



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

PROC • NUMBER 063 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, March 5, 2013

—
Chair

Mr. Joe Preston

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Tuesday, March 5, 2013

• (1105)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC)): We'll call the meeting to order. We have some fantastic witnesses today and lots to discuss and cover.

I will start off by doing my map thing again for those members of the committee who were here last time. We have made another change, I think. The map on your right will always be what it is today. The map on your left will be the one from the report of the commission. Members at the end as they make their presentations will tell us what is changing on it. We've been having some real trouble overlaying because of the names, so we're just going to stay with what it is now and what the commission has represented.

For witnesses, that's what you have. So if you're going to refer to the map over here, please tell us. When using the laser pointer, please avoid the analyst and the chair. The clerk's very quick; the rest of us are not.

Mr. Stewart and Mr. Julian, which one of you would like to go first? You'll have five minutes.

Mr. Stewart, you're going first. You have five minutes to thrill the committee with your changes.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): I'll give it my best shot.

I'd like to thank you for having me here today.

I would also like to thank the clerk for the eleventh-hour translation and for sending the documents around. Essentially we'll be splitting our presentation. I'll be going through the community objections to the Burnaby North—Seymour configuration in the report. Then Peter will talk more about how we propose to fix this.

Really I just wanted to stress all the way through my presentation how unpopular the decision essentially to cross the Burrard Inlet is. When we get to the maps, I can show you exactly what I mean. We're asking the committee to recommend to the commission that they not go ahead with this change.

Again, I will stress that I feel that the commission's work was integral; I just feel they made a mistake in this situation.

If we look at the first map, that's the current configuration of the riding of Burnaby—Douglas. Once we pull up the Burnaby North—Seymour map on the other screen you'll see what the commission has proposed. You can see that the new Burnaby North—Seymour riding goes across the Burrard Inlet. The only way that those two

communities connect is through the Iron Workers Memorial Bridge. Almost unanimously the many people who have been coming out to the commission meetings and writing letters to the editor have objected to this configuration.

The Chair: Is the bridge you're speaking of there on the bottom left of the new riding?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: That's right, and that's the only way those two municipalities connect.

The objection to this merger of north Burnaby and North Vancouver is highlighted in the commission's report. I'll read you a quote:

It was and remains apparent to the Commission that there is a distinct lack of enthusiasm on both sides of Burrard Inlet for some combination of the existing North Vancouver and Burnaby—Douglas electoral districts to address deviations from the electoral quota. There were many submissions that viewed the large arterial corridor of the Ironworkers Memorial (Second Narrows) Bridge as more of a challenge to than an enhancement of access and communication for constituents.

Just to remind the committee, this proposal was also put forward in 2002 by the boundaries commission that reviewed boundaries at that time. There was the same level of objection from the community, and that commission decided not to go ahead. They proposed the same configuration that we're faced with today. The community pushed back very hard on both sides, North Vancouver and Burnaby, and the commission in the end reversed its decision and left us with the riding that we have today.

The commission held two meetings on this new change. In total, 59 people attended. One of the commissioners told me that it was by far the most controversial change in the whole province, and he attended meetings with large audiences that were passionately against this change.

Letters from both sides were sent to the commission. There were letters to the editor, lineups of people of all political stripes outside my office, objections from the board of trade, objections from the business improvement associations. There is a letter from city council that I've included in your package. It goes through the four main objections that are brought up time and time again.

Essentially, there's no significant community of interest between these two communities. North Burnaby and North Vancouver are distinctly different. First, North Vancouver is very wealthy, Burnaby, less so. These are different economic profiles. Second, Burnaby is a land of immigrants. We have 100 different languages in Burnaby. North Vancouver is not nearly as diverse. Third, there are different health authorities on the north shore, and North Vancouver and north Burnaby have different health authorities. Finally, there is the objection to the bridge.

Seniors showed up at these community hearings to say that it was almost impossible for them, because they are transit reliant, to make it from one side to the other, and they never travel between those two ridings.

The Chair: Mr. Stewart, we're running out of time.

• (1110)

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Okay, how much time do I have left?

The Chair: None.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Okay, those were my four objections.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll briefly reiterate what Mr. Stewart has just said about the reaction from the public in 2002, when a similar new riding was proposed, North Vancouver—North Burnaby, and the public reaction today.

I attended the public hearings in Burnaby and New Westminster. Another parliamentary colleague, Fin Donnelly, attended the commission hearings in Coquitlam. Very clearly there was a virtual consensus among the public from dozens of people who intervened. Even in the community of New Westminster, people were speaking against this proposed new riding because the communities of interest simply were not there.

I've circulated a copy of a proposed new riding, instead of the North Vancouver—North Burnaby riding, that does meet with some real consensus within our community and preserves those communities of interest that exist. I believe every member of this committee has a copy. I'd like to quickly go through that new riding, the existing ridings, and what would change.

First off, for Burnaby—Douglas, you would see a smaller reduced Burnaby—Douglas riding that would include the communities of interest that exist already in North Burnaby. As Mr. Stewart has indicated, there's a demographic similarity in north Burnaby, and that would be preserved.

Second, if you go two maps over to the third map, you'll see the proposed reduced-size Burnaby—New Westminster riding. There's a lot of community of interest between the south Burnaby neighbourhood, which demographically is the most diverse in all of Canada, and the west side of New Westminster, and a number of institutional links as well, including local schools. They cross the 10th Avenue area between the west side of New Westminster and south Burnaby.

If you go to the final map, you'll see the community of interest that exists between the east side of New Westminster, including the Sapperton neighbourhood, Coquitlam, and the Maillardville area, and that community of interest would be preserved.

Then if you go to the third map along in your kit, which is the proposed new Port Moody—Burquitlam riding, demographically this area has a great community of interest. There is a lot of interaction across North Road. The Burquitlam area is actually a combination of Burnaby and Coquitlam, and you'll see many businesses that publicize themselves as Burquitlam businesses. What this does is it preserves that community of interest and is a much better new riding than the proposed new riding of North Vancouver—North Burnaby.

There has been a real consensus in the community about that, and I'd like to say that my colleague, Fin Donnelly, who's not here today, as well as Mr. Stewart and I, believe that would be a much better new riding, a proposed Port Moody—Burquitlam riding, than the North Vancouver—North Burnaby riding. That's the case that was put by many in the public to the commission at the hearings.

Just to close, Mr. Chair, I'd like to read two quick paragraphs from the City of Burnaby's submission to this committee. It was sent to Mr. Scheer and Mr. Nicholson. It says that basically, in terms of the North Vancouver—North Burnaby riding, "...the two communities are not geographically linked. The need to cross Burrard Inlet to visit each community would compromise an MP's ability to devote equitable amounts of time in each community." Mayor Corrigan from the City of Burnaby said, "In closing, we respectfully request that you convey our strong objection to this proposal to the House of Commons committee." That is this committee.

Mr. Chair, it's very clear. I think there is a virtual consensus in our communities that this proposed new riding of North Vancouver—North Burnaby is a non-starter, and something along the lines of a Port Moody—Burquitlam riding would be much more in keeping with the communities of interest that exist in our area.

The Chair: Thank you very much, both of you, for your opening statements today.

We'll go to questions.

Mr. Lukiwski, are you leading off?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC): I think Mr. MacKenzie's going to.

The Chair: Mr. MacKenzie's going to lead off today.

You have five minutes.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

I understand exactly what you're saying. These are tearing apart and putting together areas in nonsensical ways, from your view of dealing with constituents. What I didn't see was what the population numbers would end up being with the changes you're proposing. How would that fit with what the officials are trying to do?

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you very much for the question. It's a very good one.

In terms of the electoral quotient for British Columbia, the three existing ridings that are reduced in size and the proposed new riding of Port Moody—Burquitlam would be within 2% of the quotient, so within 104,000 to 106,000 voters. The proposal would keep with the mandate that the commission has, certainly.

• (1115)

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: The other part that I was having trouble trying to sort out is that you're talking about a new riding, but is that an additional riding over what the electoral boundaries commission have?

Mr. Peter Julian: No, because they propose a new riding of North Vancouver—North Burnaby, which is extremely problematic for all the reasons that we've just set out, we're saying North Vancouver—North Burnaby as a new riding is a non-starter. Instead of doing that as the new riding in the area, we're proposing Port Moody—Burquitlam. It doesn't change anything else in terms of the scope of the commission's recommendations for British Columbia.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I take it you're both singing from the same song sheet with what you perceive.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: It's not a new riding. It's just a new configuration of ridings. We just draw the lines differently, that's all.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: But as two members from the area, you're both in agreement about the change.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Absolutely.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: What about the adjoining ridings that you would then touch as a result of those changes?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: We have spoken at length with my boundary MPs: Peter, Libby Davies, Fin Donnelly. We've all discussed this and they're broadly in agreement as well, or absolutely in agreement with this.

The Chair: Some of them will be coming here so we can ask them that.

Mr. Peter Julian: I'd like to add, Mr. Chair, if I might, Mr. Donnelly has actually sent a letter to this committee saying that he supports the reconfiguration we're proposing.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I think he will be one of the people coming.

The other thing I saw when I looked at this, Mr. Kennedy, is you did a telephone polling and I saw the numbers. When I look at it, although there are 60% in favour with what you're talking about here, there are still a fair number of people who agree that they need changes, or they just simply don't understand what the changes are about. Is that a fair assessment of your telephone polling?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Everybody should have a sheet on that. What we did here is basically we called every household in the affected areas. We had 1,000 people respond from North Vancouver, and we had almost 1,400 respond from North Burnaby. Of those with an opinion, in North Vancouver 79% were opposed to this; of those with an opinion in North Burnaby 80%. As you can imagine, some people don't care. They're undecided about these kinds of questions. We did have some who were undecided, but if you look at those people with an opinion, and when I talked to the company, they said the response rate was much higher than they would normally get on a poll like this.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I take it that these calls were not interactive.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: People would just vote with their telephone.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: There would be no discussion about what this was.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: No, there wasn't, and the questions I have there I tried to make as unbiased as possible.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I see the questions.

The Chair: One minute.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: My last question would be, these proposals that the electoral boundaries commission have brought forward... Your proposals were put to them, and they, I guess for lack of better words, ignored your proposals. Is there some reason why now you think we could somehow have them overturn that and go to what you had already proposed the first time? Is there some change that we can look to?

Mr. Peter Julian: I certainly think that from the community reaction, which has been extremely negative, and from the testimony that was at the commission as well, there is a moral weight to the argument, and past precedent as well. In 2002, that public reaction was sufficient to nix the idea of a North Vancouver—North Burnaby riding.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: You had public representations?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Cullen, you're up. Five minutes, please.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Thank you.

The polling feature is interesting. We haven't seen that yet. It doesn't surprise me that you had a certain number of people who either didn't understand or care, but of those who did have an opinion that's pretty impressive. I'm curious, with this having been proposed before and rejected by the community, and then proposed again and with people speaking strongly against this, does this new proposal have a name, Peter? Are you suggesting a name for it, this new riding?

• (1120)

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, Port Moody—Burquitlam, which is the two communities that would form the basis for that new riding, as opposed to North Vancouver—North Burnaby. What we would say is Port Moody and Burquitlam have a great deal of demographic similarities and they have an existing community of interest that North Vancouver and north Burnaby do not have.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I don't know this section of road or community very well. I do know a bit about the idea of coming from North Vancouver into Burnaby.

How many offices do each of you have in the ridings?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: We have just the one.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: One each? I don't know what office rates are like. I have a large northern rural riding. We have a couple of offices, because of the space, but we also get rent for \$650 a month in some cases. But when you run a few of them, it adds up.

What's the possibility of opening an urban office in North Vancouver and an urban office in Burnaby, financially speaking?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: With the MOB, you couldn't open one and staff it. So essentially, if you go ahead with this new riding, you'll have one office.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: You'll have to choose.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: The MP will have to choose whether it's on the north side or the south side. I'd like to stress that these are transit-dependent communities, especially Burnaby, and the transit routes are horrendous between the two.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Describe the transit situation in this new proposal for a Port Moody—Burquitlam riding. What's it like to get around?

Mr. Peter Julian: There are linked SkyTrain stations and bus stations and bus routes that integrate through Port Moody and Burquitlam. So there is an existing transportation corridor. With North Vancouver—North Burnaby, you have to leave the riding for that one link, and there's a bridge that is sometimes closed because of accidents. As to the transit links, you have to go to downtown Vancouver and then come back, if you're going to hope to have any real connection between the two halves of this proposed riding.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: What the committee often seeks to do—and you saw this in some of our instruction notes—is tick a number of boxes. One shows the number of voters left in any new proposals we see, because we know that's one of the commission's mandates. We also look for communities of interest to understand if communities are inherently connected through past cultural associations, school boards, and the like. Another one is trying to understand it all logistically. This is the one place where MPs talk to MPs, and we know the work and the effects it would have on the ability to serve the constituents in new or old proposals of ridings.

This is my one opportunity to really go after a colleague here, and I'm having a hard time, which is really disappointing for me today. I'd like to go after both of you. There are some old bets.

A voice: It's a good thing he's not the House leader.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Yes, it's good I'm not in any position of any kind.

I'm trying to pick a hole in your argument about understanding these communities. The commission has a difficult job, which is to create a new riding that is going to have domino effects. We often talk about this here, so I'm sure you appreciate the challenge.

Mr. Julian, do you have something to say?

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Cullen, for your reference to an MP's work. I wanted to quote the former MP for Burnaby—Douglas. In 2002, when he appeared before the commission, he said the following:

While there was a North Vancouver—Burnaby riding previously, north Burnaby residents often complained that they never saw the MP, who lived in North Vancouver and almost never attended Burnaby functions or responded to concerns of

Burnaby groups. I personally was often called upon to assist that MP's constituents in the Burnaby area, and attend community events there.

I think that is a very practical ramification of what it means when you have two completely separated communities being represented by one MP.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: How are we doing for time, Chair?

The Chair: You have 30 seconds.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Thank you.

Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Sure, a lot of the folks who came to present to the commission hearings were service providers, and they stressed that there are actually no links between the service providers in North Vancouver and those in north Burnaby. They don't cooperate in delivering services. They cooperate on the south shore. That's just another factor.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I think the most compelling part of your argument is first, that the communities have been through this already, this matter of a new horizontal riding. Second, to have that many people show up is impressive, as committee members will know.

Yes, it's disappointing the commission went the other way.

Thanks.

• (1125)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Lamoureux. It's nice to have you here today, Kevin.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's great to be here.

Did either of you make a presentation to the commission? Both of you did?

In making the presentation to the committee, what do you feel? Is the presentation you made to the commission the same that you're making before us today?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: I've added information since the decision. We've added a letter from the City of Burnaby. The turmoil within the community has been ongoing since the new maps came out. I'm trying to present that information. It wasn't a one-off blip. This is a community that's going to be permanently angry. Both sides of the inlet are going to be angry about this, so I'm adding that to my testimony today.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thanks, Mr. Lamoureux.

I'd just like to be frank. Prior to these public hearings, one of the commissioners in British Columbia said that the public hearings would not change anything. I think subsequent to seeing the map that has come out following the commission hearings, there's been a reaction in the community from people who are saying, "They told us the public hearings wouldn't change anything and they haven't changed anything", and they're upset, because there should have been a role for the public in these hearings. Frankly, that's why we're coming before you today.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: So there's no deviation whatsoever from the original draft proposal that would have been made last spring. None of your thoughts or generally speaking....

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: There is a slight change. They've moved a boundary in North Vancouver a little bit, but that's very minor.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: So in terms of the redistribution, there are just very minor changes overall.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: No. From what was proposed by the commission initially, which went forward to the public, to what was eventually included in the report in terms of the Burnaby—North Seymour riding, there was a small change, but not the change the public wanted.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: You'll have to excuse me for not knowing, but what about other ridings in the province? Did they make any substantial changes at all from a province-wide perspective? Do we know if the commission responded?

Mr. Peter Julian: Honestly, I don't know. I think there were some changes. Actually, as members of the committee, you'd be better versed in that than we would be. We haven't seen what types of submissions you've been getting from B.C. MPs.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: I was interested in seeing the poll. Is this verbatim what would have been expressed on the phone in its entirety?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Yes, it is. I gave it to the commission as well. I presented this to the commission, and it was widely reported in local newspapers as well.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Did either of you receive written correspondence or anything of this nature reflecting some of the opinions you've expressed?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Absolutely. I still am. My staff said people are coming in with letters asking how they can get them to the committee and the House of Commons to make sure this change doesn't go ahead. So it still is probably one of the top issues in our community as reflected in local papers and in what's happening in my constituency office as well as in Peter's.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Have all of the other MPs in the surrounding ridings been contacted by the two of you, or by either one of you, just to make sure they're comfortable with what it is you're suggesting?

Mr. Peter Julian: As I mentioned, Mr. Donnelly, who's in the third riding that's primarily affected by this, has said that he agrees with the proposals we're bringing forward. He wasn't able to appear today, but hopefully he will appear.

The Chair: We received a letter from him, and he has suggested that will suffice.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: So there are really three ridings involved.

Mr. Peter Julian: There are three that are primarily impacted.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: For the ones that are not primarily impacted, are we talking about a significant percentage? Would there be under a few thousand who would be affected?

Mr. Peter Julian: The primary, I guess, would be the North Vancouver—North Burnaby riding. In a sense there will be no incumbent for that new riding, as there is no incumbent for Port Moody—Burquitlam. That would be the riding, I guess, that would be impacted by that. As I say, certainly the public on both sides of Burrard Inlet have been pretty clear.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: This first map is the one you're talking about ideally.

Mr. Peter Julian: The first map is the overall reconfiguration of the three existing ridings and the creation of a fourth, rather than North Vancouver—North Burnaby.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: But this is the one you're suggesting that we adopt.

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, and then each of the other maps would be the proposed configuration so we would keep within the riding quotients for British Columbia for each of the three existing ridings and the fourth riding that would take the place of North Vancouver—North Burnaby.

• (1130)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you. You're right on time.

Mr. Reid, go ahead for five minutes, please.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have your map here. Unfortunately, we don't have it up there.

There are four ridings. Starting at the top and going clockwise, the one that is the north-most, at 12 o'clock, is Port Moody—Burquitlam. What are you calling the one that is at 3 o'clock, which includes Douglas Island?

Mr. Peter Julian: It's New Westminster—Coquitlam....

Mr. Scott Reid: Perhaps I can ask you to go around them all, just so I'm clear on this.

Mr. Peter Julian: Okay.

It would be a reconfiguration of the existing New Westminster—Coquitlam riding, with the northern part of Coquitlam being added to Port Moody—Burquitlam, the proposed riding to replace North Vancouver—North Burnaby.

Mr. Scott Reid: Right. Then continuing clockwise, the next one is....

Mr. Peter Julian: It is Burnaby—New Westminster, which is the riding I represent.

But the Burnaby portion, the Burquitlam portion, would go to the proposed Port Moody—Burquitlam riding.

Mr. Scott Reid: Right. And then the last one is....

It's just that what is happening here, as we've been discussing it, is that I've been trying to figure out which one is which. It's not your fault, it's just....

Mr. Peter Julian: No, no, that's quite all right.

Mr. Scott Reid: So the last one is....

Mr. Peter Julian: It is Burnaby—Douglas, and it would take the Burquitlam portion of Burnaby—Douglas, which is the portion, if you go to Burnaby...which is a delightful place to go. We encourage you to come. In fact, this committee could make a trip there, if you like.

So you have Burnaby Mountain, and below Burnaby Mountain is the flat area, which is the Burquitlam area. Everything below Burnaby Mountain, which is where the SFU campus would be, would be included in Port Moody—Burquitlam.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay.

Actually, seeing as we've wound up there, I'll ask my next question about a little area there. Obviously, I'm aware that the topography justifies some changes that might not be intuitive to one looking at it from the outside, but you have a riding with a sort of peninsula jutting into another. Burnaby—Douglas juts into....

For Westridge, I can see the logic of connecting that either south or west with equal ease. Then there's this long area. Is there a population at all along Highway 7A, Barnet Road, or is that unpopulated?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: It's not populated.

Mr. Scott Reid: It's not populated, so it doesn't really matter, from a population point of view, where it's included.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: I can tell you the logic behind that L-shape. They're the primary transportation corridors.

Really, if you start in the top left corner, one primary transportation corridor, Willingdon Avenue, runs north-south. The other one is Hastings Street, which runs east-west.

That's why in our proposal that L-shape kind of makes sense, because that's how people travel.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay.

Is there either a bridge or some kind of transportation link between the Coquihalla up there and the...or do you have to go all the way around the entire inlet to get from...?

Let's say I'm at "B", as in Barnet, and I want to go to where the "C" is, on the Coquihalla. I'm not sure I'd want to do that, actually, because it looks like it's not very heavily populated, but do I have to go all the way around?

Mr. Peter Julian: There's no cross at Burrard Inlet, so you do have to go around.

The communities are fairly small. Belcarra, Ioco, and Anmore are the tiniest communities in the Lower Mainland. They're separate district municipalities, but I think their populations are about a thousand each.

Mr. Scott Reid: The next question is actually for the folks from Elections Canada. I just want to make sure I get it in before my five minutes are up.

I'm wondering if, at a subsequent meeting, before we have to make any decisions, you can come back here with the population estimates for those four proposed constituencies. You know what the names are. I would ask you to do that also for any other constituency that is affected by transfers of population, in or out, as a result of these maps, just so we'll have something to work with that is a consensus document.

Mr. Benoit Montpetit (Team Leader, Technical Expert, Electoral Geography, Elections Canada): According to this map?

Mr. Scott Reid: Yes.

Mr. Benoit Montpetit: I will produce a report of the new ridings proposed, with the adjacent ridings.

Mr. Scott Reid: That would include the spillover effects from the other ridings that are outside.

Mr. Benoit Montpetit: Yes. I'll do that and send it to the committee.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay. That would be very much appreciated.

The next thing I want to ask goes back to our two witnesses.

You mentioned that you'd had the consent of a number of the adjoining MPs. As you were doing this, I was very quickly trying to take your map and overlay it with my photocopy of the report of the boundaries commission.

I may not be right about this, because it is hard with their different sizes and all that sort of thing, but it looks to me like this would affect as well the territory of the new Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam riding, which I assume is kind of the successor to what James Moore represents now, and also the new North Vancouver riding, I think, which I assume would be Mr. Saxton.

Have you spoken to either of those two and gotten their consent on this? I think I'm right that those two are both affected.

● (1135)

Mr. Peter Julian: You're absolutely right about North Vancouver and north Burnaby. We are proposing that this new riding not exist. That's why we're proposing what we've come through with today. It very clearly impacts that.

It does have a minor impact, perhaps, on Mr. Moore's existing riding, if you look at the configuration, but the primary impacts are on the three ridings of the members of Parliament who have come supporting this proposal, namely, me, Mr. Donnelly, and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Scott Reid: Right. So—

The Chair: Scott, you're a minute over.

Mr. Scott Reid: I'm sorry, I'll stop. Thank you.

The Chair: I was going to ask the same question. Other ridings of members of Parliament are affected by what you're suggesting. We've asked each time at this committee if you have spoken to those members at least. Are they in agreement or not?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: One's in the room with us today. That's Mr. Saxton.

The Chair: He's up, and he'll be able to answer that question. Oh, sorry, he's not appearing, so I take it you have documentation—

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: From what I've read in the newspapers, Mr. Saxton's been fairly quiet on these issues, initially questioning the decision of the commission, but from my understanding he has not appeared before either of the commission hearings that I attended.

The Chair: Okay. Is the current riding of Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam being affected by this? Minister Moore's riding would be the riding I'm thinking of. I know it borders on this one, and there are some changes to it. Have you asked him?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: We didn't have an opportunity to talk with him at the commission hearings because he wasn't there, and we haven't talked to him subsequently.

The Chair: All right.

There was some question about the north piece.

Mr. Michel Bédard (Committee Researcher): I was wondering, in the north, just south of the Mountain Forest, I understand that some neighbourhoods did not get assigned anywhere under your proposal. Would those be in the North Vancouver riding?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: You may be talking about the first nation there, Tsleil-Waututh, who, as an aside, have also vigorously objected to the new boundary proposals.

The Chair: The point is, I don't think you have it anywhere. We're trying to ask you what riding it's in now.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: They're there.

The Chair: They're there, in what riding?

Mr. Peter Julian: They would be in the North Vancouver reconfiguration that will include North Vancouver and north Burnaby.

The Chair: Okay, as long as we have that for the calculations.

Mr. Cullen, did you have one more question before we finish?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: It was just about following up on what you talked about here. I'll be curious what Mr. Saxton says, because he's left it open to appear. But essentially, virtually keeping the status quo, is that what you're proposing for North Vancouver? You would be staying with the ridings that currently exist, keeping all of North Vancouver together with this extended arm out there, the way it is right now.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Leave the north shore ridings, essentially.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: To confirm, did the commission hold meetings in North Vancouver?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: And the public at the meetings in North Vancouver said what?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: They didn't want this, almost unanimously. I think one person at the very end of the meeting objected.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: One out of 10, one out of 20?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Nineteen were there.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So to be clear, and this is, I think, answering the question as to where those folks would go. Sorry, what was the first nation again?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Tseil-Waututh. Also, former MPs and city councillors showed up and said they didn't want that either. So a very strong voice in North Vancouver said they didn't want this change.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Thank you.

• (1140)

The Chair: One more question, this one from Mr. Lukiwski, and we'll finish with this panel.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Thank you very much.

Sorry to make you go over ground that I think you've already covered here, but I'm trying to get it clear in my own head. Nathan said originally it's a difficult job for any commission, particularly when they're adding seats to a province. It's one thing if you're not adding anything and just trying to make changes within the existing construct, but here they're trying to add seats. So I'm wondering again, with the arguments that you have made to the commission when you appeared before it, even though you have brought forward some additional information since that time, what was their primary reason for, as my colleague said, ignoring, or I would say rejecting, your arguments at the hearing level, and coming forward with the map we see before us today? Were there a series of arguments? There must have been something—

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: What's disappointing is they provided none. They made a statement at the beginning of the hearing process saying this change was going to go ahead no matter what the public said. It was quoted in the paper, which made the commission quite nervous during their presentations. Then they just went ahead and made the change with no justification in the report. You can look at the report; it's not in it.

Mr. Peter Julian: I'd just like to add that it's far beyond the members of Parliament. We have submissions from the City of Burnaby. City of New Westminster councillors and City of Coquitlam councillors came out. So really, within the community, within Burnaby—New Westminster, and I would suggest Coquitlam as well, there is a real consensus that this is not in the interests of the community generally. That pushback has been community-wide.

The Chair: Mr. Gill, very quickly, you haven't had a question so I'll let you jump in.

Mr. Parm Gill (Brampton—Springdale, CPC): Yes, I have a very quick question.

I understand these are two different communities obviously, represented by two different municipalities, two different mayors and so on. Is it also true that from 1968 up to about 1988 it was represented by one MP?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: That's why the community is so dead set against this. They have experience in the past. They got rid of that configuration. It was proposed again in 2002. All the communities came out and completely rejected this change. That's why they're fighting against it. It's because they have lived through it once and it didn't serve them.

Mr. Peter Julian: The growth in the Lower Mainland has meant that we don't need to do this. When the Lower Mainland was a smaller area in terms of riding quotients 20 years ago, it may have been acceptable. It is not acceptable to this community now. I referenced the former member of Parliament for Burnaby—Douglas, who talked about what the impacts have been for servicing those two communities.

The reality is what we've proposed to you today is within the riding quotient, so there is no need to rip apart and forceably join two communities that don't have that community of interest between them.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Cullen, did you have one more quick comment, please, so we can change out?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Absolutely. On what Mr. Stewart said, you said the commission made a statement about the impact of community submissions, or the lack of impact. Did they say this in front of the community members who were presenting, or did they say this in the newspapers?

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: It was an interview that one of the commissioners, Commissioner Ladyman, gave right at the beginning of the process to *The Huffington Post*, I believe, and it actually made it through all the local papers and they were backtracking all the way through the process.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I see, okay.

Mr. Kennedy Stewart: Again, they were slightly poisoned right from the beginning.

The Chair: Mr. Armstrong, very quickly, and we'll finish off.

Mr. Scott Armstrong (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC): Doesn't the existing riding of Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam have four different communities with four different mayors and a similar body of water between them, but people can get back and forth there? Is there a different transit there or something, or is that just as easy?

Mr. Peter Julian: No, what happens with the communities of Belcarra, Ioco, and Anmore is they shop in Port Moody, so they tie directly in. There is a community of interest between Port Moody and those three smaller areas.

Mr. Scott Armstrong: There is an enterprise area in that riding—

Mr. Peter Julian: Absolutely, and for institutions, for schools, etc. And just in terms of the information, the commission's comments prior to the public hearings, we should make that available to the committee, so we'll pass that on to you.

Mr. Scott Armstrong: Please.

The Chair: Thank you.

Gentlemen, thank you for coming today and for being so prepared and able to share your information with us. Thank you for being here.

We'll suspend just for a minute while we put our next panel in place. Thank you.

• (1140)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1145)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order, please.

Mr. Warawa, it's great to have you here today. You got to watch a little bit of the end of the last segment and you've seen what it's like.

Many members of Parliament never have the chance to sit at that end of the table and be a witness at a committee, so we'll try to be as hard on you as we can be today.

You'll have five minutes to start, to give us a summary of what it is you're here to present today, and then the members will ask you questions.

Go ahead.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the members of the PROC committee. It's a real honour to be here and an opportunity to present to you an objection to the report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for British Columbia.

Would you, please, refer to the map. I believe it has been passed out to you. I've provided it through the clerk's office.

The commission has proposed that the existing riding known as Langley be divided up, creating the loss of community interest and the loss of community identity.

I'm honoured to present to you the request of my community. This is where this originated. There was a lot of consultation. I agree with what they have said.

The federal riding of Langley has two Langleys in it, the City of Langley and the Township of Langley. They have a long history of working together as one community.

In 2003 they both worked together as a community, as councils, as the chamber, to see the establishment of a new federal riding called Langley, in time for the 2004 election. I was elected in 2004 and have been honoured to represent the community since then.

The community unanimously supports keeping our community together, and has presented numerous times that as a community our first choice is to continue using the existing riding boundaries. This was proposed to the commission by both mayors, councils, and the Langley Chamber of Commerce.

Our community has acknowledged that if the commission would not support using the existing riding boundaries, and it would be right at the extreme of the population quotient, then we strongly suggest that the commission use the Township of Langley municipal boundaries and call the new riding Langley—Aldergrove, not Fort Langley—Aldergrove.

This request was also made to the commission as their second choice, if we couldn't keep it together, when both mayors and the chamber made their presentations. This continues to be the request of the community.

The commission's first and second map proposals.... It proposes that both important parts of the community from the Township of Langley be removed, creating the loss of community of interest and the loss of community of identity.

By recommending that the commission put 35 polls of the Willoughby area back into the Township of Langley, you would maintain the community of interest and community identity, and both ridings would be within the electoral quotient variant.

It's important that I again request that the new riding use the Township of Langley municipal boundaries and that the riding be called Langley—Aldergrove. The commission's proposals—both of them—is that the riding be called Fort Langley—Aldergrove. That name does not properly represent the riding or the wishes of the community.

Fort Langley is an important part of the riding, but a very small part of it. The riding predominantly is Langley. So Langley—Aldergrove is the requested name.

We also request that the proposed riding of Cloverdale—Langley be called Cloverdale—West Langley, because it's such a small part of Langley. The name Cloverdale—West Langley would better represent the makeup of the riding and the wishes of the constituents.

I have consulted with my community and my colleagues. I have support for what I am proposing and requesting today.

I look forward to your questions.

● (1150)

The Chair: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Lukiwski, would you like to start us off for five minutes.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks, Mark, for being here.

I want to get something clear in my mind. Mark, are you recommending both name changes and boundary changes? The last part of your presentation seemed to concentrate mainly on the name.

Mr. Mark Warawa: I'm sorry. I was trying to listen to you, and I got translation in French. I'm changing the station back to English now.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: The question was, are you proposing both some boundary changes and name changes, or are you mainly suggesting just name changes?

Mr. Mark Warawa: I'm requesting both. If PROC disagrees, then the very minimum is to have the communities represented by name change.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: On the boundaries proposed by the commission, on the new boundaries they call Fort Langley—Aldergrove and Cloverdale—Langley, if those two boundaries were to come into effect, what would the populations in each of these two ridings be, and what variance would they have to the provincial average?

Mr. Mark Warawa: The targeted provincial average is 104,000 approximately. What is being proposed for Cloverdale—Langley is 108,519. That's for Cloverdale and, we hope, west Langley. For Fort Langley—Aldergrove it is 94,883, so it is under.

If you put back the 35 polls in Willoughby, which they have taken out of Langley, you would then in Cloverdale—Langley go from 108,000 down to 88,000. So with a 25% variance off the 104,000, you could go from 130,000 down to 78,000. So at 88,000 you are still 10,000 more than that variant.

Langley—Aldergrove has a population, proposed, of 94,883. By putting the Langley ridings back into Langley, it would go up to 115,883, with a maximum of 130,000, so you're still well within the variance.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I'm doing rough mental math here. It would appear the current ridings as proposed by the commission would be within the variance and actually be a little closer to the provincial average than what you may be suggesting with your proposed changes. Would that be an accurate reflection?

● (1155)

Mr. Mark Warawa: That is accurate, but....

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: It doesn't take into account a lot of the other considerations. I'm just wondering about the population side.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Exactly.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Do the changes you are recommending affect any other ridings besides these two? In other words, do you have neighbouring ridings that would be affected by the boundary changes you're suggesting, or only these two?

Mr. Mark Warawa: It's only these two.

What the community has proposed, which I agree with, is that we use the Township of Langley municipal boundaries. The commission has taken out Willoughby and added west Abbotsford.

The community would like to have west Abbotsford put back into Abbotsford, but that would create a domino effect to my east, so I'm not proposing that. I'm proposing that the only change be to my west, which would be Cloverdale—West Langley. That would be the only impact. We would still be within the population quotient variant, and that would be the only domino effect.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Okay.

You mentioned you had been making this representation on behalf of the community that had been suggesting some of the changes you have proposed here.

Did you make a proposal yourself at the commission level?

Mr. Mark Warawa: No, I did not. We were well represented as a community. Both councils and the chamber made the presentation. I waited until this opportunity.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Were the arguments you presented to us today the same arguments that were presented to the commissioners at the public hearings?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Yes, but let me clarify that. They are exactly the same proposals. The only difference is they ask for municipal boundaries. So that we do not have a domino effect to my east, I am suggesting we don't mess with the Abbotsford—Langley boundary. That was not included in the proposal.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: You have some new information, but similar arguments were made to the commission.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: After hearing the arguments and coming up with this map, did the commission give a rationale for proposing the map, which seems to be in opposition to some of the community groups you say made their representations known?

Mr. Mark Warawa: The proposal was primarily due to the electoral quotient by population. It works, but I believe, and the community believes, it does not include the culture of the community, the community interests, and the community identity. It actually divides the community, and that's why the community is quite concerned.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: The presentation's good, Mark.

I'm having a little bit of a problem understanding this, because we can't do the three here. We see what was. We see what the commission has proposed. I'm trying to see this in terms of what you're suggesting.

Where I'm running into confusion is that right now you don't have any west Abbotsford in your riding. The new map is suggesting west Abbotsford gets included, right?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: You're okay with that?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Yes.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Because you don't want to cause this domino effect.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That wasn't what was presented by the councillors and the chamber, but you are trying to anticipate other challenges.

Now I'm going to go to the eastern part of your riding.

Mr. Mark Warawa: That was the eastern part we were just talking about.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Excuse me. I'm going to go to the western part of your riding, which is changing under all scenarios from what it was.

Under the current scenario, you only go so far, just to the outer edge of east Clayton. Is that right? I'm looking at the current maps, on the right-hand side. You're going to lose that section in there under the proposal.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Right. This area here is called Willoughby.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That's called Willoughby. Thank you. Willoughby doesn't appear on any of our maps, and I was trying to figure out where Willoughby was.

Mr. Mark Warawa: This is not to scale. There are two different scales; these maps are slightly different.

Right now, Langley city is this small area here.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I see.

Mr. Mark Warawa: This area here is Willoughby.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Yes.

Mr. Mark Warawa: I'm asking that you use the municipal boundaries. Basically right about here, it's at 176 Street.

• (1200)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That's the new riding, yes?

Mr. Mark Warawa: This is all part of the new riding.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That's all new.

Mr. Mark Warawa: It's this area right here that they've taken out and added to Langley city. Langley city is this area right here.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So you're impacting on the new riding of Cloverdale—Langley with your proposal.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: One of the challenges we've had, as the chair will know, is that we've looked at Alberta where they're adding some seats and there were a lot of configurations and effects on the new riding as suggested. We don't have anyone to speak on behalf of the new riding because obviously there is no one there.

What does that mean logistically for communities of interest for that Cloverdale—Langley riding under your proposal? How does it change things?

Mr. Mark Warawa: As I said, right in this area is the Langley Events Centre. It is a centre of culture. In that area there is a large Korean—and I want to use Canadian—concentration. To keep it together really would help the community.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: To be clear on that, you are suggesting in your proposal to keep it. Are your lines the same as what the boundary commission has proposed, or have you moved the line over there?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Right. I'm proposing that this line right here be moved over to here.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: And you want to keep that cultural centre in Langley.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Okay.

The Chair: Mark, that small slice you're talking about, what is the population?

Mr. Mark Warawa: It's 21,000. It's 35 polls.

The Chair: So it's fairly—

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So those 35 polls and the 21,000, which way they go has, as Tom pointed out, big impacts on both ridings in terms of trying to hit that target.

Your argument to us today is that we're going to deviate more than what's suggested in order to hit that community of interest box. I don't want to sum it up.

Mr. Mark Warawa: I think that fairly sums it up. Because of community of interest, they are so connected to the township of Langley culturally because of what's going on around there. If you removed them, you would be putting them into a community where they would no longer be part of that cultural mosaic.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So even though Tom took my time, I'm still going to come in under time. I just want the committee to note that for future consideration.

The Chair: We'll put that in the bank for you. Thank you.

Voices: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Monsieur Dion, five minutes for you, please.

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Thank you very much.

Mark, could you repeat the numbers for the committee? If the commission agrees with your proposal, what does that mean for the quotas? How far are we? You gave the explanation but I did not understand. How far are we now, and how far would we be with your proposal for the two ridings that would be affected?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Thank you very much. Currently what's being proposed for Cloverdale, hopefully called Cloverdale—West Langley, is 108,519, and that would reduce it by 21,000 to 87,519. It would be 35 polls. The minimum suggested quotient would be 78,000, so it's still substantially above the minimum. By putting those 35 polls back into Langley, from whence they came, that 21,000 would increase that population of 94,883 to 115,883, which is the proposal from the commission. In that 25% variant you can have up to 130, so it's well under that. It does meet the variant but it dramatically takes into consideration the community of interest and community of identity.

Chair, before I was elected federally I was a bureaucrat with the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, in loss prevention. I worked with a number of different communities, and Langley is unique in its level of volunteerism and community involvement. Everybody in the Fraser Valley will acknowledge that; Langley is unique. That's why this is so important to the community. Every weekend there are community events. Everybody is involved, and we do not want to disenfranchise any part of the community.

• (1205)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: So today the magnitude is 94 for one riding and 108 for the other one.

With your proposal, it would be 87 for one riding and 105 for the other one, so the magnitude is much bigger.

Mr. Mark Warawa: It would be 115.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes, 115. So the magnitude is bigger.

Mr. Mark Warawa: It is.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I guess the commission tried to stay within the range of 10%, rather than 25%. All of them tried to do that.

So you will need to come up with a very strong argument to go beyond the 10%. Your argument is that this community must stay

together and there's no other way to do the math than to come up with this magnitude between 87 and 105.

Mr. Mark Warawa: The other way would be to put part of the west Abbotsford-Aldergrove area back into the Abbotsford area. I do not have the numbers for the Abbotsford area, so I'm not sure if they are involved, where they are. That would be one way of reducing that.

It's very important to the community that we have the community interest aspect of it, that cultural aspect. By removing that from Langley, it will have a cultural impact.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Would it be possible for the colleague to work on this scenario and to come—

The Chair: I have Abbotsford here. It would be under the latest from the commission: 96,819 and 7.58% below quotient now.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: In which scenario?

The Chair: In no scenario. The way Abbotsford is currently drawn, it is 96,819.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: So 96,000.

The Chair: Mr. Warawa asked about taking some from Abbotsford to make up the population in Langley—Aldergrove. But Abbotsford itself is already under.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: It's already low. I think you will have a real problem convincing the commission to do that. Your scenario would not work as well.

Mr. Mark Warawa: I was trying to avoid a domino effect on the west and east, but if we wanted to be...

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I understand.

Mr. Mark Warawa: This is why the recommendation to the commission right from the get-go was that we use the Township of Langley municipal boundaries as the riding boundaries, and have Langley city go over to Cloverdale. The cultural fit is much better, both for Abbotsford and Langley, and for Cloverdale.

But in both proposals the commission has taken portions of Langley out, which is a concern to the community. That's why I am before you today. If anything, most important is that the names properly represent, and I've shared with you the names.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: The other riding has no MP. It is a new riding.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I just wanted to make sure. You haven't discussed this with the other colleague.

Mr. Mark Warawa: No.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dion.

Mr. Reid.

I'm going to go down to about four minutes. We do have to get to the other report today too.

Mr. Scott Reid: I think in all fairness, when we say the place has no MPs, that's not true. Every chunk of territory in Canada is represented by someone. It's just that when these areas expand, what we're really saying is that we anticipate that they will not be—

A voice: The same....

Mr. Scott Reid: Yes, but I think Mr. Warawa can speak with equal confidence about all parts of these ridings, except the parts that came in from Fleetwood—Port Kells and South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale.

It doesn't show it on these maps. I wanted to ask, in these two ridings that you're talking about, the ridings of Fort Langley—Aldergrove, Langley—Cloverdale, what are the municipal boundaries? Is it all just part of one municipality or are there several municipalities in there?

Mr. Mark Warawa: The municipal boundaries are actually what were used in 2003. Here on the map is the boundary for Langley, and you can see it over here. This is Langley, and this is the municipal boundary for Langley and for Abbotsford.

Mr. Scott Reid: Got it.

Mr. Mark Warawa: So on the west this is all Surrey. What's being proposed here is this riding will have Langley municipal government, and with this municipal boundary here, it will now be Langley and Abbotsford, and this is all Surrey in here.

• (1210)

Mr. Scott Reid: So basically the new riding that they are calling Fort Langley—Aldergrove at this point contains parts of two municipalities.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

For the riding boundary you suggested for the Willoughby area, you were showing a street that doesn't show up on this map. Right there. That's where you're showing it. That's actually the municipal boundary, is it?

Mr. Mark Warawa: That's right. And you can see it over here. Right there, that is 196th Street. There it is, right there. This small circle here is Langley city and the rest of it is Langley township.

Mr. Scott Reid: Those are two different municipalities.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Scott Reid: You have part of Langley township inside the new Langley—Cloverdale riding.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct. That's Willoughby, which is part of Langley township, and this is what they are wanting to put back into this.

Mr. Scott Reid: But it's the only part that deviates from the municipal boundary.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay.

I'm sorry, I just want to move through because I have some more questions and limited time here. Regarding growth and population of the communities, this is obviously a rapidly growing area. Where is the growth taking place? I ask this because if it's taking place more in the riding that under your preferred scenario is underpopulated, that is more justifiable than if it's an area that's already overpopulated and you're putting.... You see what I'm saying?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Yes. It's a very good question.

The Willoughby area is expected to increase by about 50,000 over the next 18 to 20 years. It has a higher population now than in the proposal of the commission, and this is where all the growth and development is proposed to grow. It will likely grow faster than this area here.

Mr. Scott Reid: Just because the commissioners will be looking at our report, you basically said it will be growing mostly to the west of 200th Street, which is in the Langley—Cloverdale riding and not in the Fort Langley—Aldergrove riding.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Correct. This street here is 208th Street, and to the west of 208th Street, the Willoughby area, is the fastest growing area; it's where all the development is happening. It's much slower in this area here, the rest of Langley. So for growth you will see this proposed riding is larger than this, and so by including parts of this back into Langley, it will actually help this to stay in line with the provincial average.

Mr. Scott Reid: Do I have time for one more question?

The Chair: Sure.

Mr. Scott Reid: The one thing I have to ask is this. Willoughby you described as having a single community of interest based on the fact that it has a Korean Canadian population. You expressed a preference for putting it in the Fort Langley—Aldergrove riding as opposed to the Langley—Cloverdale riding. In the event that someone were to try splitting that community and putting part of it in one riding and part of it in the other, would that be worse than having it all in one riding or the other? Do you see why I'm saying that? It helps resolve the numbers question to some degree.

Mr. Mark Warawa: There is an annual international festival where a cultural diversity celebration happens at the event centre. It's Korean, Ukrainian, Chinese, Mexican. It's a wonderful festival that's actually being funded by grants from the federal government. So to have it now taken out of the community and put in another federal community would have a negative impact, so we're asking that it all be put back to where it came from.

The Chair: Thank you. I was going to suggest that sounds like my kind of cultural festival.

Madam Turmel.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Thank you. I will be speaking in French.

I have a question that follows up on what Mr. Reid was saying. I want to be sure that I understood his breakdown. One would drop to 87,000, and the other would increase to 115,000.

When you spoke about an increase of 30,000 to 50,000, does that apply to the 115,000 or to the 87,000?

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa: It would increase. Cloverdale and hopefully west Langley would reduce from 108,500 to 88,000. But that is the area that has a substantially higher growth rate. Langley—Aldergrove, increasing from 94,000 to 115,000, actually increases it in the slower growth area.

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Okay, that's fine.

[Translation]

Thank you.

●(1215)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: One thing that popped into my mind is we talked about the domino effect a lot. We've talked about Cloverdale dropping down under your proposal to 88,000. Elections Canada has been helping us with getting the numbers exactly right. My concern is that actually what we'll then be asking the commission to do for this now small riding of 88,000, especially in such a high concentration of population, is to seek to pull population up from South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale.

I wonder if we could expand the new map to a larger scale so we can see all the ridings.

Do you see the domino that I'm concerned about? They'll say, "Fine, if this committee wants to make Cloverdale—Langley smaller, we're going to go into Surrey—White Rock, into Fleetwood—Port Kells, and we're going to start pulling neighbourhoods and polls out of there." Do you see how it might weaken your proposal? That domino effect is almost certain to happen if the committee follows through on this.

Mr. Mark Warawa: The whole area here in Langley and in Surrey is the very fast-growing area. The cultural community in here is very different from in here.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I appreciate that. The fast-growing nature has been something which the boundaries commissions, generally depending on the provinces, haven't made a big deal out of. They haven't counted on fast population growth. So you can talk to Brian Jean about that, where it's obvious and real and it still didn't get as much impact as you'd think.

So the commission stays with what is, is what is. Can you address that concern? If we make Cloverdale—Langley this new riding, 88,000 people, what's to stop the commission from walking around

and trying to get another 10,000, 20,000 or maybe another 30,000 folks?

In some of these ridings, Surrey—White Rock, I don't know what the new numbers are going to be, but they're high. So now, in order to satisfy two things at once, they'll certainly pop up pieces of Surrey, or Fleetwood—Port Kells, or Surrey—Newton.

Mr. Mark Warawa: That's why I was trying to avoid the domino effect. My proposal, by using municipal boundaries, would still be within that quotient variant, and it is probably one of the fastest growing areas and so it is already within the quotient and still would meet that.

The reason for the request is for the cultural community of interest reason. I think it's important that we do keep that. Also, the name changes are a very important part of my request.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I was going to end with that. The name aspect I very much appreciate. I'm trying to get my head around a Lower Mainland riding having 88,000 people. That would seem unusual to any passing observer, even with the fast-growth nature of that. It would be unusual to recommend it just because some of those ridings are so large, and they will be large still and grow quite quickly, like Surrey will, we expect, over the next 20 years.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Could I make one final comment, then. The request is that we use the municipal boundaries. Right now this is a higher number than this area, and it's faster growing. If PROC believes some of those 35 polls could be put back, and instead of using 208th Street, using 200th Street, maybe that would be a compromise and would solve a portion of the problem.

But the main issue is cultural community interest, and that is why I am making this request here.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Warawa, for coming here today.

We will suspend for a moment. We will be going in camera to discuss a previous report, so I will suspend.

[Proceedings continue in camera]

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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