



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

REPORT ON THE *REPORT OF THE FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION FOR THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 2022*

**Report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and
House Affairs**

Honourable Bardish Chagger, Chair

**MAY 2023
44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION**

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

**REPORT ON THE *REPORT OF THE FEDERAL
ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION FOR THE
PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 2022***

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Procedure and House Affairs**

**Hon. Bardish Chagger
Chair**

MAY 2023

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

NOTICE TO READER

Reports from committees presented to the House of Commons

Presenting a report to the House is the way a committee makes public its findings and recommendations on a particular topic. Substantive reports on a subject-matter study usually contain a synopsis of the testimony heard, the recommendations made by the committee, as well as the reasons for those recommendations.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

CHAIR

Hon. Bardish Chagger

VICE-CHAIRS

John Nater

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau

MEMBERS

Luc Berthold

Rachel Blaney

Blaine Calkins

Michael Cooper

Hon. Greg Fergus

Mark Gerretsen

Sherry Romanado

Ruby Sahota

Ryan Turnbull

OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO PARTICIPATED

Dan Albas

John Aldag

Gary Anandasangaree

Niki Ashton

Martin Champoux

Andy Fillmore

Peter Fragiskatos

Sébastien Lemire

Taleeb Noormohamed

Warren Steinley

Alain Therrien

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Mike MacPherson

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Parliamentary Information, Education and Research Services

Andre Barnes, Analyst

Laurence Brosseau, Analyst

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

has the honour to present its

FORTY-SECOND REPORT

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(a)(vi), the committee has considered the objections filed in respect of the Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, in accordance with section 22 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. E-3, and has agreed to report the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE <i>REPORT OF THE FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES</i> <i>COMMISSION FOR THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 2022</i>	1
Introduction.....	1
Objections.....	2
A. Electoral boundary changes.....	3
1. Vancouver Island.....	3
(a) The Honourable Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay, P.C., the member for South Surrey—White Rock (objection regarding the electoral district of Nanaimo—Ladysmith)	3
2. Lower Mainland Fraser Valley	4
(a) Joint objection from 12 members	4
(b) Joint objection: Peter Julian, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby; and Bonita Zarrillo, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.....	6
(c) Don Davies, the member for Vancouver Kingsway	7
(d) The Honourable Dr. Hedy Fry, the member for Vancouver Centre.....	8
(e) Wilson Miao, the member for Richmond Centre.....	9
(f) The Honourable Joyce Murray, P.C., the member for Vancouver Quadra	10
(g) Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville.....	12
(h) The Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, the member for Vancouver South	13
(i) Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	15
3. The Southern Interior.....	16
(a) Richard Cannings, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay	16
B. Changes to the names of electoral districts	19
1. Vancouver Island.....	19

(a) Rachel Blaney, the member for North Island—Powell River.....	19
2. Lower Mainland Fraser Valley	20
(a) Joint objection from twelve members.....	20
(b) John Aldag, the member for Cloverdale–Langley City	21
(c) The Honourable Joyce Murray, P.C., the member for Vancouver Quadra	21
(d) The Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, P.C., the member for Vancouver South.....	22
(e) Tako Van Popta, the member for Langley—Aldergrove	22
(f) Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	22
(g) The Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson, P.C., the member for North Vancouver	23
3. The Southern Interior.....	24
(a) Richard Cannings, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.....	24
(b) Tracy Gray, the member for Kelowna—Lake Country	25
APPENDIX A LIST OF WITNESSES	27
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS	29
DISSENTING OPINION OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA.....	31



REPORT ON THE REPORT OF THE FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION FOR THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 2022

INTRODUCTION

On 18 April 2023, pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(a)(vi) and section 22 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* (EBRA),¹ the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs (the Committee) began its consideration of the objections filed by members of the House of Commons in respect of the *Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia* (the Report and the Commission).

After each decennial census, the number of members of the House of Commons and the representation of each province is adjusted according to the rules found in section 51 and 51A of the *Constitution Act, 1867*.

The chief electoral officer (CEO) is responsible for calculating the number of members of the House allotted to each province. This calculation is mathematical and the CEO exercises no discretion in the matter.

The work of readjusting electoral boundaries is carried out in each province by an independent and neutral three-member electoral boundaries commission. The mandate of these commissions is to consider and report on the division of their province into electoral districts,² the description of the boundaries and the name of each electoral district.

The EBRA provides the rules governing the division of a province into electoral districts. The population of each electoral district must be as close as possible to the electoral quota for the province, that is, the population of the province divided by the number of members of the House of Commons allocated to the province under section 51 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*.

In setting the boundaries of an electoral district, each commission is legally obliged to consider the community of interest, community of identity or the historical pattern of an

1 [Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act](#), R.S.C. 1985, c. E-3.

2 Note that the terms “electoral districts” and “ridings” are used interchangeably in this committee report.



electoral district in the province. Further, electoral districts must have a manageable geographic size, in cases of sparsely populated, rural or northern regions.

A commission may depart from the provincial electoral quota by plus or minus 25% in order to respect the community of interest, community of identity, or the historical pattern of an electoral district, or to maintain the manageable geographic size of sparsely populated districts. In circumstances that are viewed as extraordinary by a commission, the variance from the electoral quota may be greater than 25%.

After coming up with an initial Proposal for the electoral districts in their province, a commission is required to hold at least one public meeting to hear representations by interested persons. After the completion of the public hearings, each commission prepares a report on the boundaries and names of the electoral districts of the province. These reports are tabled in the House of Commons, and referred to the Committee.

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

The Committee then has 30 sittings days to consider members' objections, unless an extension is granted by the House. The Committee's reports on members' objections are referred back to the relevant commissions, along with the objections, the minutes of the proceedings and the evidence heard by the Committee. The commission then has 30 calendar days to consider the merits of all objections, and prepare its final report.

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

OBJECTIONS

The Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia was tabled in the House of Commons and referred to the Committee on 8 February 2023. At the end of the 30-day period, the clerk of the Committee had received 16 objections from members of Parliament. In the following section, the objections are grouped according to the regions used by the Commission in its Report.

A. Electoral boundary changes

Eleven objections to the proposed British Columbia electoral boundaries were filed.

1. Vancouver Island

One member filed an objection to the proposed electoral boundaries of an electoral district on Vancouver Island: the Honourable Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay, P.C., the member for South Surrey—White Rock, objected to the electoral district of Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

(a) The Honourable Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay, P.C., the member for South Surrey—White Rock (objection regarding the electoral district of Nanaimo—Ladysmith)

Ms. Findlay objected to the proposed boundaries of the electoral district of Nanaimo—Ladysmith. In particular, she objected to the proposal to move the northern boundary so that the District Municipality of Lantzville becomes part of the electoral district of Courtenay—Alberni. Ms. Findlay noted that there is a community of interest between Lantzville and the City of Nanaimo, with partnerships in infrastructure, safety, policing, recreation, sewer, water and other services. She further told the Committee that Lantzville used to be considered a subdivision of the City of Nanaimo.

Ms. Findlay told the Committee that Mark Swain, Mayor of Lantzville, had reached out to the Commission to express concerns on behalf of his community regarding the proposed boundary changes. To balance off the proposed inclusion of Lantzville in the same riding as the City of Nanaimo, he suggested moving the southern parts of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, such as Saltair and the surrounding areas, into the riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, as their community of interest aligns well with the City of Duncan. Mr. Swain sent a copy of his letter to each federal political party with an elected official in British Columbia in the hopes of gaining non-partisan support for his proposal. Ms. Findlay therefore submitted her objection on his behalf, despite the fact that it concerned a riding that was not her own.

While the matter did not concern her own riding, Ms. Findlay pointed out that in addition to being a the member from British Columbia, she was born and raised in the Nanaimo—Ladysmith electoral district and knows it very well.

The Committee supports Ms. Findlay's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.



2. Lower Mainland Fraser Valley

Nine objections relating to the electoral boundaries in the Lower Mainland Fraser Valley were filed by members. These include two joint objections: one filed by 12 members; and one filed by Peter Julian, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, and Bonita Zarrillo, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

The other seven objections are from Don Davies, the member for Vancouver Kingsway; the Honourable Hedy Fry, P.C., the member for Vancouver Centre; Wilson Miao, the member for Richmond Centre; the Honourable Joyce Murray, P.C., the member for Vancouver Quadra; Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville; the Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, P.C., the member for Vancouver South; and Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

(a) Joint objection from 12 members

Twelve members signed a joint objection to some of the proposed boundaries and names of British Columbia ridings in the Lower Mainland Fraser Valley. These members are:

- John Aldag, the member for Cloverdale—Langley City;
- Parm Bains, the member for Steveston—Richmond East;
- Terry Beech, the member for Burnaby North—Seymour;
- Sukh Dhaliwal, the member for Surrey—Newton;
- the Honourable Hedy Fry, P.C., the member for Vancouver Centre;
- Ken Hardie, the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells;
- Ron McKinnon, the member for Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam;
- Wilson Miao, the member for Richmond Centre;
- Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville;
- the Honourable Carla Qualtrough, P.C., the member for Delta;
- Randeep Sarai, the member for Surrey Centre; and

- the Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson, P.C., the member for North Vancouver.

(1) General Comments on the Redistribution of Electoral Districts in the City of Vancouver

The signatories of the joint objection stated that they were collectively aware of the possibility that the ridings in the City of Vancouver could be the subject of various objections by members. They indicated that they supported members who objected to the proposed boundaries of their own ridings, provided that their proposals did not affect the non-Vancouver ridings named in the joint objection. Further, the signatories of the joint objection asked that any objection affecting the named non-Vancouver ridings be first accepted by their affected neighbouring member of Parliament.

Mr. Noormohamed, Mr. Miao and Dr. Fry all filed separate objections and agreed with the principles set out in the joint objection.

(2) Support and Objection to Some of the Proposed boundaries in the Commission's Report

The signatories of the joint objection were generally satisfied with several of the ridings proposed in the Commission's Report. This is the case for Burnaby North—Seymour, Delta, North Vancouver (renamed Capilano—North Vancouver), Surrey—Newton, Surrey Centre, Fleetwood—Port Kells, Cloverdale—Langley City and Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam.

As for the district of Steveston—Richmond East, Mr. Bains indicated that he was satisfied with the proposal and generally accepted the proposed boundaries. However, in the joint objection, he stated that he could work with Mr. Miao on minor changes affecting both their ridings.

For Vancouver Centre, the objection stated that Dr. Fry was relatively satisfied with the proposed boundaries but filed a separate objection specifically for Granville Island.

Lastly, the joint objection noted that Mr. Weiler reiterated concerns that were heard during the public hearings and that he had filed a separate objection about them. The signatories of the joint objection indicated that they are prepared to support his proposal, for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, in which part of the eastern boundary set out in the Report to 21st Street under the highway would be moved, provided that this changed did not affect the eastern boundary of North Vancouver or the proposed boundaries of the riding of Burnaby North—Seymour. According to the signatories, placing the boundary at 15th Street instead of 21st Street



would be a feasible option, as this is the boundary that was presented by the Commission in its initial Proposal. The signatories indicated that they expected the Commission to take into account the rapid growth of North Vancouver and the declining growth of West Vancouver in its decision.

(b) Joint objection: Peter Julian, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby; and Bonita Zarrillo, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam

Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo jointly objected to the proposed boundaries for the ridings of New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville (the current riding of New Westminster—Burnaby), Port Moody—Coquitlam, and Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam. Their objection can be summarized in three points:

- Riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam: The members stated that Maillardville, a community belonging to the City of Coquitlam, should remain in its entirety in the riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam rather than being included in the riding of New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville. The members indicated that the Commission’s proposed boundary divided a community of interest that shares community services and school systems. They stated that this division does not appear intuitive, as it does not follow any natural boundary line. Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo also expressed concern that the local Indigenous communities were not consulted, as Maillardville is located on unceded Kwikwetlem territory. According to the members, keeping Maillardville intact within the riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam would remedy this lack of consultation and preserve the community of interest.
- Riding of Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam: The boundaries proposed in the Commission’s Report would divide the community of interest that exists between the Westwood Plateau and the villages of Anmore and Belcarra, which have historically been kept in the same riding. According to Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo, the Westwood Plateau has a distinct identity and historic connection to the riding of Port Coquitlam and should be placed, in its entirety and with the villages of Anmore and Belcarra, in the riding of Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam. The entire Westwood Plateau was placed in the riding of Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam between the 2002 to the 2012 redistributions.
- Riding of New Westminster—Burnaby: Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo objected to the Commission’s proposal to divide the Edmonds community of

interest into two ridings, and recommended that it remain entirely within New Westminster—Burnaby. They pointed out that Burnaby is one of the most diverse municipalities in British Columbia, with close to 60% of residents being immigrants; the Edmonds community in Burnaby, in particular, has one of the highest concentrations of immigrant and refugee households, and is a community of interest in its own right that should not be severed. They further noted that, historically, the community has remained in a single riding. Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo stated that the proposed boundaries would affect the longstanding relationship between the riding's federal representatives and their constituents, while making it difficult to keep the integrity of the area intact.

Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo told the Committee that their proposal would maintain the population of each riding well within the variance from the electoral quotient permitted by the EBRA.

The Committee supports Mr. Julian and Ms. Zarrillo's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(c) Don Davies, the member for Vancouver Kingsway

Mr. Davies objected to the boundaries proposed in the Commission's Report for the riding of Vancouver Kingsway. Specifically, he stated that he considered it inappropriate and unnecessary to extend Vancouver Kingsway into the area at the southwest corner of the riding (i.e., extending south to 49th Avenue between Knight Street and Main Street). He criticized the expansion proposed by the Commission as it would divide the Punjabi Market, and not respect the historical, cultural and social importance of this area to South Asian Canadians who reside in the Lower Mainland.

In his appearance before the Committee, Mr. Davies stated his proposal provided close alignment of Vancouver's seats with the provincial quotient, kept all city seats within Vancouver's municipal boundaries, and respected important social, cultural and political communities of interest.

Mr. Davies stated that, in his view, instead of extending the Vancouver Kingsway riding south to 49th Avenue between Knight Street and Main Street, the current southern boundary (i.e., 41st Avenue) should be retained and the western boundary of the riding should be extended to Ontario Street. Mr. Davies specified that Ontario Street would be



a logical division that respected communities of interest and identity as, for municipalities, it divides east and west Vancouver. To that end, a significant socio-economic divide exists on Ontario Street between its east and west side, with respect to the size of municipal lots. He also noted that many residents identified themselves as living on the “east side” or “west side” of Vancouver.

Mr. Davies expressed concern that the proposal in the Report is “radically different” from the Commission’s original proposal, which he believed rendered the public hearing process meaningless. In his view, in proposing the boundaries of the City of Vancouver, adhered “slavishly” to the criterion of numerical equality of voters and paid insufficient attention to the criterion of community of interest, which is of equal importance.³

(d) The Honourable Dr. Hedy Fry, the member for Vancouver Centre

Dr. Fry objected to the placement of part of Granville Island into the proposed riding of Vancouver West Broadway instead of Vancouver Centre. Aside from this matter, she considered the proposed boundary changes for the riding of Vancouver Centre to be reasonable. Dr. Fry stated that there are historical ties between Granville Island and Vancouver Centre and that deep ties between the two communities of interest justify keeping them together within the riding of Vancouver Centre.

Dr. Fry noted that Granville Island has a strong connection to Vancouver Centre as a community of interest and forms an integral part of the city’s arts and cultural fabric with its theatres, restaurants and specialty stores. As a central tourist point in this area, Granville Island is linked to the jobs, hotels and restaurants of the west end and downtown as an economic community. On the island is a park named after former Vancouver Centre member of Parliament Ron Basford, who contributed to the island’s development, and which also illustrates the historic ties between the island and Vancouver Centre. Further, the Squamish Indigenous community traditionally has used the island as a meeting place.

Dr. Fry noted that there are pedestrian bridges that connect Granville Island and parts of Vancouver Centre, including the Olympic Village. She also said that under two dozen constituents reside on the portion of the island that was removed from the riding, and that those constituents live on houseboats; therefore, keeping the commercial portion of Granville Island in Vancouver Centre would not result in a substantial increase in population for the riding, nor would it have a domino effect on neighbouring ridings.

3 House of Commons, Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs (PROC), *Evidence*, 1st Session, 44th Parliament, Meeting 62, 18 April 2023, 1140 (Don Davies, the member for Vancouver Kingsway).

Dr. Fry told the Committee she received several letters of support regarding her objection, including from the Granville Island Council.

The Committee supports Dr. Fry's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(e) Wilson Miao, the member for Richmond Centre

Mr. Miao objected to the proposed boundaries of the riding of Richmond Centre—Marpole (the existing riding of Richmond Centre). His objection pertains to the addition of the Marpole district of Vancouver to the riding, as it is currently comprised only of parts of the City of Richmond. According to Mr. Miao, the addition of Marpole would be a disservice to constituents, as it would divide the attention of a member of Parliament between these two cities. He also stated that Marpole and Richmond are themselves distinct communities of interest. In support of his objection, Mr. Miao referenced accessibility, the existence of distinct communities of interest for each of the two municipalities, and the history of the riding.

Instead, Mr. Miao suggested dividing the municipality of Richmond equally between two members of Parliament, rather than creating a riding composed of one part of Richmond and one district of Vancouver. To this end, he suggested two options that would keep intact the majority of the existing boundaries for Richmond Centre, yet place some areas in the neighbouring riding of Richmond East—Steveston riding:

- The first option would move the boundary of the northeast corner of the proposed riding of Richmond Centre so that the community of West Cambie would be fully incorporated into the Richmond East—Steveston riding.
- The second option would move part of the southern boundary of the proposed riding of Richmond Centre so that the community of Steveston would be fully incorporated into the riding of Richmond East—Steveston.

In these options, the community of Marpole in Vancouver would be absorbed into a Vancouver riding.

In terms of accessibility, Mr. Miao stated that, under the Commission's proposal in its Report, constituents living in Marpole would have to travel to the city of Richmond to access the office of their member of Parliament, resulting in additional transportation costs.



As for communities of interest, Mr. Miao stated that Richmond and Vancouver are very distinct communities and have their own distinct identities and community life. Locally, agencies serve each community independently and are not connected. Further, the City of Richmond, in particular the downtown area, is home to a larger population of new Asian immigrants, as compared to the municipalities of the Lower Mainland.

Also, Mr. Miao stated that the existence of a transit line and bridges linking the cities of Richmond and Vancouver does not justify their incorporation into the same riding because their use by people who work in Richmond remains minimal.

Mr. Miao noted that no previous redistribution resulted in the creation of a Richmond district that would include any municipality located to its north.

Lastly, Mr. Miao pointed out that, in Vancouver, Marpole is a residential district whose population is expected to grow by 30% over the next three decades. This growth is so significant that the City of Vancouver Parks Board recognized the need to replace the existing community centre to meet the needs of this district. Mr. Miao stated that it would not be in the best interest of Marpole residents to have this growing area represented by a member of Parliament serving primarily the City of Richmond rather than Vancouver. Given the high growth in both Richmond and Marpole, Mr. Miao indicated that the riding would fast exceed the Commission's targeted average population size.

Mr. Miao's objection was accompanied by letters of support from Malcolm Brodie, Mayor of the City of Richmond; Michael Lee, MLA for Vancouver—Langara; Ella Huang, Executive Director of Richmond Centre for Disability; Tracy Beshara, Executive Director of the Marpole-Oakridge Family Place Society; Nilda Borrino, Executive Director of the Marpole Neighbourhood House; Jim Kojima, constituent in Richmond Centre; Mark Wiens, constituent in Richmond Centre; Diane Chieng, constituent in Richmond Centre; and Xue Mei Zhong, constituent in Marpole, Vancouver. In addition, Mr. Miao noted that he has the support of Mr. Bains, as well as the following neighbouring members: Mr. Sajjan, Ms. Murray and Mr. Noormohamed.

The Committee supports Mr. Miao's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(f) The Honourable Joyce Murray, P.C., the member for Vancouver Quadra

Ms. Murray objected to the boundaries of the proposed riding of Vancouver West Broadway (currently the riding of Vancouver Quadra) in the Commission's Report. She indicated that, in her view, the proposal departed significantly from the current

boundaries and the Commission's initial Proposal; it was proposed without adequate consultation; and it divided the Musqueam First Nation, which is a community of interest and identity. Further, the proposed riding would adversely affect the Greek community in Vancouver Quadra.

In Ms. Murray's view, the integrity of the Musqueam Band's core area should be kept intact in a single federal riding. Further, the north-south axis of the riding ought to be maintained to respect the social and historical fabric of the districts and communities in the area.

Currently, Vancouver Quadra runs north-south along Arbutus Street and extends west to encompass the peninsula bordered by the University of British Columbia (UBC), English Bay and the Fraser River. The proposed riding of Vancouver West Broadway in the Commission's Report would divide the Musqueam First Nation's traditional lands, which include UBC lands, Jericho lands and Musqueam Reserve No. 2, between the two new ridings of Vancouver West Broadway (formerly Vancouver Quadra) and Vancouver Arbutus (formerly Vancouver Granville). Also, the Musqueam band would be separated from the mouth of the Fraser River, a place considered by the band to be of historical significance.

Ms. Murray referred to section 19 of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, which requires that states consult and cooperate with Indigenous peoples to obtain their consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them. She stated that the Commission should have consulted the Musqueam Indian Band prior to proposing boundaries that would divide their community among several ridings. She stated that the initial proposal "made a lot of sense" but that the Report is a "radical and dramatic" departure from it.⁴

In addition, Ms. Murray indicated that the proposal would divide a large part of the residential area of Vancouver Quadra's Greek community, which is located south of 16th Street, between Dunbar and Arbutus, and its cultural and economic centre, which is located in an area of West Broadway known as "Greektown."

The Committee supports Ms. Murray's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

4 PROC, *Evidence*, 1st Session, 44th Parliament, Meeting 62, 18 April 2023, 1145 (Hon. Joyce Murray, the member for Vancouver Quadra).



(g) Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville

Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville, objected to the proposed boundaries for the riding of Vancouver Arbutus (currently Vancouver Granville) on three separate grounds. Mr. Noormohamed agreed that the western and northern boundaries ought to remain the same as proposed by the Commission, and the following changes be made to the proposed boundaries:

- the proposed western and northern boundaries ought to remain the same;
- the eastern boundary, at its southward portion, should be set along Ontario Street from 16th Ave. to 49th Ave.; and
- the boundary west along 49th Ave. should be moved to Cambie Street instead of east to Fraser Street and should then continue down Cambie Street to the river, encompassing all of Marpole and connecting to Southwest Marine Drive.

Firstly, he objected to the severing of the community of Marpole from the rest of the city of Vancouver. Indeed, the Commission has proposed that Marpole be incorporated into the proposed riding of Richmond Centre—Marpole. However, Mr. Noormohamed stated that the community of Marpole shares little in common with the city of Richmond. Further, he noted that Marpole is closely linked to the city of Vancouver, in particular the nearby Oakridge community, Marpole’s planning and community services are provided by the City of Vancouver, and local organizations often use both “Marpole” and “Oakridge” in their name.

Moreover, Mr. Noormohamed noted that Marpole residents have a lower average annual income than many Vancouver neighbourhoods. As such, their population could be viewed as more vulnerable and therefore would benefit from unfettered access to their members of Parliament. In his view, to place residents of Marpole in a riding in which they do not share a common interest or relationship could engender disenfranchisement.

In Mr. Noormohamed’s view, the Commission’s proposal would divide communities of interest, according to section 15(1)(b)(i) of the EBRA, and depart from the historical patterns of the local electoral districts, as the community of Marpole has always been part of a riding serving other parts of the city of Vancouver. He recommended that the Marpole community be incorporated in the proposed Vancouver Arbutus electoral district.

Secondly, Mr. Noormohamed stated that the northern portion of the eastern boundary of the proposed riding ought to follow along Ontario Street, rather than Main Street, as proposed by the Commission. He indicated that Ontario Street divides the east and west sides of Vancouver, and that on its either side, the communities differ significantly in terms of culture, economics and social realities. Further, the Commission's placement of the riding's eastern boundary along Main Street would impact small businesses, as they would have to work with as many as three members of Parliament to advocate for services. The proposed boundary would also disadvantage the community of identity formed by individuals residing between Main Street and Ontario Street. Mr. Noormohamed's contention on this matter is supported by Mr. Davies and Mr. Sajjan.

Lastly, Mr. Noormohamed is concerned that Vancouver Arbutus separates the Punjabi market from other Sikh and Punjabi cultural sites and associations, including the Sunset Community Centre, the Sunset neighbourhood and the Ross Street Temple. He explained that these associations and community hubs work in partnership to seek federal support and engage with the federal government, and ought to remain in the same riding.

Mr. Noormohamed stated that there was "a problem"⁵ with the consultation process under the EBRA, as there was no public hearing held if the Commission's report has completely different boundaries than those in the original proposal.

Mr. Noormohamed's objection was supported by Mr. Miao, Mr. Sajjan, and Mr. Davies. His objection was accompanied by letters of support from local elected officials, businesses and community associations and residents.

The Committee supports Mr. Noormohamed's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(h) The Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, the member for Vancouver South

Mr. Sajjan objected to the proposed boundaries of the existing electoral district of Vancouver South (proposed electoral district of Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby). In the Report, the proposed riding of Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby extends from the southeastern part of the City of Vancouver to the southern part of the City of Burnaby. Mr. Sajjan stated that this configuration both separated and adversely affected the Punjabi Market and the Khalsa Diwan Society of Vancouver from the Sunset area in Vancouver South. These are areas that have a significant historical community of interest

5 PROC, *Evidence*, 1st Session, 44th Parliament, Meeting 62, 18 April 2023, 1150 (Taleeb Noormohamed, the member for Vancouver Granville).



and South Asian identity. He also criticized the division of the Sunset area into three electoral districts. Finally, he stated that the proposed changes were made without any consultation, as the Commission's initial Proposal for the existing riding of Vancouver South were minor and did not alarm the communities concerned.

Mr. Sajjan proposed

- Rather than placing part of Fraser Street and 49th Avenue in Vancouver Kingsway, that the current northeast portion of Vancouver South be placed within the riding of Vancouver Kingsway to ensure established neighbourhoods remain in the same riding;
- To keep Sunset together, Fraser Street should not be the boundary between Vancouver Arbutus and Vancouver Fraserview—Burnaby South. Instead, this boundary should be moved westward to Ontario Street from 41st Avenue to 49th Avenue. This would result in the northwest corner of the existing riding of Vancouver South (41st Avenue at Ontario Street to Cambie Street, travelling south on Cambie Street, eastward to Ontario Street on 49th Avenue) would be placed within Vancouver Arbutus.
- To keep intact the historical Marpole neighbourhood within the riding of Vancouver Arbutus.

Mr. Sajjan emphasized that Vancouver South is one of the most diverse areas of the City of Vancouver. It comprises four areas: Sunset, Victoria-Fraserview, Killarney, Champlain Heights, and River District. The proposal in the Commission's Report divides the Sunset area among several ridings and, with respect to communities of interest, creates two issues:

- The proposal separates the Punjabi Market and the Khalsa Diwan Society of Vancouver from the Sunset area despite the cultural, historical and community significance of these institutions to the South Asian migrant community in the Sunset area. The proposed change places the Punjabi Market in the riding of Vancouver Arbutus and the Khalsa Diwan Society in the new riding of Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby. Mr. Sajjan stated that he was satisfied that the Commission did not intend to separate the Sikh community, which was established in 1902, from the Punjabi Market.
- The proposal splits the "Sunset on Fraser" shopping district into the three proposed electoral districts of Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby,

Vancouver Arbutus and Vancouver Kingsway. Mr. Sajjan stated that since the creation of the electoral district of Vancouver South in 1914, the fragmentation of Sunset has never been so acute despite the changes and mergers that occur during electoral boundary redistributions.

Mr. Sajjan noted that the Commission's initial Proposal struck him as adequate, which is why few, if any, regional organizations appeared at the public hearings. However, the proposal in the Report represented a drastic change, and Mr. Sajjan stated that if such a proposal had been put forward in the first place, the Commission would have heard many concerns from residents, businesses and community leaders. Many organizations and leaders have also contacted Mr. Sajjan on this issue, and several provincial and federal elected officials have expressed their support for keeping the Punjabi Market and the Khalsa Diwan Society of Vancouver in the Sunset area. Mr. Sajjan's objection was accompanied by close to 20 letters of support from various South Vancouver organizations and community leaders.

The Committee supports Mr. Sajjan's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(i) Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country

Mr. Weiler objected to the proposed boundaries for the riding of West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country (proposed riding of Howe Sound—West Vancouver).

Mr. Weiler's objection to the proposed boundary changes is based on the severing of a community of interest. He objected to the severing of West Vancouver into two federal electoral districts, more specifically the division of the historic community of Ambleside—Dundarave. He explained that this community has a distinct character and it shares a coherent stretch of commercial businesses and public institutions within the District of West Vancouver. It is where most of the riding's public institutions and amenities are located, and it is home to organizations such as the Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association and the Ambleside and Dundarave Residents Association. He explained that dividing West Vancouver would:

- complicate outreach, advocacy and engagement;
- lead to confusion among constituents; and
- reduce voter engagement.



In its Report, the Commission modified its initial Proposal by moving the eastern boundary between Howe Sound—West Vancouver and Capilano—North Vancouver from 15th Street to 21st Street. Mr. Weiler stated that rather than alleviating residents' concerns, this change exacerbated them, as it further divided the heart of their community of interest. Many seniors live in the area, and the location for advance polling is where the Commission proposed to set the boundary. According to Mr. Weiler, in the next federal election, voters may not know in which riding they must vote. He believes that the boundary should have been moved to keep the community intact.

As a result, Mr. Weiler recommended that the riding's eastern boundary on 21st Street should be moved to 11th Street to preserve the Ambleside—Dundarave community of interest. 11th Street is the border of Ambleside, and such a change would bring the population of the riding to 123,717, which is roughly the average population size of Vancouver's electoral districts. The advantage of this proposal is that it preserves the integrity of the communities of interest within West Vancouver.

Mr. Weiler also recommended that the Commission not make any further adjustments to neighbouring electoral districts unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. Weiler's objection was accompanied by letters of support from the West Vancouver Mayor and Council and the Ambleside Dundarave Residents Association.

The Committee supports Mr. Weiler's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

3. The Southern Interior

One objection to the boundaries of a Southern Interior riding was submitted by a member: Richard Cannings, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

(a) Richard Cannings, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay

Mr. Cannings objected to the proposed boundaries of the South Okanagan—West Kootenay electoral district and the neighbouring ridings. He stated that the proposed boundaries cause a number of problems and divide communities of interest.

The proposal in the Report eliminates approximately half of the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay, in its east and north, and adds a comparable territory and population in its west. According to Mr. Cannings, the proposal divides communities of interest and identity and does not take into consideration the history of this electoral district. Areas removed from the current electoral district include the northern part of

the West Boundary area; the City of Nakusp and the surrounding parts of the Regional District of Central Kootenay on the eastern side of the Arrow Lakes, the Slocan Valley, the suburbs of Castlegar and the Beaver Valley. In place of these areas, the Commission proposes to add to the riding the entire Similkameen Valley, including the towns of Keremeos and Princeton and part of the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen.

Consequently, Mr. Cannings proposed:

- Reintegrate the Similkameen Valley into the proposed electoral district of Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna. Mr. Cannings stated that the main concern of local residents was keeping the valley intact in one electoral district.
- Retain the proposal to move Big White Ski Resort to the electoral district of Kelowna, but separate it from the community of Beaverdell, which would remain in the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay (Similkameen—West Kootenay).

In the Report, the Commission removed Big White Ski Resort from South Okanagan—Similkameen and added it to the riding of Kelowna, which Mr. Cannings stated makes sense. However, in Mr. Canning's view, West Kettle Valley, including the community of Beaverdell, should remain in place, as Beaverdell has much more in common with other communities on the West Boundary, including Rock Creek, Midway and Greenwood. Beaverdell should remain in the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

- Retain the proposal to move the City of Nakusp and the remainder of area K of the Regional District of Central Kootenay into the proposed riding of Vernon—Monashee.
- Retain areas H and I of the Regional District of Central Kootenay (Slocan Valley and Castlegar suburbs) in the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay (Similkameen—West Kootenay).

The Slocan Valley, the heart of West Kootenay, lies north of the Kootenay River. The proposal in the Report would transfer the Slocan Valley to the new electoral district of Vernon—Monashee. However, Mr. Cannings stated that the valley is an integral part of West Kootenay in terms of culture, economy and identity. He expressed concern that this region would not be well represented if placed in the electoral district of



Vernon—Monashee because of the distance and the extreme differences in economy and culture between the Slocan Valley and Okanagan. In addition, residents would have to drive up to five hours, over two mountain passes, to get to the office of their member of Parliament.

According to the Report, certain Castlegar suburbs would remain in the electoral district of Similkameen—West Kootenay, but others would be incorporated into the proposed riding of Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Rockies or Vernon—Monashee. According to Mr. Cannings, this ignores the deep and close ties that these communities have with Castlegar.

- In his view, area A of the Regional District of Kootenay Boundary (RDKB) (Beaver Valley) ought to be placed in the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay (Similkameen—West Kootenay).

In Mr. Cannings' view, the most problematic change proposed by the Commission would be to remove the Beaver Valley (including the cities of Montrose and Fruitvale and area A of the RDKB) from South Okanagan—West Kootenay and incorporate it into Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Rockies. The valley is essentially part of the City of Trail; Beaver Valley residents work, shop, socialize and engage in leisure activities in Trail. The ties between these communities are very old and the valley has always been included with Trail in federal and provincial electoral districts. In addition to ignoring their shared communities of identity and interest, this change would require residents to travel to Cranbrook to visit the office of their member of Parliament (a three-hour drive over a mountain pass) rather than Castlegar (30 minutes, without a pass), as is currently the case.

Although it is not part of his riding and is relatively far from it, Mr. Cannings stated it would make sense to keep the City of Kamloops in one riding, since it has never been divided by federal electoral boundaries in the past. The current proposal splits it between Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola and Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies. Mr. Cannings stated that the residents of Kamloops have expressed their concerns to him about this matter.

Mr. Cannings indicated that his objection was made on behalf of the 1,000 constituents who contacted him to complain about the lack of consultation in the process that led to the proposed changes, as the proposal in the Report differs significantly from the Commission's initial Proposal. These constituents told him that the public consultation process was deeply flawed because the proposal in the Report differs substantially from

the initial Proposal, and that a second round of public consultations should take place when the Commission proposes changes that widely depart from their initial Proposal.

The Committee supports Mr. Canning’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

B. Changes to the names of electoral districts

Ten objections to the proposed names of electoral districts in British Columbia were filed.

1. Vancouver Island

One objection to the proposed name of a Vancouver Island riding was filed by a member: Rachel Blaney, the member for North Island—Powell River.

Ms. Blaney, who is a member of the Committee, recused herself from the discussion and consideration of her objection.

(a) Rachel Blaney, the member for North Island—Powell River

Ms. Blaney objected to keeping the name of the riding of North Island—Powell River. Instead, she proposed renaming the riding “North Island—qathet” to better reflect the area it covers. It would also be a step toward reconciliation, qathet being the name, which means “working together,” given by the Tla’amin First Nation to the regional district in 2017. Many businesses and organizations have since ceased using the name “Powell River” to reflect this change. The word “qathet” is intentionally spelled with a lower case letter, in accordance with the spelling used by First Nations.

Ms. Blaney clarified that “Powell River” does not adequately reflect the geographic area covered by the riding. Ms. Blaney also pointed out that Powell River was named after Israel Wood Powell, the first superintendent of Indian Affairs in British Columbia and the main architect of certain colonial policies in the province, including residential schools and the banning of the potlatch, an important cultural ceremony for local Indigenous communities.

Ms. Blaney stated that it was crucial to always examine existing structures through the lens of discrimination and Canada’s colonial history, because it is within these structures that processes are embedded that disenfranchise marginalized communities. Ms. Blaney indicated that she was able to file this objection because the territory that she represents



is primarily occupied by nations that were all comfortable with the proposed name and share a common language.

Ms. Blaney stated that she spoke with the leadership of the local First Nations communities, who stood in favour of the name change. These communities are the Komox, Homalco and Klahoose, which all share a common language and culture with the Tla'amin Nation.

The Committee supports Ms. Blaney's objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.⁶

2. Lower Mainland Fraser Valley

Seven objections relating to the names of ridings in the Lower Mainland Fraser Valley were filed by members. One of these is a joint objection from 12 members.

The six other objections were from Mr. Aldag; Ms. Murray; Mr. Sajjan; Tako Van Popta, the member for Langley—Aldergrove; Mr. Weiler; and Mr. Wilkinson.

(a) Joint objection from twelve members

Twelve members signed a joint objection to the names of some British Columbia ridings in the Lower Mainland Fraser Valley.

The signatory members of the joint objection stated that they support the following name changes:

- Current electoral district of North Vancouver: change the proposed name “Capilano—North Vancouver” to “North Vancouver—Ambleside.”
- Current electoral district of Cloverdale—Langley City: change the current and proposed name “Cloverdale—Langley City” to “Cloverdale—Langley City—Sullivan Heights.”
- Current electoral district of West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country: change the proposed name “Howe Sound—West Vancouver” to “West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.”

⁶ Ms. Blaney, who is a member of the Committee, recused herself from the discussion and consideration of her objection.

- New electoral district of Vancouver Fraserview—Burnaby South: change the proposed name “Vancouver Fraserview—Burnaby South” to “Vancouver South—Burnaby.”

The Committee supports these objections and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider them favourably.

(b) John Aldag, the member for Cloverdale–Langley City

Mr. Aldag objected to keeping the name of the Cloverdale—Langley City electoral district. He proposed that the name be changed to Cloverdale—Langley City—Sullivan Heights.

Mr. Aldag stated that his proposed name change would better represent the community of Sullivan, which considers itself as a separate area from other Surrey districts, and also does not have a close affiliation with the community of Cloverdale. There is also a clear geographic separation between Cloverdale and Sullivan Heights, with significant parcels of agricultural land between the western geographic end of Cloverdale and the eastern geographic end of Sullivan Heights.

Mr. Aldag’s objection is supported by Mike Bose, who sits on Surrey City Council and lives in the Sullivan district. Mr. Aldag also noted that he submitted this objection in writing at the public hearings but did not receive a response from the Commission.

The Committee supports Mr. Aldag’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(c) The Honourable Joyce Murray, P.C., the member for Vancouver Quadra

Ms. Murray objected to the proposed name of Vancouver West Broadway, instead of the existing name of Vancouver Quadra. She does not believe that it adequately reflects the rich history of the riding, which for 74 years had included the Musqueam Lands, UBC, Kitsilano, Dunbar, Kerrisdale from Burrard Inlet all the way to the mouth of the Fraser River.

The Committee supports Ms. Murray’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.



(d) The Honourable Harjit S. Sajjan, P.C., the member for Vancouver South

Mr. Sajjan objected to the proposed name change of the existing riding of Vancouver South to “Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby.”

Mr. Sajjan stated that if the Commission decides to combine Vancouver South with part of Burnaby South, the name “Vancouver South—Burnaby” or even “Vancouver—Burnaby South” would be more appropriate, as it would reflect the names of the current electoral districts affected by the change.

The Committee supports Mr. Sajjan’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(e) Tako Van Popta, the member for Langley—Aldergrove

Mr. Van Popta objected to the proposed name of the electoral district, “Langley Township,” and instead suggested the name “Langley Township—Fraser Heights.” The new electoral district would straddle the border between Surrey and Langley. Mr. Van Popta stated that it was important that the City of Surrey’s Fraser Heights area be included in the name of the new electoral district, particularly because the Fraser Heights area accounts for 17.5% of the 117,251 inhabitants that would reside in the new electoral district.

Mr. Van Popta noted that the proposal has the support of neighbouring members of Parliament including Mr. Aldag, Mr. Hardie and Mr. Van Popta. The objection also received support from the Mayor of Surrey.

The Committee supports Mr. Van Popta’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(f) Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country

Mr. Weiler objected to the proposed name for the current riding of West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, which the Commission has proposed to rename Howe Sound—West Vancouver. He criticized the new name for eliminating any reference to the Sunshine Coast and the Sea to Sky region, which are distinct areas of the riding. He explained that only half of the riding’s population would be represented by the new name, which would alienate residents and could lead to confusion and frustration. He recommended that the riding’s name remains West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

The Committee supports Mr. Weiler’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(g) The Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson, P.C., the member for North Vancouver

Mr. Wilkinson objected to the change in name for the riding of North Vancouver, which the Commission has proposed to rename Capilano—North Vancouver. He proposed several names based on two scenarios: if the Commission sustains Mr. Weiler’s objection or if it overrules it.

He also explained why he lent his support to two seemingly contradictory objections to boundary changes from colleagues.

In its proposal, the Commission suggested incorporating the Ambleside—Dundarave neighbourhoods of West Vancouver within the proposed riding of Capilano—North Vancouver. While Mr. Wilkinson believes this change would not be conducive to effective representation for the residents of North Vancouver, he also recognizes the significant challenges that the Commission faced in its attempt to balance community interests with demographic parity. This position explains why Mr. Wilkinson signed both the objections from Terry Beech, the member for Burnaby North—Seymour, that generally supports the Commission’s proposal, and the objection from Patrick Weiler, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, that seeks to maintain a community of interest of West Vancouver by limiting the western boundary of the North Vancouver to 11th Street and below Highway One.

Irrespective of whether the proposed boundaries for the riding remain the same, Mr. Wilkinson objects to changing the riding’s name to Capilano—North Vancouver. Consequently, Mr. Wilkinson proposes two alternative names; which one should be retained would depend on the commission’s decision with respect to Mr. Weiler’s objection.

Should the Commission overrule Mr. Weiler’s objection, Mr. Wilkinson suggested the name “North Vancouver—Ambleside” as an alternative. He explained that the current proposed name does not encapsulate the full character of the riding and is not representative of the geography of the riding as parts of the riding extend past the Capilano River. The advantages of the new name would include:

- putting the emphasis on North Vancouver because a majority of residents of the electoral district reside in North Vancouver;



- ensuring that there is no confusion with the provincial electoral district of West Vancouver—Capilano; and
- ensuring that those living in the neighbourhood of Ambleside see their community reflected in their electoral district’s name.

However, should the Commission accept the changes proposed by Mr. Weiler, Mr. Wilkinson recommends that the name become “North Vancouver—Capilano” for the following reasons:

- putting the emphasis on North Vancouver because a majority of residents reside in North Vancouver;
- ensuring that those living in the neighbourhood of Capilano see their community reflected in their electoral district’s name; and
- ensuring that residents of West Vancouver below Highway One and east of 11th Street recognize that they are now within a new riding.

The Committee supports Mr. Wilkinson’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

3. The Southern Interior

Two objections concerning the names of ridings in the Southern Interior were submitted by two members: Mr. Cannings; and Tracy Gray, The member for Kelowna—Lake Country.

(a) Richard Cannings, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay

Mr. Cannings objected to the proposal to rename the electoral district of South Okanagan—West Kootenay to “Similkameen—West Kootenay” and would like to see the electoral district retain its current name or one of the names proposed below. He said that omitting “Okanagan” from the name ignores the fact that almost 60% of the population in the electoral district lives in this valley. He also indicated that if Similkameen were to be retained in the new electoral district, it could be called South Okanagan—Similkameen—West Kootenay; alternatively, it could be called South Okanagan—Boundary—West Kootenay.

The Committee supports Mr. Canning’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

(b) Tracy Gray, the member for Kelowna—Lake Country

Ms. Gray objected to the proposed name of the new electoral district of Vernon—Monashee; she would like the name “Lake Country” to be included. She noted that the proposed new electoral district of Vernon—Monashee would include the municipal district of Lake Country, and she thought it was critical that “Lake Country” be part of the name of the electoral district that includes that community for the following reasons.

First, Ms. Gray pointed out that Lake Country is one of the fastest growing communities in British Columbia, with a 22% increase in population in five years according to the most recent Statistics Canada census. Second, the current electoral district includes the names of the area’s two largest municipalities, Kelowna and Lake Country, yet the proposed new electoral district of Vernon—Monashee would include the name of only one of the area’s largest municipalities, Vernon. Third, Ms. Gray points out that the name “Lake Country” was included in the name of the electoral district in the Commission’s original proposal. Lastly, adding the words “Lake Country” to the name of the electoral district of Vernon—Monashee would refer to three geographic areas, which would be indistinguishable from the names of other proposed electoral districts in British Columbia.

Ms. Gray stated that this objection was filed in light of the concerns expressed by the Mayor of the District of Lake Country on behalf of the residents of that community. Currently included in the electoral district of Kelowna—Lake Country, the citizens of Lake Country are concerned about losing the designation of their identity in the name of the electoral district that will represent them in the future. Ms. Gray’s objection was accompanied by a letter from Blair Ireland, Mayor of the District of Lake Country.

The Committee supports Ms. Gray’s objection and recommends that the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia consider it favourably.

APPENDIX A LIST OF WITNESSES

The following table lists the witnesses who appeared before the committee at its meetings related to this report. Transcripts of all public meetings related to this report are available on the committee’s [webpage for this study](#).

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Don Davies, M.P., Vancouver Kingsway	2023/04/18	62
Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay, P.C., M.P., South Surrey—White Rock		
Hon. Hedy Fry, P.C., M.P., Vancouver Centre		
Peter Julian, M.P., New Westminster—Burnaby		
Wilson Miao, M.P., Richmond Centre		
Hon. Joyce Murray, P.C., M.P., Vancouver Quadra		
Taleeb Noormohamed, M.P., Vancouver Granville		
Tako Van Popta, M.P., Langley—Aldergrove		
Bonita Zarrillo, M.P., Port Moody—Coquitlam		
Rachel Blaney, M.P., North Island—Powell River	2023/04/20	64
Richard Cannings, M.P., South Okanagan—West Kootenay		
Tracy Gray, M.P., Kelowna—Lake Country		
Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan, P.C., M.P., Vancouver South		
Patrick Weiler, M.P., West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country		

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

A copy of the relevant *Minutes of Proceedings* ([Meetings Nos. 62, 64 and 74](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Hon. Bardish Chagger
Chair

Report on the Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia: Conservative Dissenting Report

This Dissenting Report reflects the views of the Conservative Members of Parliament who serve on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs (“PROC”): MP John Nater (Vice Chair of the Committee, Perth—Wellington), MP Luc Berthold (Megantic—L’Erable), MP Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe), and MP Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton).

Introduction

PROC received nine Notices of Objection in response to the Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia requesting electoral boundary changes (the “Boundary Objections”). The Boundary Objections were made by the Honourable Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock), the Honourable Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre), MP Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre), MP Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville), the Honourable Harjit Sajjan (Vancouver South), MP Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway), MP Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country), MP Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay), as well as a joint objection by MP Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby) and MP Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam). The Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson (North Vancouver) had submitted but then withdrew his objection.

PROC also received eight Notices of Objection requesting electoral boundary name changes (the “Name Objections”). The Name Objections were made by MP Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country), MP Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove), MP John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City), MP Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River), as well as by MPs Cannings, Miao, Sajjan, and Weiler.

Additionally, there was a joint objection in support of the Commission’s report signed by MP Terry Beech (North Burnaby—Seymour), the Honourable Carla Qualtrough (Delta), the Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson (North Vancouver), MP Parm Bains (Steveston—Richmond East), MP Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton), MP Aldag, and MP Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam (the “Joint Submission of Support”).

We respectfully disagree with the conclusions of the Report of PROC to support the objections of MPs Miao, Noormohamed, Sajjan, Weiler, Julian/Zarrillo, and Cannings, and wish to elaborate on our reasons for supporting the work of the Commission. We note that PROC reported back but did not endorse the objection of MP Davies. We do not support his objection. We concur with the Report of PROC to support the objection of MPs Findlay and Fry. We further concur with the report of PROC to support the Name Objections of MPs Gray, and Van Popta. We take no position with regards to the other Name Objections.

The Findlay Objection

We respectfully request the Commission to favourably consider MP Findlay’s objection by adjusting the boundary of Nanaimo—Ladysmith to include Lantzville. This targeted proposal, which is supported by the Mayor of the District of Lantzville, Mark Swain, would return

Lantzville to Nanaimo—Ladysmith, while adjusting the southern boundary of the riding slightly northward such that Saltair and the surrounding area would be moved into Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

We recognize that the Commission considered the strong ties between Lantzville and Nanaimo, however, decided to move the northern boundary of Nanaimo—Ladysmith southward to minimize disruption in terms of changes to Vancouver Island ridings and avoid a “domino effect around the Malahat area.”¹ This resulted in Lantzville being moved into Courtenay—Alberni. We understand and generally agree with the Commission’s reasoning.

However, we submit that MP Findlay’s proposal better respects communities of interest and identity, while respecting relative population parity, without creating a cascading effect. As Mayor Swain highlights, Lantzville and Nanaimo are closely connected, including sharing infrastructure, policing, recreational services, and cultural activities.² By contrast, Saltair is closely connected with Duncan situated in Malahat—Cowichan—Langford. If adopted, the populations of Nanaimo—Ladysmith and Malahat—Cowichan—Langford would still fall within the population range adopted by the Commission for Vancouver Island. Courtenay—Alberni’s population, which would be slightly under 120,000 brings it more closely in line with province’s electoral quota.

The Vancouver and Richmond Objections

Except for the objection of MP Fry, the objections of the other Vancouver MPs, and Richmond MP Miao have overlapping issues, specifically as it pertains to Marpole, with a cascading effect. As such, we analyze these objections together.

We support MP Fry’s submission that Granville Island be part of Vancouver Centre. This is a minor adjustment that will not have a cascading effect on other ridings and has a negligible impact on the populations of Vancouver Centre and Vancouver West Broadway.

Otherwise, we respectfully submit that the Commission reasonably drew the boundaries of Vancouver and Richmond ridings, and that no further adjustments be made.

Key to the way in which the Commission drew the Vancouver map is its decision to connect Richmond Centre with the Vancouver neighbourhood of Marpole to create the riding of Richmond Centre—Marpole. This decision reflects considerable feedback received by the Commission during the consultation period.

In its initial proposal, the Commission added a portion of the existing New Westminster—Burnaby and Delta ridings to the two Richmond-based ridings. As the Commission states, this was done to address “significantly under-quota populations of the two current Richmond electoral districts.”³ However, the Commission received opposition from “[m]any residents of

¹ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.14.

² Evidence, Letter of Mark Swain, Mayor of the District of Lantzville, undated.

³ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.18.

the municipalities touched” by the proposal.⁴ Accordingly, the Commission adopted a “different solution to add needed population to the current Richmond electoral districts,” namely connecting Marpole with Richmond—Centre.⁵ Although the Commission acknowledged that “[c]rossing the Fraser River is a significant step in the design of an electoral district,” the Commission effectively had no choice but to take this step with respect to at least one of the Richmond ridings, having regard for population.

We note that the Commission, where possible, tried to keep municipalities united.⁶ However, the Commission had to address the aforementioned population challenges concerning Richmond, and that Vancouver “has not kept pace with the general population growth of the province.”⁷ As a result, the Commission decided to maintain six Vancouver ridings, with two of them spanning municipalities. Having made this decision, connecting Marpole with Richmond is reasonable, having regard for Richmond’s proximity and other factors that the Commission detailed in its final proposal.

The Commission considered the “urban nature of Richmond Centre, the success of Canada Line transportation, and the location of two bridge crossings of the north arm of the Fraser River.”⁸ The Commission is also satisfied that “historical patterns of Marpole and Richmond and communities of interest between neighbourhoods are sufficiently strong to support this crossing.”⁹

Arguments against this configuration were most strongly made by MPs Miao and Noormohamed in their respective objections, and during their testimony at PROC. Their main arguments can be summarized as follows: (1) it would unhelpfully split the capacity of the MP to serve constituents in both municipalities of Vancouver and Richmond;¹⁰ (2) there would be logistical challenges for Marpole residents to access their MP’s office in Richmond;¹¹ (3) Marpole and Richmond have distinct community identities;¹² and (4) there is no historical pattern of a Richmond riding’s boundaries including municipalities to the north, only the south.¹³

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.18

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.18

⁶ *Ibid.*, p.12

⁷ *Ibid.*, p.18

⁸ *Ibid.*, p.18

⁹ *Ibid.*, p.18

¹⁰ Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Wilson Miao, p.1; Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Taleebe Noormohamed, p.6.

¹¹ Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Wilson Miao, p.1

¹² *Ibid.*, p.2; Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Taleebe Noormohamed, p.6.

¹³ Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Wilson Miao, p.2; Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Taleebe Noormohamed, p.6.

Respectfully, we find these arguments to be unpersuasive. To begin with, although Vancouver and Richmond are distinct municipalities, it is common for an MP to represent more than one municipality. Both Vancouver and Richmond are urban municipalities with many of the same challenges, including infrastructure and housing. It is reasonable to expect that the MP for Richmond Centre—Marpole will be able to effectively manage relationships with both municipalities.

We also do not agree that there will be any real logistical challenges for constituents living in Marpole to connect with an MP whose office is likely to be in Richmond. As the Commission noted, there is connecting infrastructure. This includes the Oak Street Bridge. Oak Street runs through the middle of Marpole and is the route that takes commuters to the centre of Richmond. The time to drive from Marpole to the centre of Richmond is negligible, taking approximately ten to fifteen minutes. There is also regular light rail service between Marpole and the centre of Richmond, the cost of which is economical. Any inconvenience for residents would be minor, and pales in comparison to the challenges that many constituents of large rural ridings have in connecting with their MP.

Also, there is precedent for this type of a riding configuration in the Greater Vancouver Area. For example, the riding of Burnaby North—Seymour connects Burnaby with North Vancouver, which are separated by a larger body of water, with only one bridge, and no light rail service. There does not appear to be any significant geographical challenges for constituents in that riding to connect with their MP. Indeed, MP Beech, who represents Burnaby North—Seymour, has expressed satisfaction that the Commission has maintained the riding.¹⁴

On the question of a community of interest, the Commission considered this, and was satisfied that there is a sufficiently strong connection between Richmond Centre and Marpole. We defer the Commission in reaching this conclusion.

MPs Miao and Noormohamed are correct that historically, Richmond ridings have never been connected with communities to the north, only communities to the south. However, as discussed, the Commission received negative feedback during the consultation process about tying the Richmond ridings with New Westminster—Burnaby and Delta. The drawing of Richmond Centre—Marpole reflected this public feedback, along with practical challenges that the Commission had to address relative to the populations of Vancouver and Richmond.

MP Miao recommends that Marpole be moved to an exclusively Vancouver-based riding, and that Richmond—Centre and Steveston—Richmond East be entirely Richmond-based, with Richmond split between the two ridings. However, as discussed, the Commission has already determined this not to be practicable. If Marpole were moved out of Richmond Centre, then it would be necessary to extend one or both Richmond ridings into Delta, which was not well-

¹⁴ The Joint Submission of Support, p.1.

received. Moreover, it would have a cascading effect impacting ridings across the Lower Mainland.

Without more, the Commission “got it right” in drawing Richmond Centre—Marpole. This is supported by the positive feedback from MP Qualtrough, who is pleased that the City of Delta is united within one riding. It is also noteworthy, that other Lower Mainland MPs expressed support for adjustments made by the Commission between its initial proposal and final proposal, some of which would have to be reversed if Marpole was moved out of Richmond Centre. It is also noteworthy that the other Richmond MP, Parm Bains, is satisfied with the boundaries of Steveston—Richmond East, which would be changed if the Commission accepted MP Miao’s proposal.

It follows that we cannot support the objection of MP Sajjan. MP Sajjan proposes keeping the Sunset neighbourhood united by moving Marpole to Vancouver Arbutus. This would be to make up for the loss of residents in the parts of Sunset that would be moved from Vancouver Arbutus to Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby. For the reasons already outlined, this adjustment would have a cascading regional effect. We further observe that while relatively small parts of Sunset are situated in Vancouver Arbutus, and Vancouver Kingsway, much of the neighbourhood’s population is concentrated in Vancouver Fraserview—South Burnaby. This reflects efforts by the Commission to keep communities of interest together, to the extent possible.

The Commission’s decision to tie Marpole with Richmond—Centre resulted in the reorganization of the two main ridings on the western side of Vancouver with the drawing of Vancouver Arbutus and Vancouver West Broadway.¹⁵ MP Murray objects to the drawing of Vancouver West Broadway and has asked the Commission to “keep the current Vancouver Quadra boundaries to the extent possible.”¹⁶ If adopted, the Commission would be faced with the task of “going back to the drawing board,” which we believe to be impracticable and would, from a regional lens, likely disrupt what has been, overall, a well-received map.

The Julian and Zarrillo Objection

We respectfully submit that the Commission appropriately drew the boundaries of Port Moody—Coquitlam, New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville and Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam. As such, we do not support the joint objection of MPs Julian and Zarrillo.

The primary concern of MPs Julian and Zarrillo is the Commission’s decision to place Maillardville in New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville, rather than Port Moody—Coquitlam. In considering the objection, the placement of Maillardville should not be looked at in isolation, but by having regard, more broadly, for the way in which the Commission drew boundary lines for the Burnaby and Tri-Cities region.

¹⁵ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.19.

¹⁶ Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Joyce Murray, p.3.

Looking through a regional lens, the Commission weighed feedback during the consultation process. This included concerns that the City of Burnaby had been divided into six ridings. In response, the Commission decided to “significantly redraw the electoral district boundaries affecting Burnaby and surrounding municipalities.” There were also concerns regarding the drawing of Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam in the initial proposal, in which the riding traversed the Pitt River. As the Commission noted, [t]his design did not find favour on either side of the Fraser River or Pitt River.”¹⁷ To address this the Commission decided to “extensively reconfigure the electoral districts from the Pitt River to Annacis Island and eliminate the proposed crossings of the Fraser River and the Pitt River in this area of the region.”¹⁸

The adjustments made by the Commission in the region have been generally well-received. MP Julian expressed general support for the adjustments made in Burnaby between the initial proposal and the final proposal.¹⁹ The Joint Submission of Support, signed by MP McKinnon, who represents Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, states: “The final result is a coherent riding for Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, giving full value to the cohesive community and geography.” This evidences that the Commission took care to consider communities of interest and identity for the region, in the context of a “difficult undertaking.”²⁰ Given the general regional satisfaction with the adjustments, we caution against further adjustments, which could result in an unwelcome cascading effect.

We further observe that the adjustments proposed by MPs Julian and Zarrillo would result in the populations of the ridings of Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Port Moody—Coquitlam, and Burnaby Central to fall further outside the regional average population (“RAP”) set by the Commission, as well as electoral quota for British Columbia (“EQBC”).

Based on the final proposal of the Commission, Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, with a population of 114,460, is -2.28% and -1.58% relative to the RAP and the BCEQ, respectively. The Julian/Zarrillo Objection, if adopted, would take Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam to +4.46% and +5.13%, relative to the RAP and BCEQ, respectively.

Port Moody—Coquitlam, with a population of 115,367, is -1.50 and -0.80, relative to the RAP and BCEQ, respectively. The Julian/Zarrillo Objection would take Port Moody—Coquitlam to +5.77% and +6.43, relative to the RAP and BCEQ, respectively.

Burnaby Central, with a population of 120,734, is +2.99% and +3.81%, relative to the RAP and BCEQ, respectively. The Julian/Zarrillo Objection would take Burnaby Central to -6.53% and -5.87, relative to the RAP and BCEQ, respectively.

These deviations from the RAP and BCEQ, in all three ridings, fall outside the largest deviation in the final proposal for The Lower Mainland and Fraser Valley, which is Burnaby Central at

¹⁷ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.19.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 19

¹⁹ Evidence, Procedure and House Affairs Committee, 18 April 2023 (Peter Julian).

²⁰ The Joint Submission of Support, p.2.

+3.81% relative to the BCEQ. Indeed, under the Julian/Zarrillo Objection, the deviation from the BCEQ would approximately double from the current largest regional deviation (Burnaby Central) for Port Moody—Coquitlam and Burnaby Central.

We acknowledge that the Commission does have latitude relative to population pursuant to the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. E-3 (the “EBRA”). However, the overarching principle of the EBRA is to ensure that each riding shall as close as reasonably possible, correspond to the electoral quota for the province. Consistent with this, the Supreme Court of Canada in *Reference re Provincial Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)*, [1991] 2 S.C.R. 158, determined that while absolute parity is impossible, a citizen’s vote should not be unduly diluted. As McLaughlin J. (as she was then) wrote at p.185:

“It emerges therefore that deviations from absolute voter parity may be justified on the grounds of practical impossibility or the provision of more effective representation. Beyond this, dilution of one citizen’s vote as compared with another’s should not be countenanced.”

That the Julian/Zarrillo Objection materially increases deviations for all three mentioned ridings, should, in our opinion, weigh heavily against adopting the objection.

We further note there is decades of precedent for Maillardville to be situated in the same riding as parts of New Westminster and Burnaby. This is relevant, because in drawing riding boundaries, the Commission shall consider “the historical pattern of an electoral district” pursuant to section 15(1)(b)(ii) of the EBRA. Maillardville was situated in the riding of New Westminster-Coquitlam between 1979 and 1988, and again from 2004 to 2015. Between 1997 and 2004 Maillardville was part of New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby.

Finally, we observe that the Commission has to the greatest extent possible respected the community of interest and identity that is Maillardville. Lower Maillardville, the oldest neighbourhood in Coquitlam, has been kept whole, being situated in the same riding. Although Maillardville is part of the City of Coquitlam, Maillardville, is not uniquely the only Coquitlam community situated in a riding with communities outside of Coquitlam. Coquitlam is divided into three ridings, including Port Moody—Coquitlam and Coquitlam-Port Coquitlam.

The Weiler Objection

We submit that the Commission’s decision to select 21 Street as the eastern boundary for Howe Sound—West Vancouver is reasonable. It is evident that the Commission carefully considered feedback provided during the consultation process and concluded that this configuration “is the only fair and appropriate resolution to the electoral district’s high population.”²¹

²¹ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.17.

MP Weiler argues that the 21 Street boundary “severs the Ambleside-Dundarave community of interest.” However, the Commission had no practical choice but to divide West Vancouver into two ridings, having regard for its population. As such, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to draw a boundary line in West Vancouver, respecting population parity, without impacting communities of interest. 21 Street is a major transportation corridor running through the centre of West Vancouver that connects Marine Drive with the Trans-Canada Highway. It is a clear line of demarcation that should cause no real confusion amongst residents and businesses.

MP Weiler proposes that instead the eastern boundary be 11 Street. However, this would result in a population of 123,717, well outside the RAP and BCEQ of +5.33 and +6.0, respectively.

MP Weiler concedes the population variance but argues that it is within the range of the RAP for Vancouver Island, and notes that the riding borders the Vancouver Island riding of North Island—Powell River.

It is our observation that the Vancouver Island RAP is based upon combined factors that are unique to Vancouver Island alone, including: (1) population growth since the last redistribution;²² (2) the unique geography of Vancouver Island, with waters separating it from the mainland “making it largely impractical to combine their territories into electoral districts;”²³ and (3) the decision of the Commission to allocate British Columbia’s additional riding to the Southern Interior, rather than Vancouver Island.²⁴ Accordingly, we submit that it is not appropriate to consider the RAP for Vancouver Island in the context of Howe Sound—West Vancouver – a riding with a substantial population minutes away from downtown Vancouver.

Finally, we note that the neighbouring affected MP, Jonathan Wilkinson, does not support MP Weiler’s proposal to move the eastern boundary of Howe Sound—West Vancouver to 11 Street.²⁵

The Cannings Objection

We submit that the Commission should reject MP Cannings objection. The objection would result in a boundary configuration that is contrary to public input during the consultation period. It would also have a cascading impact that is not supported by the affected MPs and could necessitate substantial changes to riding boundaries in the Southern Interior.

In essence, MP Cannings proposes that certain communities in the West Kootenay be moved to Similkameen—West Kootenay from Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Rockies and Vernon—Monashee. To adjust for this added population, MP Cannings proposes to move the

²² *Ibid.*, 9

²³ *Ibid.*, 8-9

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 9

²⁵ The Joint Submission of Support, p.2.

Similkameen Valley into Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna. To offset a population loss in Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Rockies, MP Cannings propose that the municipalities of Golden and Field be moved from Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies to Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Interior. Notably, MP Cannings has made this proposal without the support of the affected MPs Mel Arnold and Rob Morrison, nor is there any evidence that he has consulted or has support from the affected municipalities of Golden and Field. In short, MP Cannings is unilaterally proposing a radical realignment of the electoral boundaries in the Southern Interior. In our view, the stage in the process by which MPs may submit objections is past the time for a significant redraw of the electoral map.

The “workability” of MP Cannings proposal rests with severing the Similkameen Valley from the riding. Such an adjustment would ignore public input that the Commission received. The Commission heard clearly that the residents of Penticton, members of the Penticton Indian Band, the Regional District for Okanagan-Similkameen, and the municipalities of Keremos and Princeton opposed being separated as the Commission initially proposed. The Commission responded to this feedback by making boundary adjustments to unite the communities of the Similkameen Valley with Penticton. MP Cannings objection would undo this, thereby separating communities of interest and identity. Even MP Cannings concedes that the adjustments made by the Commission between its initial and final proposal concerning the Similkameen Valley is “somewhat positive.”²⁶

Keeping Similkameen Valley communities united with Penticton is further supported, having regard for “the historical pattern of an electoral district” pursuant to section 15(1)(b)(ii) of the *EBRA*. Except for the last redistribution, the Similkameen Valley and Penticton have been part of the same federal ridings for decades. The feedback that the Commission received from the public and from the affected municipalities was to restore this historic connection.

Finally, in our opinion, MP Cannings contention that the process is “deeply flawed”, and that residents of the West Kootenay had “no recourse to public input at all” is without merit.²⁷ The Commission held twenty-six in-person hearings, over seven weeks, and heard from 211 presenters across the province.²⁸ Further, the Commission held a virtual hearing. There was ample opportunity for residents in the West Kootenay, like all other British Columbians, to provide input to the Commission.

The Gray and Van Popta Name Change Objections

We respectfully ask the Commission to adopt the name changes proposed by MPs Gray and Van Popta.

²⁶ Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia by Wilson Miao, p.1

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 4-5

²⁸ Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of British Columbia, p.9.

With respect to MP Gray’s objection, we observe that the District of Lake Country is a sizeable community in the southern half of the riding. Moreover, it has been included in the name of the present riding of Kelowna—Lake Country since 2004. Amending the name of Vernon—Monashee to include Lake Country more accurately describes the composition of the riding. Moreover, adding this name will bring greater awareness to residents that they are in a new riding, having historically been situated in the Kelowna-based riding that for the past twenty years has borne in its name “Lake Country”. We note that this name change is supported by the Mayor of the District of Lake Country, Blair Ireland.²⁹

MP Van Popta’s objection that Fraser Heights be added to the name of the Langley Township would more accurately describe the riding by recognizing a sizeable community that is in the City of Surrey and not Langley Township. The name change is supported by MPs John Aldag and Ken Hardy, who along with MP Van Popta, currently represent the communities that will be part of the new riding. Finally, the proposed name change is consistent with the approach the Commission took to the naming of the neighbouring ridings of Cloverdale—Langley City and Abbotsford—South Langley.

Respectfully submitted,

John Nater, MP, Vice-Chair
Perth—Wellington

Luc Berthold, MP
Megantic—L’Erable

Blaine Calkins, MP
Red Deer—Lacombe

Michael Cooper, MP
St. Albert—Edmonton

²⁹ Evidence, Letter of Blair Ireland, Mayor of the District of Lake Country, March 8, 2023.