the comments of my honourable colleague on the agreement. The changes I'm proposing to the commission will affect two ridings, the newly created riding of Mississauga Centre and the current riding of Mississauga—Brampton South.

I personally spoke with the sitting member for Mississauga—Brampton South, Ms. Adams, and she's in full agreement with the proposed changes.

Also, from a practical point of view, Mr. Chair, it's very easy for residents to remember when it's a very straightforward border—it's one street, and you live east of that street, in this case it's Hurontario

—that they are part of the riding. If you live south of the street... But with all these borders going down different streets, it's confusing. People who live on one side of the street are part of the riding; on the other side of the street, they are not.

Therefore, from a practical point of view, I think it makes perfect sense.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have no one else on my list of questioners, so we thank you.

We will be going in camera, but before we do that I'd like to thank our witnesses for coming today and being as cooperative as they were.

Since this is our last meeting on Ontario, and our last meeting before we go in camera to finish the reports, I'd also certainly like to thank our two people from Elections Canada, Madame Boisvert and Monsieur Montpetit. Thank you for all of your help during this process. I know we've been cranky from time to time, so thank you for putting up with us. We have been happy to have you with us.

We will go in camera and will suspend for a minute while we do.

Thank you.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

---





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 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>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>