



FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 16, 2023

A meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee was held on Thursday, February 16, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

Present were: Chair Jennifer Murphy
Warden Peter Emon
Councillor James Brose
Councillor Glenn Doncaster
Councillor Michael Donohue
Councillor Anne Giardini
Councillor David Mayville

Regrets: Vice-Chair Valerie Jahn

Staff Present: Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk
Jeffrey Foss, Director of Corporate Services
Jason Davis, Director of Development and Property
Laura LePine, Director of Community Services
Mike Blackmore, Director of Long-Term Care
Lee Perkins, Director of Public Works and Engineering
Ashley Wilton, Manager of Provincial Offences
Chris Ryn, Manager of Information Technology
Daniel Burke, Manager of Finance
Greg Belmore, Manager of Human Resources
Tina Peplinskie, Media Relations and Social Media Coordinator
Rosalyn Gruntz, Deputy Clerk
Connie Wilson, Administrative Assistant, Corporate Services
Tyson Hilts, Systems Analyst, Information Technology

Chair Murphy called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. The Chair recited the land acknowledgement, identifying that the meeting was being held on the traditional territory of the Algonquin People. The roll was called, and no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-12

Moved by Councillor Mayville

Seconded by Councillor Brose

THAT the minutes of the January 11, 2023 meeting be adopted. CARRIED.

Administration Department Report

Mr. Kelley overviewed the Administration Department Report which is attached as Appendix A, the Administration Addendum Report#1 attached as Appendix B and the Administration Addendum Report#2 attached as Appendix C.

Chair Murphy advised Committee that the Agenda needs to be amended to incorporate the two Administration Addendum Reports.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-13

Moved by Councillor Giardini

Seconded by Councillor Brose

THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend that the February 16, 2023 Agenda be amended to incorporate the two Administration Addendum Reports. CARRIED.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-14

Moved by Councillor Giardini

Seconded by Councillor Donohue

THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend that the March meeting of this committee be rescheduled to Monday, March 20, 2023. CARRIED.

Mr. Kelley overviewed the changes to the Weighted Vote By-law 10-01, advising that the revised weighted vote sheet provides details of the number of electors (residents and non-residents) for each municipality which is obtained from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-15

Moved by Councillor Brose

Seconded by Councillor Giardini

THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend to County Council that the Strategic Plan for 2023-2026 be approved. CARRIED.

Mr. Kelley thanked Elected and staff for all their hard work at the January Strategic Planning sessions which were facilitated by Mr. Erik Lockhart, Queen's Executive Decision Centre. The mission and vision statements within this new Strategic Plan have been realigned, a 10-year vision was established for longer term planning with six identifying priorities, supported by detailed objectives and actions.

Committee discussed the Asset Management Plan and the Long-Term Financial Plan, noting that a review should also be completed of these documents.

Councillor Doncaster entered the meeting at 9:51 a.m.

Mr. Foss advised that Asset Management is a regulated practice and Ontario Regulation 588/17 provides all municipalities with practical guidelines to follow and noted that during the upcoming 2023 Budget Workshop, Finance staff will be reviewing our progress to date. Mr. Foss noted that a significant milestone will take place through O. Reg 588/17 on July 1, 2024 which requires that all Asset Management Plans must clearly identify condition ratings or standards for all core infrastructure assets (e.g. roads, bridges, culverts) and everything that qualifies as a fixed asset, along with the 10-year plan to rehabilitate/refurbish those assets. The County of Renfrew, similar to all municipalities are putting plans in place to meet those requirements. The Asset Management Plan will have a high profile in 2023, culminating in a presentation to committee to not just ensure that core, but all assets are in compliance with O. Reg 588/17. To Committee's discussion, a review or an update of the Asset Management Plan fits in nicely with what we are planning in 2023 and required to do based on provincial regulations. At the staff level, there will be a significant level of work throughout 2023 and preparation for presentation within the 2024 budget document, as well as ensuring the County of Renfrew meets those regulations by July 2024.

Committee thanked Mr. Foss for the update but recommended that the establishment of the foundational standards for the Asset Management Plan should be completed at a focused session. Mr. Kelley thanked Committee for their feedback and recommended that prior to the establishment of the 2024 Budget targets in August/September 2023, it would be beneficial to have a session to review the Asset Management Plan/Long-Term Financial Plan.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-16

Moved by Councillor Giardini

Seconded by Councillor Mayville

THAT the Administration Department Report attached as Appendix A and the Administration Addendum Reports attached as Appendix B and C be approved. CARRIED.

Corporate Services Department Report

Mr. Foss overviewed the Corporate Services Department Report which is attached as Appendix D.

Mr. Foss overviewed the detailed Audit Planning Report from KPMG highlighting the key milestones and deliverables. Mr. Foss advised that their field work will continue through March and April, with anticipation of the draft financial statements to be brought to this committee in May and the final audited Financial Statements in June.

Committee discussed the requirement through the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25 that the Treasurer of a municipality shall in each year, on or before March 31 provide to the council of the municipality an itemized statement on remuneration and expenses paid in the previous year. Mr. Foss advised that by posting these statements of remuneration and expenses on our County of Renfrew website, it is made a public document.

Committee discussed the Association of Municipalities of Ontario's call for Provincial Action on Property Assessment and Warden Emon noted that it is ongoing discussion item at his AMO Board meetings and Chair Murphy noted that the ROMA board is also discussing this issue.

Committee recessed at 10:24 a.m. and reconvened at 10:35 a.m. with all persons present.

Mr. Kelley thanked Mr. Foss, Mr. Burke and his Finance team for the compilation of the 2023 draft budget, noting it has been a particularly difficult year to attempt to meet targets and has involved a large level of creativity, including the addition of the strategic plan requirements. We have scheduled two days for the Budget Workshop to ensure that no Council member feels rushed.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-17

Moved by Councillor Doncaster

Seconded by Councillor Mayville

THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommends that the Draft 2023 Budgets for all divisions reporting to this Committee be forwarded to the February 22, 2023 County Council Budget Workshop for approval. CARRIED.

2023 Budget

Mr. Foss advised that the Members of Council section of the Budget is a good example of the challenges and pressures facing the County of Renfrew. A third-party consultant was engaged and a remuneration survey and analysis were completed in 2022, comparing the County of Renfrew Elected Officials to many of our peers in eastern Ontario with similar sized populations and budgets. As a result, Council had approved the recommended increase to place Council members in the 55th percentile of the comparators, thereby, increasing Council salaries by 8.7 % in 2023 from 2022. Mr. Foss noted that mileage rate amounts have also increased in 2023 based on the Canada Revenue Agency guidelines, and the mileage baseline, that was reduced during the pandemic, will need to return to pre-pandemic levels, similar to the hospitality line item (lunches). Also, 12 of our Council members are utilizing Manulife benefits which increases the costs in this area. As a result, the Members of Council area would have a 14.7% overall increase.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-18

Moved by Councillor Donohue

Seconded by Councillor Mayville

THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend to County Council that in preparation for the 2024 budget, part of the process be that the Treasurer's Report for all of the Committee packages and during the budget workshop include a forecast column of the prior years' expenditures. MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Mr. Burke provided an overview of the draft 2023 General Administration budget noting that the enhancement of \$150,000 is to implement the Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives beginning in 2023.

Mr. Ryn overviewed the draft 2023 Information Technology budget, advising that there are budget pressures within maintenance fees, cyber security training needs to be completed with the ever-evolving cyber security threats, and within the communication fees line we will defer purchase of three network switches. Mr. Ryn overviewed the two Business Cases for Information Technology which includes the change of the Administrative Assistant II position to a Helpdesk position and the Business Analyst position identified through the Perry Group Consultants Digital Strategy Review.

Mr. Nolan entered the meeting at 11:16 a.m.

Mr. Belmore overviewed the draft 2023 Human Resources budget advising that he has reduced the expenses in purchased services, office expenses by deferring a computer purchase and travel to meet the budget target.

Ms. Wilton overviewed the draft 2023 Provincial Offences budget and advised that the pressures have been reduced as our satellite courts are still closed, therefore there are no building rental or travel costs. Adjudication costs are also reduced due to the shortage of Justices of the Peace. Within the enhancement column, the Provincial Offences office is returning to our previous prosecution model by hiring a prosecutor as a part-time County employee. Mr. Foss advised that we have prepared a Business Case for consideration, but last month staff were forced into recruitment for this position due to the sudden departure of our current prosecutor, who was hired as a Justice of the Peace for the Pembroke area at the end of December 2022. With the impending Ministry of the Attorney General download of Part III matters to the County of Renfrew, staff recruited for the Prosecutor position and Ms. Tara-Lee Hay, was the successful candidate, she was a court Prosecutor in City of Ottawa, is a Paralegal professor at Algonquin College and lives in Renfrew County.

Warden Emon departed the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Mr. Foss advised that the Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) to non-union and salaries of the Council members has been set at 2.0% as directed by Council.

Mr. Nolan departed the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

Mr. Foss advised that within Financial Expense, we had applied for and received funding from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) in 2022 for grants within the Municipal Modernization Fund to enhance our digital infrastructure, in accordance with our digital strategy review, to implement the County-wide new web mapping application using ESRI ArcGIS online technology and implement a new Human Resources Information System. The agreement with MMAH was for over \$300,000 and last year's Council approved a recommendation that the County's share of cost comes from this budget in the amount of \$171,000. In 2020, Council had approved staff to move forward with business plan to move outside departments into this building, these Service Delivery Improvement Plan savings continue to be recognized, as we renovated this building and our Provincial Offences, Child Care, Renfrew County Housing Corporation and Ontario Works staff were brought in house. The savings of \$466,000 over seven years will be reviewed as part of the Budget Workshop.

Mr. Foss advised that the 2023 levy target at 2.5%, combined with the 2022 levy growth of 2.16% will result in a total levy change of 4.66%. Council will need to approve budget reductions of \$3,000,000 to meet this levy target, not including the enhancements column.

Committee recessed at 12:00 p.m. and reconvened at 12:07 p.m. with the same persons present.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-19

Moved by Councillor Brose

Seconded by Councillor Giardini

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Finance and Administration Committee move into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended for the purpose of personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees (2023 Budget): Time 12:09 p.m. CARRIED.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-20

Moved by Councillor Giardini

Seconded by Councillor Brose

THAT this meeting resume as an open meeting. Time: 12:23 p.m. CARRIED.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-21

Moved by Councillor Brose

Seconded by Councillor Mayville

THAT the Corporate Services Department Report attached as Appendix D be approved. CARRIED.

New Business

Committee asked that a copy of the 2023 Budget Workshop Treasurers Report excel spreadsheet be distributed to County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. FA-C-23-02-22

Moved by Councillor Brose

Seconded by Councillor Giardini

THAT this meeting adjourn and the next regular meeting be held on Monday, March 20, 2023.

Time: 12:33 p.m. CARRIED.

COUNTY OF RENFREW**ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT REPORT**

TO: Finance and Administration Committee

FROM: Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk

DATE: February 16, 2023

SUBJECT: Department Report

INFORMATION**1. Weighted Vote System**

We have received some inquiries from members of County Council on the County's Weighted Vote system, so following the inquiries we completed a review of By-law 10-01 which contains a schedule for the weighted vote for each municipality. Attached as Appendix I is By-law 10-01, being a By-law to establish a Weighted Vote System for municipalities in the County of Renfrew. The weighted vote is based on one vote per 500 **electors** for each municipality. Also attached is a revised weighted vote sheet that shows the number of electors (residents and non-residents) for each municipality which is obtained from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) and the revised number of votes per municipality for a total of 221 votes. Previously we calculated a total of 208 votes used for two recorded votes in January but the correction to 221 weighted votes did not change the final outcome on those recorded votes. The weighted vote is obtained in a municipal election year.

RESOLUTIONS**2. Strategic Plan 2023 to 2026**

Recommendation: THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend that County Council receive the County's draft Strategic Plan for 2023-2026; and that staff bring back the full report to the Budget Workshop and to the March meeting of County Council.

Background

On January 16, 2023, County Council attended a Strategic Planning session lead by Mr. Erik Lockhart of Queen's Executive Decision Centre. County Council and staff developed a roadmap for this term of this council. At today's meeting, Mr. Kelley will present the 'draft' Strategic Plan which is attached as Appendix II.

COUNTY OF RENFREW

BY-LAW NUMBER 10-01

A BY-LAW TO ESTABLISH A WEIGHTED VOTE SYSTEM
FOR MUNICIPALITIES IN THE COUNTY OF RENFREW

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990, Section 26(1), as amended, allows the Council of a County, by by-law, to change the composition and size of the Council and the number of votes given to any member;

AND WHEREAS on March 31, 1999 the Council of the County of Renfrew adopted By-law 23-99, being a by-law to establish a weighted vote system for municipalities in the County of Renfrew, based on one vote per 500 electors for each municipality in the County of Renfrew;

AND WHEREAS Restructuring Orders effective January 1, 2001 for the Township of Madawaska Valley, the Township of Bonnechere Valley, and the Township of Whitewater Region contain clauses which restricts their County Council representatives to a number of votes at County Council which is less than provided for by County of Renfrew By-law 23-99;

AND WHEREAS the Municipal Restructuring Orders noted above supersede County of Renfrew By-law 23-99, however the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990, Section 25.2(13), as amended, allows a municipality to exercise its powers to amend – by by-law - Council composition and the number of votes given to Council members before or after an order of the Minister comes into force;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed desirable and expedient to enable County Council representatives from all local municipalities within the County of Renfrew to avail themselves of the number of votes at County Council provided by County of Renfrew By-law 23-99;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew enacts as follows:


1. That County Council adopt a weighted vote system for County Council based on one vote per 500 electors for each municipality at County Council.
2. That the municipalities within the County of Renfrew and the number of electors within each municipality shall be based on the most current list of municipalities and electors as provided by the Ontario Property Assessment Corporation (OPAC), which shall be the basis of the weighted vote.


3. That the number of votes for each municipality at County Council will be based on the criteria listed at Schedule "A" attached hereto.
4. That, notwithstanding clause 2, no individual municipality shall have greater than 24% of the total weighted vote.
5. That a review of the weighted voting process occur at least once every five years.
6. That this by-law come into force and take effect upon meeting the conditions prescribed under the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990, Section 26(3), as amended, as follows:
 - (a) A majority of all votes on County Council are cast in its favour;
 - (b) A majority of the Councils of all municipalities that form part of the County for municipal purposes have passed resolutions consenting to the by-law; and
 - (c) The total number of electors in the local municipalities that have passed resolutions referred to in clause (b) form a majority of all the electors in the County.
7. That County of Renfrew By-law Number 23-99 enacted on March 31, 1999 is hereby repealed.

READ a first time this 31st day of January, 2001.

READ a second time this 31st day of January, 2001.

READ a third time and finally passed this 31st day of January, 2001.


BARRY MORAN, WARDEN


NORM LEMKE, CLERK

SCHEDULE "A"

WEIGHTED VOTE SYSTEM FOR COUNTY COUNCIL

That the number of votes for each municipality at County Council will be based on the following criteria:

- (a) 1 - 500 municipal electors: one (1) vote;
- (b) 501 - 1000 municipal electors: two (2) votes;
- (c) 1001 - 1500 municipal electors: three (3) votes;
- (d) 1501 - 2000 municipal electors: four (4) votes;
- (e) 2001 - 2500 municipal electors: five (5) votes;
- (f) 2501 - 3000 municipal electors: six (6) votes;
- (g) 3001 - 3500 municipal electors: seven (7) votes;
- (h) 3501 - 4000 municipal electors: eight (8) votes;
- (i) 4001 - 4500 municipal electors: nine (9) votes;
- (j) 4501 - 5000 municipal electors: ten (10) votes;
- (k) 5001 - 5500 municipal electors: eleven (11) votes;
- (l) 5501 - 6000 municipal electors: twelve (12) votes;
- (m) 6001 - 6500 municipal electors: thirteen (13) votes;
- (n) 6501 - 7000 municipal electors: fourteen (14) votes;
- (o) 7001 - 7500 municipal electors: fifteen (15) votes;
- (p) 7501 - 8000 municipal electors: sixteen (16) votes;
- (q) 8001 - 8500 municipal electors: seventeen (17) votes;
- (r) 8501 - 9000 municipal electors: eighteen (18) votes;
- (s) 9001 - 9500 municipal electors: nineteen (19) votes;
- (t) 9501 - 10000 municipal electors: twenty (20) votes;
- (u) 10001 - 10500 municipal electors: twenty-one (21) votes;
- (v) 10501 - 11000 municipal electors: twenty-two (22) votes;
- (w) 11001 - 11500 municipal electors: twenty-three (23) votes;
- (x) 11501 - 12000 municipal electors: twenty-four (24) votes;
- (y) 12001 - 12500 municipal electors: twenty-five (25) votes;
- (z) 12501 - 13000 municipal electors: twenty-six (26) votes.

and so on upward, as applicable.

Municipality	Residents	Non-Residents	Total Electors	Previous Weighted Vote	Weighted Vote
McNab/Braeside	6,442	1,342	7,784	16	16
Arnprior	8,121	830	8,951	18	18
Greater Madawaska	2,397	5,243	7,640	15	16
Brudenell Lyndoch Raglan	1,373	1,812	3,185	6	7
Madawaska Valley	3,795	3,387	7,182	14	15
Killaloe Hagarty Richards	2,184	1,707	3,891	8	8
Bonnechere Valley	3,167	2,488	5,655	11	12
Admaston/Bromley	2,679	1,466	4,145	8	9
Horton	2,663	865	3,528	7	8
Renfrew	6,674	629	7,303	15	15
Whitewater Region	5,974	2,535	8,509	17	18
Laurentian Valley	7,936	1,225	9,161	18	19
North Algona Wilberforce	2,578	2,039	4,617	9	10
Petawawa	15,212	932	16,144	32	33
Laurentian Hills	2,372	727	3,099	6	7
Head, Clara, Maria	220	510	730	1	2
Deep River	3,427	236	3,663	7	8
Totals	77,214	27,973	105,187	208	221

Strategic Plan

2023-2026



**County of
Renfrew**
Ontario . Canada

Experience Our History, Share Our Future!

County of Renfrew
Strategic Plan 2023-2026
Produced February 2023.
Not for reproduction without permission.



Facilitated by: Erik Lockhart
President, Lockhart Facilitation and Associate Director
Queen's University Executive Decision Centre



TABLE OF Contents

Message from the Warden	2
Message from the CAO	3
County Council 2023	4
Mission	5
Objectives by end of 2026	7
Financial Sustainability	8
Workforce Development	9
Community Wellness & Health Care	10
Shared Services & Resources	11
Attainable Housing & Infrastructure	12
Environmental Resiliency	13


Messages

Message from the Warden

Message to come.

Peter Emon

Peter Emon
Warden
County of Renfrew



DRAFT

Message from the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)



In January 2023, County Council gathered to review the vision, agree on priorities, and identify key objectives for the next four years. Through a facilitated process, the group conducted an environmental scan by looking at trends, opportunities and threats. Based on this discussion, six priorities were agreed upon. Subsequently, the Senior Leadership Team met alongside departmental managers to define the steps and actions required to achieve these goals and objectives. This document serves as the roadmap for the strategic direction that Council and staff will follow for this term of County Council.

Building upon the successes of the previous strategic plans over the past two terms of Council, and as presented to County Council in the Fall of 2022, this plan is meant to represent a renewed focus on our Vision and Mission Statements. It clearly defines smart, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound goals as we emerge from a tremendously difficult and tumultuous three years living in and through a pandemic that changed the way we approach governmental actions, policies and procedures.

I believe that this Strategic Plan presents some new and unique opportunities for the County of Renfrew to be innovative leaders, encourage development of staff, work with our municipal partners, and present an action plan that our public stakeholders can follow and understand. Over the next four years we will continue to identify, through our business plans and reports, how our recommendations fit with the direction and priority setting of this Council. We will continue to refine and adjust the action plan as we achieve milestones and look to advance the goals beyond our initial expectations. We will deliver an annual report card and an end of term report on each of the six goals and seek further engagement from County Council to ensure that we are still meeting the intended results of this Strategic Plan.

Finally, I would like to thank all those who participated in the process of the development of this plan. I am extremely proud of the renewed commitment to shared goals and objectives and look forward to seeing the rollout and results.

Craig Kelley

Craig Kelley, CMO, Dipl.M.A., Dipl.M.M., Ec.D.
Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)/Clerk
County of Renfrew

Council

County Council 2023



Back Row (L-R): Councillor Glenn Doncaster, Town of Deep River; Deputy Clerk Rose Gruntz, Councillor James Brose, Township of North Algona Wilberforce; Laura LePine, Director of Community Services; Councillor Dan Lynch, Town of Arnprior; Lee Perkins, Director of Public Works & Engineering; Councillor Mark MacKenzie, Township of McNab/Braeside; Jason Davis, Director of Development & Property; Councillor Rob Weir, Township of Greater Madawaska; Michael Nolan, Director of Emergency Services; Councillor Neil Nicholson, Township of Whitewater Region; Councillor Mark Willmer, Township of Madawaska Valley; Jeff Foss, Director of Corporate Services/Treasurer; Councillor David Mayville, Township of Killaloe, Hagarty & Richards; Mike Blackmore, Director of Long-Term Care; Councillor Gary Serviss, Town of Petawawa

Front Row (L-R): Councillor Keith Watt, Township of Laurentian Valley; Councillor Anne Giardini, Town of Laurentian Hills; Councillor Debbi Grills, United Townships of Head, Clara & Maria; Councillor Michael Donohue, Township of Admaston/Bromley; Warden Peter Emon, Town of Renfrew; Councillor Jennifer Murphy, Township of Bonnechere Valley; Councillor Valerie Jahn, Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch & Raglan; Councillor Dave Bennett, Township of Horton; Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk.



Mission

To deliver high quality services to the residents of the County of Renfrew in an efficient and cost effective manner, focussed on the following six priorities in 2023-2026.

Vision (2023-2033)

The County of Renfrew is recognized as a model rural community balancing fiscal responsibility and the delivery of services and infrastructure that meet community needs. We have earned this reputation by:

Advocating with a strong voice to the Federal & Provincial Governments on shared investments;

Embracing technology that supports our residents and positions us as a leader in advancements in digital communications;


Managing our fiscal position through sustainable asset management and long term financial planning;

Identifying innovative solutions/approaches that allow the County to improve service delivery while meeting the service level expectations of our residents;

Progressing the County of Renfrew's pillars of economic development leading to improved quality of life;

Working effectively with local municipalities on common priorities and shared services.


Objectives and Goals



Objectives by end of 2026

Priority	
Financial Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and update Asset Management Plan (AMP) and Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) 3.0 version, using new assumptions and baselines 2. Develop a coordinated government relations / advocacy strategy
Workforce Development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lobby the Ontario College of Trades / Skill Trades Ontario to enable the transfer of qualified people from other regions into vacant positions 2. Collaboration with High School, Colleges and Universities to have students with skills that are required to fill vacancies and keep them in the Community. 3. Encourage continued support for business development through Starter Company, Summer Company, other entrepreneur programs
Community Wellness & Health Care	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable program and funding for Renfrew County Virtual Triage & Assessment Centre (RC VTAC), community paramedicine & mental health initiatives 2. Expand community based seniors health services 3. Ensure residents have access to primary care support
Shared Services & Resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the possible shared services with local municipalities and then complete an evaluation of the services that could benefit from a shared service agreement 2. Develop and deploy a plan that results in agreements that allow for sharing of resources and/or equipment and/or expertise that will lead to efficiencies
Attainable Housing & Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a true community housing strategy that would identify a future state 2. Engage a consulting firm to complete inventory of lands and services across the County 3. Develop a program to attract first time buyers 4. Support reliable connectivity (Broadband or fixed wireless) to 99% of our residents
Environmental resiliency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a climate action plan 2. Ensure joint emergency exercises across the County 3. Establish a County baseline and model template for local municipalities

GOAL #1



Financial Sustainability

OBJECTIVES

- Review and update Asset Management Plan (AMP) and Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) 3.0 version, using new assumptions, baselines
- Develop a coordinated government relations / advocacy strategy

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

- Demographic impact analysis of all COR services
- Hire grants person for increasing revenue streams
- Coordinate procurement (to consolidate all County-wide depts.)
- Integrate GIS with financial and public works data
- Hire a government relations firm to manage government relations
- Update LTFP and AMP to acknowledge new baselines; review and present on an annual basis to County Council through the budget process
- Continue to monitor and implement efficiency measures identified in the recommendations from 2020 service delivery review(s)

TIMING

- 2024
- 2024/2025
- 2024 - 2025
- 2023
- 2023 - 2024
- Annually
- 2023 - 2026

CHAMPIONS: Corporate Services, CAO/Clerk



GOAL #2

Workforce Development

OBJECTIVES

- Lobby the Ontario College of Trades / Skill Trades Ontario to enable the transfer of qualified people from other regions into vacant positions
- Collaboration with High School, Colleges and Universities to have students with skills that are required to fill vacancies and keep them in the Community
- Encourage continued support for business development through Starter Company, Summer Company, other entrepreneur programs

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES


TIMING

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Establish a County Wide Human Services strategy, including a newcomer plan, with local Chambers of Commerce | 2023 |
| • Internal HR strategy (to attract, retain people to work at the County), including execution of deliverables suggested from the 2022 staffing survey | 2023 - 2024 |
| • Align with Algonquin College and Labour Market Conditions study/ongoing efforts | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Continue promotion of Summer Company and Starter Company through Enterprise Renfrew County, Economic Development | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Lobby efforts at Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), Rural Ontario Municipalities of Ontario (ROMA), Ontario East Economic Development Commission (OEEDC), Eastern Ontario Leadership Council (EOLC) | 2023 - 2026 |

CHAMPIONS: Economic Development, Corporate Services/Human Resources



GOAL #3



Community Wellness and Healthcare

OBJECTIVES

- Sustainable program and funding for RC VTAC, community paramedicine & mental health
- Expand community based seniors health services
- Ensure residents have access to primary care support

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

TIMING

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Advocate for inter-governmental support (multi-government financial resources) for integrated approach to transitional housing | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Create partnerships, pool resources, build/repurpose transitional housing (create a Senior's Village prototype in Renfrew County); Continue to expand on the findings and action plan of the Seniors Housing Strategy (2020) | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Initiate/continue with advanced models of care (RC VTAC Medical Urgent Care Clinic Model) | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Community Needs analysis of demographics and wellness services | 2024 |

CHAMPIONS: Community Services, Emergency Services



GOAL #4

Shared Services and Resources

OBJECTIVES

- Define the possible shared services and then complete an evaluation of the services that could benefit from a shared service agreement
- Develop and deploy a plan that results in agreements that allow for sharing of resources and/or equipment and /or expertise that will lead to efficiencies

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

- Municipal Shared Services Forum: Establish an inventory of opportunities between the County of Renfrew and the local municipalities
- Update and implement recommendations from 2020 service delivery review(s)
- Review policies regarding uploading/downloading/sharing and update where necessary
- Negotiate and enter into service level agreements with local municipalities (and boards, etc., where applicable)

TIMING

2023

2023 - 2026


2023 - 2026

2023 - 2026

CHAMPIONS: Corporate Services, CAO/Clerk



GOAL #5



Attainable Housing and Infrastructure

OBJECTIVES

- Develop a true community housing strategy that would identify a future state of attainable housing
- Engage consulting firm to complete inventory of lands and services across the County
- Develop a program to attract first time buyers
- Reliable connectivity (Broadband or fixed wireless) to 99% of our residents

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

TIMING

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Enhance Community housing and homelessness strategy with defined number of housing goals, housing units, etc. | 2023 |
| • Strengthen broadband infrastructure saturation to support remote work option, working with partners at EORN, etc. | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Create an outward focused communications plan to support housing needs in Renfrew County that would include developers, non-profits, etc. | 2023 - 2026 |
| • Prioritize establishing a plan for underutilized municipal lands, including identification of upper and lower tier inventories (Housing Property Study, Bulding Condition Assessments) | 2023 - 2024 |
| • Lead role in the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus (EOWC) "7 in 7" plan for housing | 2023 - 2026 |

CHAMPIONS: Community Services, Development & Property, CAO/Clerk



GOAL #6

Environmental Resiliency

OBJECTIVES

- Implement a Climate Action Plan
- Ensure joint emergency exercises across the County
- Establish a County baseline and model template for local municipalities

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

- Establish a plan to position the County as a climate leader
- Complete flood-mapping GIS initiative with municipalities
- Advocate for federal/provincial grants to promote a greener building stock housing
- Reinvigorate active transportation plan through a review, and update where necessary, the trails strategy and active transportation plan
- Multi-municipality emergency management exercise

TIMING

- 2023 - 2024
- 2023 - 2024
- 2023 - 2026
- 2023 - 2024
- 2023 - 2026

CHAMPIONS: Public Works & Engineering, Development & Property, Emergency Services, CAO/Clerk





County of
Renfrew
Ontario . Canada

Experience Our History, Share Our Future!

9 International Drive, Pembroke, ON K8A 6W5
613.735.7288 | 800.273.0183 | info@countyofrenfrew.on.ca

   @CountyofRenfrew

COUNTY OF RENFREW**ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT REPORT ADDENDUM**

TO: Finance and Administration Committee
FROM: Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk
DATE: February 16, 2023
SUBJECT: Addendum to Administration Report

INFORMATION**3. Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario**

Attached as Appendix III is a Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission Report for the Province of Ontario, 2023.

In September 2022, the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission issued a similar report that changed the electoral district of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke removing the Township of Greater Madawaska from Renfrew County. County Council supported a resolution from the Township of Greater Madawaska opposing the proposal of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario.

Former Warden Debbie Robinson sent a letter to the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission outlining the County's concerns. The letter indicated that the removal of the Township of Greater Madawaska, in the southern region of our County, would mean that residents would have to travel well outside of their region to obtain services, meet with their Member of Parliament, and get access to the MPs staff. We also indicated that fractioning of the district would only serve to be detrimental to the effectiveness of coherent communication by our Federally elected leaders, and the service that they provide to all of the constituents.

On page 67 of the revised 2023 report, it indicates that the district of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke has been renamed to Algonquin-Renfrew-Pembroke recognizing the importance of the Algonquin people's history and presence in this region and the Township of Greater Madawaska has been returned back to the existing boundary.



Redistribution
Federal Electoral Districts

Redécoupage
Circonscriptions fédérales



Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of

Ontario

Published pursuant to the Electoral
Boundaries Readjustment Act

ISBN 978-0-660-47412-0

Cat. No.: SE3-123/10-1-2023E-PDF

© Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario, 2023

All rights reserved

Table of Contents

Overview	5
Acknowledgments	7
Part A – Background.....	8
The assignment of seats to Ontario.....	8
The population of Ontario and calculation of the Provincial Electoral Quota	8
The establishment of the Electoral Boundaries Commission	8
The legislative rules, the right to vote, and the right to effective representation	9
Part B – Consultation & Public Engagement	10
In-person meetings	11
Virtual meetings	12
Extensive public participation	12
Public submissions.....	13
(a) Issues that were beyond the mandate of the Commission	13
(b) Submissions that raised concerns that were not accurate or valid	17
(c) Submissions adopted by the Commission.....	22
Part C – Effective Representation of Indigenous Peoples.....	25
Part D – Effective Representation of Franco-Ontarians.....	27
Part E – The Geographic Pieces	31
Northern Ontario	32
City of Toronto.....	46
Eastern Ontario.....	62
Ottawa.....	69
Central East Ontario.....	76
Central Ontario.....	82
Eastern Greater Toronto Area (GTA)	89
Northern Greater Toronto Area (GTA).....	95
Mississauga	102
Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin	108

Halton, Guelph, and Wellington	114
Hamilton and Niagara.....	120
South Central Ontario.....	127
Southwestern Ontario.....	134
Southernmost Ontario	142
Summary	148
APPENDIX – Maps, Boundaries and Names of Electoral Districts	153
Province of Ontario	206
Southern Ontario (part A)	207
Southern Ontario (part B)	208
Southern Ontario (part C).....	209
City of Barrie	210
City of Belleville.....	211
County of Brant	212
Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo.....	213
Regional Municipality of Durham (part)	214
City of Greater Sudbury.....	215
City of Guelph	216
Regional Municipality of Halton	217
City of Hamilton.....	218
City of London.....	219
City of Ottawa.....	220
Regional Municipality of Peel (part)	221
Cities of St. Catharines and Thorold.....	222
City of Thunder Bay.....	223
City of Toronto.....	224
City of Windsor.....	225
Regional Municipality of York (part).....	226

Overview

This Report presents the final electoral districts drawn by the Federal Electoral Boundary Commission for the Province of Ontario. The Commission was tasked with drawing 122 electoral districts in the Province of Ontario.

The Commission was committed to achieving voter parity throughout the province as much as reasonably possible, as mandated by the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

Each electoral district shall, as close as reasonably possible, correspond to the Provincial Electoral Quota (“the Quota”). The Quota is the total population divided by the number of districts. For 2022, the Quota for Ontario is 116,590.

Historical patterns, communities of interest and identity, and manageable geographic size for districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions of the province were also considered.

The Commission is independent, impartial and non-partisan. There is no consideration of voting patterns or the partisan impacts of the redistribution plan.

The Commission had the responsibility of creating one additional electoral district, given that Ontario had been allocated 122 seats.

The Commission concluded that the effect of uneven population shifts across the province, with significant growth in some areas and only modest growth in others over the past decade, required adjustments to many existing district boundaries in order to address patterns of voter under-representation and over-representation.

In creating our proposal for a redistribution plan, the Commission endeavoured to limit the deviation from the Quota to no more than plus or minus 10 per cent.

The Commission achieved that result in all parts of the province other than Northern Ontario, where the proposed redistribution plan envisioned eight electoral districts with populations within minus 15 per cent of the Quota, and one riding where the Commission found that “extraordinary circumstances” warranted a considerably smaller population exceeding minus 25 per cent from the Quota.

It is important to note that the Commission’s endeavour, described in the proposal, was not a self-imposed limitation on deviation of Quota, but rather a benchmark or starting point from which subsequent adjustments would be necessary after public consultation.

As our proposal made clear, the Commission welcomed input and information from the public.

The Commission's efforts to promote equality of voting power was appreciated and positively commented on in a number of submissions.

The Commission was provided with considerable local knowledge during the public consultation process. As one township put it, their submission provided the context of the cultural impact of the proposed boundary adjustment on their community.

The time and effort committed by the public to this important democratic process was remarkable and very much valued by the Commission.

As a result of the extensive public submissions, the Commission modified our proposed redistribution plan.

Modifications were also made with the opportunity to consider the 2021 linguistic and demographic data made available by Statistics Canada after our proposal was completed.

These modifications have resulted in deviations from Quota beyond the range the Commission originally endeavoured to achieve. However, these results are necessary to better achieve effective representation. The Commission also adjusted the geographic size of electoral districts, particularly in Northern Ontario.

Nevertheless, the following deviations from Quota were achieved:

51% of our districts are within plus or minus 5%;

84% of our districts are within plus or minus 10%;

94% of our districts are within plus or minus 15%.

These results are consistent with the Commission's legislative mandate.

Considering that mandate, the Commission was unable to return the status quo to Northern Ontario and the City of Toronto and maintain the current number of districts in those areas.

The Commission also considered First Nations communities and the interests of Franco-Ontarians in drawing these boundaries. While our proposal endeavoured to create a remote northern district (Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk) that was to have a majority Indigenous population, we have withdrawn this concept based on many submissions attesting that the vast geographic size and diverse Indigenous composition of such a riding would undermine effective representation.

We have noted in this report that, in light of Canada's obligations to reconciliation, further action by Parliament is required to ensure effective representation of Indigenous Peoples – especially in the Far North.

Acknowledgments

The Commission is indebted to the commitment and dedication of Paula Puddy, the Secretary of the Commission, and Nicholas Hinsperger from Elections Canada, who is our statistician and geographer.

The Commission also acknowledges the contributions of Elections Canada. They were responsible for the creation and maintenance of our website, the social media interaction, the creation of the detailed maps and the preparation of the legal descriptions, the publication of our proposal and the notices of our public hearings, the technical and procedural aspects of our virtual hearings and the posting on our website of the written submissions received by the Commission.

Part A – Background

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* creates an independent non-partisan process for the review and, if necessary, revision of the federal electoral map following the most recent decennial Census.

The Commission noted that since the enactment of this legislation in 1964 there has been a sharp reduction in voter inequality within each province. Nevertheless, across the country as a whole, the formula for allocation of seats to each province has resulted in increasing disparities from voter equality.

The assignment of seats to Ontario

The Chief Electoral Officer calculates the number of seats assigned to each province in accordance with the representation formula in the *Constitution Act, 1867* (see [redistribution2022.ca](https://www.elections.ca/redistribution2022.ca)).

Pursuant to that formula, Ontario has been allocated 122 seats. There is one additional seat from the last redistribution plan prepared in 2012.

The population of Ontario and calculation of the Provincial Electoral Quota

On February 9, 2022, the Chief Statistician of Canada certified that the population of Ontario, as ascertained by the 2021 Census of Population, is 14,223,942.

The Quota, as previously described, is determined by dividing Ontario's total population by the total number of seats. For 2022, the Quota is therefore 116,590.

The establishment of the Electoral Boundaries Commission

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* provides that the Chair of the Commission for the province shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of that province and the other two members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Order in Council dated November 1, 2021, established the Ontario Commission. Madam Justice Lynne Leitch of the Superior Court of Justice serves as Chair. Dr. Karen Bird and Dr. Peter Loewen are the other members of the Commission. Dr. Bird and Dr. Loewen are Professors of Political Science at McMaster University and the University of Toronto, respectively.

Each Commission is assigned a geography specialist who assists the Commission in drawing proposed boundaries.

The legislative rules, the right to vote, and the right to effective representation

The Commission is to prepare a report setting out its recommended boundaries for each electoral district, a description for each district, and a name for each district.

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* provides that in preparing its report the Commission shall be governed by certain rules.

The population of each electoral district shall, as close as reasonably possible, correspond to the Quota.

In determining reasonable electoral district boundaries, the Commission shall consider the communities of interest or communities of identity in, and the historical pattern of, electoral districts, and a manageable geographic size for districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions of the province.

The right to vote is enshrined in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Section 3 states that “every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.”

The “Supreme Court of Canada in the leading case, *Reference Re Provincial Electoral Boundaries (Sask)*, [1991] 2 S.C.R. 158, concluded that “the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the *Charter* is not equality of voting power per se but the right to ‘effective representation’.” Effective representation entails voter parity as the primary concern, but deviations are permitted for reasons such as “geography, community history, community interests and minority representation” in order to “effectively represent the diversity of our social mosaic.” The Court noted that the right of a Commission to depart from voter parity is circumscribed by the reasons set forth in the Act “and only to the extent that the special circumstances properly permit.”

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* allows the Commission to depart from the application of the rule to achieve voter parity, as close as reasonably possible, where the Commission considers it necessary or desirable to depart therefrom in order to respect communities of interest or identity in or historical patterns of a district; or in order to maintain a manageable geographic size for districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions of the province.

However, as required by the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, absent “extraordinary circumstances,” the Commission must make every effort to ensure that the population of each electoral district in the province remains within 25 per cent more, or 25 per cent less, of the Quota.

We discuss in further detail in Part E how we have interpreted the “extraordinary circumstances” clause in relation to districts in Northern Ontario.

Part B – Consultation & Public Engagement

Before drafting the proposed redistribution plan, the Commission welcomed public input in February 2022.

Written submissions were received from interested parties, which were very helpful in the preparation of our proposal. The Commission delivered our proposed redistribution plan to Elections Canada in June 2022.

Elections Canada prepared the detailed maps and legal descriptions, translated the proposal and widely published the proposal in August 2022.

The Commission's proposal was posted on the Commission's website on August 19, 2022 ([redistribution2022.ca](https://www.elections.ca/redistribution2022.ca)). It was also published in the Canada Gazette and was circulated in print via multiple newspapers.

The Commission encouraged public input on the boundaries and/or names of proposed districts by written submissions or representation at virtual and in-person meetings.

In addition to the publications undertaken by Elections Canada, the Commission sent more than 200 letters and 500 emails directly to organizations in Ontario to advise them of the work of the Commission. These included media organizations (TV and radio stations, daily newspapers); current and former Members of Parliament and Members of the Legislative Assembly; Indigenous organizations and governments (including the band offices of all First Nations, and all Tribal Councils in Ontario); municipalities and related associations; the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and related businesses and labour councils; and the law faculties and political science or political studies departments at all universities within the province.

These communications advised that the Commission had prepared its proposal, which was a key starting point in the redistribution process. We invited all stakeholders and members of the public to participate in our hearings and/or to file written submissions.

In-person meetings

The Commission scheduled in-person hearings in areas where significant changes to districts were proposed. These were held at the following locations:

1. **Sioux Lookout (Northern Ontario)** – Monday, October 3, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., The Royal Canadian Legion, 86 Front Street, Sioux Lookout
2. **Kenora (Northern Ontario)** – Tuesday, October 4, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Douglas Family Art Centre – The Muse, 224 Main Street South, Kenora
3. **Timmins (Northern Ontario)** – Tuesday, October 11, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., The Senator Hotel, 14 Mountjoy Street South, Timmins
4. **Milton (Halton, Guelph, and Wellington)** – Wednesday, October 12, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., First Ontario Arts Centre, 1010 Main Street East, Milton
5. **Brampton (Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin)** – Thursday, October 13, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Peel Art Gallery, Museum & Archives, 9 Wellington Street East, Brampton
6. **Stouffville (Northern GTA)** – Monday, October 17, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., The Whitchurch-Stouffville Museum & Community Centre, 14732 Woodbine Avenue, Stouffville
7. **Scarborough (City of Toronto)** – Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Scarborough Civic Centre, 150 Borough Drive, Scarborough
8. **Toronto central (City of Toronto)** – Wednesday, October 19, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Toronto Reference Library, 789 Yonge Street, Toronto
9. **Ottawa** – Thursday, October 20, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Canadian Museum of Nature, 240 McLeod Street, Ottawa
10. **St. Catharines (Hamilton and Niagara)** – Friday, October 21, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Mackenzie Chown Complex, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St. Catharines
11. **London (Southwestern Ontario)** – Friday, October 28, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Ivey Spencer Leadership Centre, 551 Windermere Road, London
12. **Thunder Bay (Northern Ontario)** – Tuesday, November 8, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Valhalla Hotel & Conference Centre, 1 Valhalla Inn Road, Thunder Bay

Virtual meetings

The Commission noted the vastness of the province (the second largest geographically in Canada), the recent extensive use of remote hearings, the public's ability to utilize and access remote meeting technology in their homes or community facilities, the efficiency of remote hearings, and the potential for restrictions on in-person meetings in light of the pandemic.

As a result, the Commission also scheduled many opportunities for participation in a virtual hearing:

1. **Central Ontario; Northern GTA; Eastern GTA; and Central East Ontario** – Monday, September 26, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
2. **Hamilton and Niagara; South Central Ontario; Southwestern Ontario; and Southernmost Ontario** – Tuesday, September 27, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
3. **Halton, Guelph, and Wellington; Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin; and Mississauga** – Wednesday, September 28, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
4. **City of Toronto** – Thursday, September 29, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
5. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Friday, September 30, 2022, 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.
6. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
7. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Wednesday, October 19, 2022, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
8. **Northern Ontario; Eastern Ontario; and Ottawa** – Wednesday, October 26, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
9. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Saturday, October 29, 2022, 12:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.
10. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Tuesday, November 1, 2022, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
11. **Ontario Open Virtual Hearing** – Wednesday, November 2, 2022, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Extensive public participation

The Commission was very impressed with, and grateful for, the extensive public participation in this important democratic process. Evening in-person meetings and remote hearings proved to be very popular with the public.

The Commission's in-person and remote hearings were observed by 1,137 interested parties.

The Commission heard oral submissions from 462 persons and received 1,899 written submissions. The written submissions will be published on the Commission's website.

This number of written submissions is exclusive of multiple petitions signed by upwards of 6,000 people.

Not surprisingly, areas where the proposal envisioned more significant boundary changes (notably: Northern Ontario; the City of Toronto; Eastern Ontario; Halton, Guelph, and Wellington; Southwestern Ontario; Ottawa) generated the most submissions.

Public submissions

The Commission received specific, and often very valuable, input in relation to proposed boundaries, which is referenced below in the discussion relating to particular districts.

However, other submissions were of a more general nature.

(a) Issues that were beyond the mandate of the Commission

Some raised issues that were beyond the mandate of the Commission. These issues are important, and we have set them out below.

The difficulties in exercising the right to vote

There were numerous submissions expressing concern with the practical difficulties faced by many, including Indigenous peoples, students and Franco-Ontarians, in exercising their right to vote. There was confusion over where they could vote, and the need for French language services was highlighted.

The Commission notes these concerns with the recommendation that Elections Canada consider ways to resolve these difficulties.

It was suggested that Elections Canada, or another agency, develop and maintain ongoing relationships with First Nations communities so that such relationships are in place before elections are called to facilitate hiring and training of staff, the delivery of supplies and the procurement of appropriate polling stations. It was also suggested that internet and telephone voting be implemented, that a voter engagement campaign be developed and that the challenge of delivering election services in remote communities be addressed.

The timing of the redistribution and public consultations

The Commission received a number of submissions which included expressions of concern regarding the fact that municipal elections across the province occurred in October 2022, during the public consultation phase of the redistribution. Some municipalities suggested that this made it difficult for newly elected mayors and councillors to participate.

The Commission developed our proposed redistribution plan as quickly as possible to ensure that it was in the hands of Election Canada in June 2022 to allow time for the detailed maps and legal descriptions to be prepared prior to publication. The public consultation was scheduled as quickly as possible following publication in accordance with the requirements of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, which unfortunately coincided with municipal elections.

The Commission extended the time by which written submissions could be filed by 30 days to October 29, 2022 and provided a further extension in relation to hearings held after that date.

While there were assertions that the public consultation period was too brief and at an inopportune time, as noted, public participation was thorough and extensive and included submissions from many municipalities and their leaders, elected representatives, First Nations Chiefs, First Nation Councils, Tribal Councils, a Grand Council, the Metis Nation of Ontario, and various associations and organizations.

To enable a commission to offer a different or more expansive public consultation period, it would be necessary for Parliament to amend the timelines established in the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

The Commission shares the concerns expressed by First Nations and the Metis Nation in relation to appropriate consultation and ensuring their effective representation, as we will discuss more fully below.

The request to add more districts

The Commission was asked to add districts in certain areas and to not reduce the number of districts in Northern Ontario and the City of Toronto. There were queries as to why districts in various parts of Ontario could not, for example, approximate the population of districts in Atlantic Canada. There were many submissions reflecting articles in the media suggesting that growing disparity from representation by population across the country, and the relative underrepresentation of Ontario under the terms of the representation formula, should be addressed. Such requests are beyond the mandate of the Commission as it must fix the boundaries for the number of districts assigned to Ontario pursuant to the representation formula in the *Constitution Act, 1867*. This issue is one to be raised with, and addressed by, Parliament.

The request that the redistribution of Northern Ontario conform with the process and conclusions of the Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission

The Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission (FNEBC), established by the *Ontario Representation Act 2015*, was given a mandate to make recommendations to create at least one and no more than two additional electoral districts within the provincial electoral districts of Kenora—Rainy River and Timmins—James Bay, Ontario's two geographically largest and northernmost ridings, taking into account the following factors: communities of interest; representation of Indigenous people; municipal and other administrative boundaries; sparsity, density and the rate of population growth in the geographic areas; geographical features; the availability and accessibility of means of communication and transportation in the geographic areas; representations by members of the Legislative Assembly who represent constituencies in Northern Ontario, and other interested persons; and anything else that the Commission considered appropriate.

The FNEBC was given 90 days to conduct two rounds of public consultation, one before and one after the proposal. It used this time to carry out public hearings concerning exclusively the far North.

The FNEBC interpreted its mandate as permitting larger than normal deviations from voter parity; the Commission was more attentive to voter parity among Northern Ontario's geographically vast districts (rather than across all of Ontario) and concluded the more specific objective of Indigenous representation must be given greater weight in light of the need to remedy past injustices and provide a means for Indigenous communities to meaningfully participate in the governance of the province.

The FNEBC recommended that two additional districts be created, with the result that there are now four provincial electoral districts (PEDs) in this area of Ontario's far north:

- PED of Kenora—Rainy River – including Dryden, Fort Frances, Kenora and Rainy River;
- PED of Kiiwetinoong – including the northern portion of the former riding of Kenora—Rainy River;
- PED of Mushkegowuk—James Bay – including Weenusk (Peawanuck) First Nation, the James Bay coast, and the corridor along Highway 11 from Smooth Rock Falls to Hearst;
- PED of Timmins – including the City of Timmins.

The FNEBC highlighted that the PED of Kiiwetinoong would be a majority Indigenous district and that the PED of Mushkegowuk—James Bay would be a majority Francophone district.

Our Commission does not have the mandate provided to the FNEBC, and the FNEBC was not subject to the obligation to achieve voter parity throughout Ontario as much as reasonably possible.

It was recommended to our Commission that a committee be struck to investigate the possibility of entrenching into law a minimum of 10 federal representatives in Northern Ontario and/or providing for 12 federal representatives in line with the conclusions of the FNEBC established by the Province.

Further, we note that 49 of the municipalities in Northern Ontario that passed resolutions in relation to the proposed redistribution plan included in their resolutions a petition to the Federal Government to introduce legislation that would provide for a minimum number of “guaranteed” ridings for Northern Ontario, to ensure that the voices of Northern and rural communities are heard.

Our Commission recognizes and appreciates the value of these recommendations, and notes such considerations could also address the related issues of effective representation for Indigenous peoples and Francophone communities. However, these recommendations fall outside the mandate of our Commission and the timelines imposed by the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*. These issues are within the sole jurisdiction of Parliament.

The difficulties in accessing federal government services and the need for more resources for constituency work

A common concern expressed in hearings and written submissions was the impact of population levels, population characteristics, and geographic size on the ability of Members of Parliament to deliver “service representation” to their constituents. It was asserted that access to federal services has been diluted over the years and it is the elected representatives who are

the face of government, providing services and resolving problems in their constituency offices. In other words, the constituency office of an elected representative is where people receive access to government services. As observed by one Member of Parliament in the north, “our caseloads are high and we are the Immigration Services, the Passport Offices and the Service Canada of the North.”

It is also noteworthy that in Southern Ontario, the lack of public transportation services to constituency offices was frequently mentioned as a problem for exactly the same reason – people need assistance from constituency offices more and more.

Importantly, different and sometimes contradictory concerns were expressed. Members in geographically large constituencies often described the difficulty constituents face in gaining access to their Member because of distances. Members in geographically small but highly populated constituencies often suggested that the larger number of constituents stretched caseloads beyond capacity. Members in linguistically and culturally diverse constituencies submitted that service provision for such diverse communities was uniquely challenging. The common thread through all of these concerns is that service representation in the constituency is a primary occupation of Members and can be challenging.

These observations are important. They suggest that equitable public access to federal services is a significant problem. One way to address this would be to establish more constituency offices or hire more constituency staff. What are portrayed as problems of district boundaries could likely be addressed if Parliament were to approve substantially increased constituency office budgets in order to enhance public accessibility and help Members of Parliament manage their workload within the district, and thereby enhance the effective representation of constituents.

A related issue highlighted in submissions to the Commission, which also can be addressed by Parliament, is the funding allowance provided to Members of Parliament to support their travel and responsibility of serving constituents across the vast geographic area of the far North.

The implications on provincial and municipal representation

The Commission was mindful that the Province of Ontario has drawn its 111 southern electoral districts with names and boundaries that are identical to those of the federal districts that were in place in 2013, while creating 13 northern electoral districts that are distinct from the federal map for this region, according to the *Representation Act, 2015*. Further, the Commission is aware that in 2018 the Province revised the municipal ward boundaries of the City of Toronto to make them identical to those provincial electoral districts that are within the boundaries of the City, according to the *Better Local Government Act, 2018*. Understandably, this raised concerns about the wider implications of changes to the federal districts. In particular, there were concerns about whether the loss of one federal electoral district in the City of Toronto would be reproduced at the provincial and municipal ward levels.

However, the Commission was obliged to fulfill its mandate and was unable to maintain the existing number of electoral districts in Toronto, as will be explained more fully below. Moreover, we note that it is within the Province of Ontario’s power to draw its own boundaries for provincial and/or municipal elections.

(b) Submissions that raised concerns that were not accurate or valid

Other submissions raised concerns that were not accurate or valid, as we explain below.

The preference for the status quo

The Commission received many submissions requesting that the electoral districts be left the way they are. There were several aspects to these submissions.

Some individuals questioned the need to undertake the redistribution process at all. Some criticized the cost of the exercise. Some believed that, given the COVID pandemic, the process should be postponed until 2031. These submissions spoke neither to the obligations under the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, nor the wide population disparities in existing districts that, if unaddressed, would most certainly be exacerbated over time.

Some did not want any changes which would affect their current electoral district. Even in instances where a district exceeded the limit of deviation from Quota allowed by the legislation (+/-25%), the Commission heard arguments that the status quo was reasonable in order to respect the community of interest or the historical integrity of existing boundaries.

Some contended that any changes would confuse residents and erode voter turnout. The Commission notes that there is no conclusive empirical evidence that changes to electoral boundaries in Canada erode civic or political engagement, or undermine public confidence in elections.

Overall, we heard numerous accounts that our proposal went too far in making many changes where none were needed. It was suggested that the Commission should add a single riding where it was most needed but leave others well enough alone.

To address this specific point, we modeled a “status quo” map that adds one district to the most overpopulated area and leaves unchanged all districts beyond that geographic piece. For the sake of simplicity, our model adds the district to Halton, Guelph, and Wellington, calculates a new average population of 115,042 across each of the seven districts in that geographic piece, and leaves all 115 other districts unchanged.

To represent the implications visually, the table below covers the current 121 seats, the allocated 122 seats under the “status quo” model, and the 122 final districts. It shows the frequency distribution of variances based on 2012 and 2022 deviations.

Frequency distribution of existing electoral districts, “Status Quo” model, and Final Electoral Districts			
Size of deviation	Existing Districts (2012 Quota)	Status Quo Model (2022 Quota)	Final Electoral Districts (2022 Quota)
Greater than -25%	1	6	3
-25% to -15%	9	7	2
-15% to -10%	9	9	5
-10% to -2%	27	26	34
-2% to +2%	20	28	21
+2% to +10%	33	24	47
+10% to +15%	19	7	8
+15% to +25%	3	10	2
Greater than +25%	0	5	0
Total number of electoral districts	121	122	122

Comparing the three columns of the table, it is clear that simply adding one electoral district to a geographic area and leaving the rest of the map unaltered is not an adequate response to population changes across the province.

Beyond this modeling exercise, to say that district boundaries should be preserved at all costs would introduce a status quo bias that is beneficial, above all, to elected representatives. In performing our legislated mandate, we do not consider the interests of incumbents.

The Commission cannot fulfill its obligations under the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* by a commitment to the preservation of the status quo.

The Commission did however consider historical patterns, as required by the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*. In preparing its proposal, the Commission considered, and respected where possible, the historical pattern of electoral districts. We were persuaded by certain public submissions to alter boundary districts to further reflect historical patterns, as will be outlined below.

The questioning of the reliability of the Census data

As described, the Quota is calculated using data from the 2021 Census of Population in accordance with the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

In the course of its public hearings, the Commission heard many submissions and anecdotal claims about the reliability of the Census data especially as regards undercounting of vulnerable and marginalized populations, and the possibility that this problem was exacerbated during COVID.

Several submissions regarding Northern Ontario expressed concerns about whether Indigenous populations were adequately counted.

The Commission also heard submissions stating that recent immigrants, frontline workers and people living in rooming houses would not be at home or “unwilling to open their door” to Census takers. We were told that residents of collective dwellings (e.g., retirement homes, assisted living) were not counted or were undercounted. Comments were also made that data collection only in the English language compromised the reliability of the data.

Many of these submissions concerned Toronto’s population count, and there were several references to the City of Toronto’s backgrounder [2021 Census: Population and Dwelling Counts](#), which described a slower rate of growth than expected over the preceding decade, an actual decline in the City’s population between 2020 to 2021 due to losses in both Non-Permanent Residents and net inter- and intra-provincial migration rates, and a higher-than-expected number of dwellings deemed unoccupied in the Census count. Many of the submissions referencing this report claimed that the City’s population was undercounted by 50,000 or more individuals.

Outside of Toronto, one submission suggested that Census population counts in “cottage country” were exaggerated by the temporary presence of cottagers who had moved from the city during the pandemic.

While the Commission understands the public’s apprehensions about Census inaccuracies, it is important to clarify several points.

The Commission is mandated to use the 2021 Census data pursuant to s. 13(1) and (2) of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

The Commission noted that Statistics Canada undertakes a postcensal coverage study, with reporting anticipated two years after the enumeration date. In 2016, net undercoverage (that is, the difference between undercoverage and overcoverage) was estimated at 2.36% for Canada and 2.76% for Ontario. Further information on the coverage of the 2016 Census, including methods and results, is available here: [Coverage Technical Report, Census of Population, 2016 \(statcan.gc.ca\)](#). However, the Commission is bound by the provisions of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* that state that the population counts from the decennial Census must be used by the Commission, without allowing for a later adjustment.

Further, it is important to state that many of the claims and anecdotal observations submitted on this matter are based on misconceptions of how the Census is administered.

It should be noted that the Census was conducted in Canada’s official languages, as well as a number of other languages, including “immigrant and Indigenous languages.” The languages included:

Indigenous languages	Immigrant languages
Atikamekw	Chinese (simplified)
Northern Quebec Cree	Chinese (traditional)
Denesuline (Chipewyan)	Arabic
Oji-Cree	Punjabi
Tlicho	Spanish
Ojibway	Vietnamese
Inuktitut (Nunavik)	Persian
Plains Cree	Italian
Inuktitut (Nunavut)	Portuguese
Swampy Cree	Russian
Montagnais	Korean
Naskapi	Urdu
Mohawk	

It should also be noted that special protocols were adopted during COVID to ensure data quality. For example, the protocol with respect to enumerating populations living in collective dwellings (e.g., hospitals, senior and long-term care homes) relied on administrative data from such facilities rather than requiring residents to complete the forms themselves.

Details on the protocol for administering the Census, as well as steps taken to ensure data quality, are reported in Statistics Canada's [Guide to the Census of Population, 2021, Appendix 1.4 – Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic](#).

As explained in detail in the Guide:

“COVID-19 presented some challenges for conducting the 2021 Census of Population but despite these, the collection response rate for the country as a whole was a resounding success at 98.0%, thanks to Canadians who completed the Census in the midst of the third wave of the pandemic. Additionally, unique challenges were encountered in Northern or remote regions of the country, such as travel restrictions, border closures, shorter and shifted collection periods, unavailability of local staff, and wildfires. Ensuring the health and safety of Canadians and our employees by adapting our collection operations to ensure high quality, trusted Census data was a high priority for Statistics Canada.”

As noted, the Commission received numerous submissions alleging substantial undercounting in relation to ridings in the City of Toronto. Some of these submissions asserted that, if not for undercounting, Scarborough would have a sufficient population count to keep its current six districts (and Toronto maintain its 25). This assertion is problematic in that it takes no account of potential undercounting in other parts of the province. The same concern arises with regard to

the comparable argument that, but for flawed Census data, the population in Northern Ontario would justify 10 ridings.

The Commission also heard assertions that the Census data should be adjusted by taking into account factors such as approved housing and transportation projects, future immigration rates, and even measures of local economic productivity. With respect to the 2021 Census, the Commission was criticized for “looking in the rear-view mirror” rather than relying on data that looks to the future. Again, the Commission is bound by subsections 13(1) and (2) to use the decennial Census.

Nevertheless, we did compare the final redistribution plan against projected growth in population, based on applying the Ontario Ministry of Finance's [Ontario Population Projections](#) (published June 23, 2021). This helps, as much as possible, to assure that the populations of electoral districts across the province do not vary substantially over the period of time to the next Census.

Unnecessary concerns regarding the consequences of redistribution

The Commission heard from numerous individuals who objected to proposed changes that would, as they suggested, require them to cross electoral district boundaries to do their shopping, banking, go to school, visit their local community centre or gymnasium, or attend their place of worship. Some expressed worries that being transferred into another riding would result in them being sent to a different hospital or doctor for medical services. Some did not want to be separated from family members in another district. It is important to note that the boundaries of electoral districts can be crossed at any time and do not impair access to friends and family, schools, community and shopping centres, health and social services, police or emergency services, places of worship or other venues one wishes to attend.

The Commission also received submissions asserting that a change in a property's electoral district would alter the property's value and impact its municipal tax rate. Federal electoral boundaries are not used in the allocation of health and social services, police or emergency services, or in the setting of property tax rates.

Unnecessary concerns of funding reductions

Particularly within geographic pieces where the Commission proposed a reduction in the number of districts (Northern Ontario and the City of Toronto), but also in other parts of Ontario, there were concerns expressed that the loss of a district would result in local losses of federal funding under the New Horizons for Seniors Program and the Canada Summer Jobs wage subsidy program.

The amount of federal funding allocated for such programs is not based on the number of electoral districts in a region, but rather is a function of local population needs as derived from long-form Census data (e.g., number of unemployed youth). The local funding allocation will therefore not be impaired by redistribution, and no local organization that meets the eligibility criteria will be excluded from applying based on a reduction in districts. (See [Canada Summer Jobs wage subsidy](#) and [About the New Horizons for Seniors Program](#)).

(c) Submissions adopted by the Commission

Other submissions were adopted by the Commission and are reflected in this report.

The value of maintaining the established partnerships of municipalities, regions and counties

While the Commission is not mandated to draw district lines according to municipal, regional or county boundaries, we were urged repeatedly to “keep municipalities whole” wherever possible. We found many of these arguments highly compelling and supportive of effective representation.

Municipal leaders – especially those in smaller municipalities – expressed concerns where the proposed redistribution plan split their community across districts, creating the additional burden of having to liaise with multiple elected representatives. For their part, elected representatives described “synergies” and “alignments” with municipal leaders and other stakeholders as essential in advancing the needs of the district. One MP noted this is “where the rubber meets the road” in terms of his capacity to be an effective representative of his district in Ottawa.

Finally, from the perspective of residents of smaller communities, such communities tend to be fairly good proxies for groups of people who share a common interest and electoral boundaries should respect the boundaries of their communities.

Based on these submissions, the Commission found it important to consider and recognize the role of these local building blocks in effective representation. We are mindful that the alignment of federal boundaries with those of lower-level jurisdictions can help to facilitate more coordinated action among representatives at different levels in the advocacy, funding and delivery of complex services, and in major economic development initiatives.

We describe where we have modified our proposed redistribution plan accordingly in our discussion of our geographic pieces.

The importance of respecting communities of interest and identity

The overwhelming majority of submissions received by the Commission concerned communities of interest and communities of identity. These are important factors for the Commission to consider and weigh; however, the terms “community of interest” and “community of identity” are neither defined in statute nor case law. Nor is there any precise framework by which to assess the effectiveness of the act of representation as it relates to such communities.

While the Commission accepts the strong basis in principle for respecting communities of interest and identity, it is not self-evident in practice what constitutes a “bona fide” community of interest or community of identity.

In some cases, it seemed to be a highly subjective judgement. For example, at more than one hearing, the Commission was faced with stark differences of opinion presented by residents of the same neighbourhood with respect to the community of interest (and district) with which that neighbourhood was aligned.

Often, the invocation of communities of interest appeared to be a stand-in for a partisan or other status quo interest, rather than one rooted in deeper conceptions of community. Though shared political interests may well have their own community, the Commission did not take partisan or voting preferences into consideration in drawing its map.

Some constituents expressed a strong sense of identity with their existing district, and a bond of appreciation for the services provided by their local Member of Parliament. They indicated that they preferred not to be transferred into a neighbouring district where they were less familiar with the Member of Parliament and worried they may not enjoy the same level of service. However, it is worth noting that most of our existing districts, which would be unrecognizable 20 years ago, now appear to residents today as reasonably drawn.

A more important consideration is the distinction drawn between urban, suburban and rural communities of interest. The Commission heard that issues and perspectives varied significantly between large urban centres and smaller, remote, rural areas and accepted the assertion that these realities had to be considered in determining effective representation.

The 2021 demographic data was released after the publication of the Commission's proposal, and we had the benefit of that current data in considering communities of interest when preparing this report.

In addition to public input regarding communities of interest and identity, the Commission relied on Census data to assess patterns with respect to demographic and socio-economic indicators (e.g., official languages understood and first spoken, Indigenous, immigrant and visible minority populations as a percentage of residents, household income, percentage of households renting, etc.). While such analyses cannot always provide clarity as to how people perceive their interests and organize themselves collectively, it did help us in considering how groups may be clustered in such a way as to create natural communities of interest within electoral boundaries. Wherever possible, the Commission has endeavoured to protect such clusters, particularly in the case of more marginalized members of our community who may perceive their political power as being diminished with certain shifts to electoral boundaries.

Notwithstanding our reservations discussed above, the Commission interpreted communities of interest and identity as broadly as possible and modified the proposed redistribution plan to reflect these submissions in a number of districts, as set out in our discussion of each geographic piece.

However, the Commission notes that legislative clarity with respect to criteria to define communities of interest and identity would be helpful. This is a further issue for Parliament's consideration.

The importance of respecting historical patterns

The Commission took a broad view with respect to historical patterns of electoral districts. In drawing boundaries, we looked not only at their current configuration but were attentive to also understanding how the lines were drawn in prior readjustments, and how residents may have related to those changes.

The Commission also appreciated the attachment that residents expressed to certain district names that reflect both a sense of history and place.

It would be statutorily unacceptable *not* to take historical patterns (and communities of interest and identity) into account. To do so would mean drawing boundaries arbitrarily with population parity as the only criteria. However, the Commission determined that it would be an error to prioritize these factors above the more objective and neutral baseline of population equality.

Nevertheless, we have identified several contexts in which the importance attached to historical patterns (and to communities of interest or identity) seemed paramount, such that greater deviations from population parity should be accepted to achieve more effective representation. These circumstances are described in relation to the applicable geographic piece.

Part C – Effective Representation of Indigenous Peoples

In preparing our redistribution plan, the Commission considered the location of all First Nations reserves and communities and sought to ensure that no such community would be arbitrarily divided by an electoral district boundary.

If an electoral district included a First Nations reserve that had not participated in the Census, the Commission considered the population data available from the *Indian Registration System* as reported by *Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)* in proposing the boundary for that electoral district.

The Commission received expressions of appreciation for noting the distinctive challenges of effective representation in Northern Ontario.

However, as was fairly noted, “the perspectives and needs in the “Far North” and as Indigenous peoples are very different even from those of most of the residents of the other proposed Northern ridings.” It was also importantly noted that “while the number of people is an important factor in setting electoral boundaries, so is geography and the accessibility of that geography.”

The Commission received many valuable submissions with respect to the practical difficulties and inappropriateness of the proposed geographically large district of Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk and its division of Treaty 9, Treaty 3 and Treaty 5 First Nations. These submissions will be discussed more fully under the geographic piece for Northern Ontario.

We also heard strong messages about keeping Tribal Councils intact and keeping First Nations together with municipalities with which they have important relationships. In addition, we were informed of significant off-reserve Indigenous populations living in those northern towns and cities that act as “service hubs” for First Nations and as “home base” for many Indigenous agencies. We have endeavoured to respect these relationships and off-reserve populations in our report.

The Commission proposed the addition of several Indigenous names for proposed districts. The Commission received generally positive responses to that aspect of its proposal. Many appreciated this gesture towards recognizing the vital presence and history of Indigenous peoples in our province.

It was suggested that the Commission add additional Indigenous names. As a result, the Commission requested additional input from Tribal Councils and First Nations as well as Métis leadership organizations on this concept. Specifically, the Commission wrote to these organizations requesting feedback on the proposed Indigenous names, and suggestions for any names that might be appropriately added to other proposed federal ridings.

With the benefit of these submissions and consultations, our redistribution plan has been improved.

However, the Commission is of the view that more can, and should, be done to address effective representation of Indigenous peoples. For example, the Commission's mandate and the legislated timeline (unlike the mandate of Ontario's Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission) did not allow for direct discussions with First Nations prior to the development of the proposed redistribution plan.

The Commission received recommendations that in recognition of Treaties and the Crown's commitment to Nation-to-Nation relationships with First Nations, in-person consultations – particularly in remote fly-in communities – supported by appropriate interpretation and translation, be undertaken.

As was stated, Canada has unique and constitutionally protected obligations to First Nations, and a commitment to reconciliation with them. The Commission urges Parliament to consider how best to address these obligations in the context of electoral district boundaries.

Part D – Effective Representation of Franco-Ontarians

The Commission has taken every step to ensure that the presence and voice of Franco-Ontarians is not diluted by dividing them in such a way as to reduce their weight by riding.

In determining population counts during the preparation of our proposed redistribution plan, the Commission used data from the 2021 Census. The 2021 linguistic data had not been released by Statistics Canada and the Commission instead utilized the available data, namely, from the 2016 Census, in preparing our proposal.

In October 2022, after our proposal was published, the 2021 linguistic data was released by Statistics Canada. The Commission has utilized the more current data in preparing this report.

The Commission received very helpful submissions from the Assemblée de la francophonie de l'Ontario, and implemented their recommendations to the extent possible. One submission, dated September 25, 2022, contained two recommendations: that the Commission follow the provincial electoral map for Northern Ontario; and that the Commission publish data of the Francophone populations in the proposed electoral districts. The second submission, dated October 11, 2022 (marked as the final version), contained three recommendations. The first was identical to the first recommendation in the September 25 submission; the second recommended a better grouping of Francophone communities; and the third requested that the Commission's analysis use more inclusive datasets, such as those used to calculate the *Potential demand for federal communications and services in the minority official language* dataset.

Following these submissions, the Commission has based its analysis on more inclusive data. The tables below show both Mother Tongue and First Official Language Spoken for the ten districts with the largest Francophone population shares.

Existing Districts - Mother Tongue and First Official Language Estimates		
Existing Districts (10 Highest Percentage)	Mother Tongue French %	First Official Spoken Language French %
Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	54%	56%
Nickel Belt	35%	35%
Orléans	28%	31%
Ottawa—Vanier	24%	27%

Existing Districts - Mother Tongue and First Official Language Estimates

Existing Districts (10 Highest Percentage)	Mother Tongue French %	First Official Spoken Language French %
Timmins—James Bay	26%	26%
Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksasing	23%	23%
Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	17%	17%
Sudbury	17%	17%
Nipissing—Timiskaming	14%	13%
Ottawa South	11%	13%

Final Districts - Mother Tongue and First Official Language Estimates

Final Districts (10 Highest Percentage)	Mother Tongue French %	First Official Spoken Language French %
Prescott—Russell—Cumberland	56%	57%
Kapusksasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk	35%	35%
Manitoulin—Nickel Belt	31%	31%
Orléans	28%	31%
Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester	23%	27%
Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry	19%	19%
Sudbury	17%	17%
Nipissing—Timiskaming	14%	14%
Ottawa South	11%	13%
Ottawa Centre	9%	10%

The Commission has, as requested, considered the *Potential demand for federal communications and services in the minority official language* dataset. The Commission has applied this data to ensure that municipalities with demands for Francophone services of over 20% are placed in districts with substantial Francophone populations, implementing the third recommendation in the October 11, 2022 submission. This is discussed further in our section on Northern Ontario.

In their first recommendations, the Assemblée de la francophonie de l'Ontario requested that the Commission add two districts in Northern Ontario as was done by the provincial Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission (FNEBC), which resulted in the addition of a majority Francophone riding. This request was echoed by other Franco-Ontarians. However, as set out above, the Commission's mandate does not allow it to fulfill this request.

We note that the creation of additional districts in consideration of the constitutionally protected language rights of Franco-Ontarians is an issue to be addressed by Parliament.

We endorse the submissions of the Assemblée de la francophonie de l'Ontario that it is important that the Commission ensure “that Francophones are grouped together in common constituencies in order to maintain the representation of our linguistic minorities in Parliament.”

We note that the Assemblée de la francophonie de l'Ontario, in their September 25 submission, estimated that pursuant to our proposal “the French speaking population of Nickel Belt would be reduced by about 50%” and objected to the removal of some large Francophone communities from Nickel Belt into neighbouring districts. The Commission notes that this commentary was not included in the October 11 submission. The Commission further notes that our proposal would not have resulted in such significant reductions. Nevertheless, this submission in relation to Nickel Belt, repeated by others, was impactful.

The October 11 submission suggested that the Commission explore various changes to better regroup the Francophone population, especially as concerns the proposed district of Manitoulin—Nickel Belt. The Commission has done so and regrouped to the extent possible. As a result, in drawing the final map, the Commission has returned the largely Franco-Ontarian municipalities of West Nipissing, St.-Charles, French River, and Markstay-Warren to MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT (with a population that is 31% Francophone), rather than NIPISSING—TIMISKAMING (which is 14% Francophone).

Furthermore, the Commission ensured that the one federal riding where Francophones are in the majority, Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (renamed PRESCOTT—RUSSELL—CUMBERLAND), has been preserved.

First Official Language French Estimates		
First Official Language French (10 Districts with Highest Percentage)	Existing Districts	Final Districts
Over 50%	1	1
40% to 50%	0	0
30% to 40%	2	3
20% to 30%	3	1
10% to 20%	4	5

The Commission has endeavoured to maintain the level of the Francophone population in the ten federal electoral districts with the largest Franco-Ontarian populations, as shown in the tables above. This has been done by ensuring that the larger Francophone communities are grouped together in common constituencies.

The Commission recognized that a Francophone population is a community of interest and has not moved such a community from a majority Francophone district to a majority Anglophone district simply to balance population or to comply with a self-imposed limit of deviation from Quota.

The movement of a Francophone community in North Glengarry for other reasons is addressed in our discussion of the Eastern Ontario geographic piece.

Part E – The Geographic Pieces

The Commission is presenting our final report by referencing 15 geographic pieces. For each of these, we present visual illustrations of the existing, proposed and final electoral districts. We also provide a description of the most significant changes.

In addition, we have included three tables for each geographic piece, with the districts listed in alphabetical order.

The first table (A) lists the existing electoral districts as established pursuant to the 2012 redistribution process. The table shows their populations as determined by the 2011 Census, and their deviations from the provincial Quota established in 2012, followed by their populations in 2021 and the resulting deviations from the 2022 Quota. The bottom rows present summary data for those existing districts including, most notably, the average deviation from the Quota and the range in deviations from the Quota. The range indicates the total magnitude of deviation from the Quota between the least and most populous districts in a geographic piece. This first table thus reveals the variation from population equality within a geographic piece as well as the changes that have arisen since the last redistribution.

The second table (B) lists the proposed electoral districts as set out in our proposed redistribution plan, their 2021 populations and their deviations from the 2022 Quota. The bottom row presents summary data for the proposed districts, including the range in deviations from the 2022 Quota.

The third table (C) lists the districts established in our final redistribution plan, their 2021 populations and their deviations from the 2022 Quota. The bottom row presents summary data for the districts, including the range in deviations from the 2022 Quota.

Detailed maps of the final redistribution plan with legal descriptions can be reviewed online at redistribution2022.ca via the Map Viewer tool, which allows each user to enter a specific address and locate the applicable electoral district.


In this section, we first address the two geographical pieces where we concluded that it was necessary to reduce the number of districts: Northern Ontario and the City of Toronto. The discussion will then proceed with the rest of the geographic pieces, from east to west.

Northern Ontario

Northern Ontario - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.


Northern Ontario - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario



For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.



There was only modest population growth in Northern Ontario, compared to the rest of the province, over the past decade.

The population of Northern Ontario grew by 2.8% (from 831,984 in 2011 to 855,128 in 2021), while the remainder of Ontario grew by 11.2% in the same period.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the 10 existing electoral districts in Northern Ontario are shown in Table 1A. These districts have an average 2021 population of 85,513 — a figure that is 26.7% below the Quota of 116,590. While Kenora was deemed an “extraordinary circumstances” district in the 2013 Redistribution Order, there are presently five additional districts in this region with populations that fall more than 25 per cent below the 2022 Quota.

Table 1A – Northern Ontario Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	79,801	-24.87%	80,310	-31.12%
Kenora (Extraordinary Circumstance)	55,977	-47.30%	64,261	-44.88%
Nickel Belt	90,962	-14.36%	94,947	-18.56%
Nipissing—Timiskaming	90,996	-14.33%	89,781	-22.99%
Parry Sound—Muskoka	91,233	-14.10%	104,494	-10.37%
Sault Ste. Marie	82,052	-22.75%	79,331	-31.96%
Sudbury	92,048	-13.34%	95,537	-18.06%
Thunder Bay—Rainy River	82,984	-21.87%	82,357	-29.36%
Thunder Bay—Superior North	82,827	-22.02%	83,325	-28.53%
Timmins—James Bay	83,104	-21.76%	80,785	-30.71%
Average	83,198	-21.67%	85,513	-26.65%
Range (most populous to least populous)	36,071	33.96 pp	40,233	34.51 pp
Average – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	86,223	-18.82%	87,874	-24.63%
Range – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	12,247	11.53 pp	25,163	21.59 pp

pp = percentage points

The initial proposal for the North

Given these extreme disparities from population equality and the distinctive challenges of representation in the North, the Commission discussed at great length the meaning of ‘effective representation’ and the challenges of balancing the considerations set forth under the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*.

The Commission noted that in 2016 the province of Ontario established the Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission (FNEBC) to make recommendations regarding the creation of at least one, and no more than two, new provincial electoral districts from the geography of the current provincial electoral districts of Kenora—Rainy River and Timmins—James Bay.

As previously discussed, the Commission further noted the distinctions between its own mandate as set out in the rules prescribed by the federal *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* and the legislative mandate of the Ontario Far North Electoral Boundaries Commission. Our Commission is constrained by its mandate and by the smaller number of districts to be created.

The Census population data and the mandate respecting voter parity revealed the potential for a reduction of two electoral districts in Northern Ontario. Our Commission considered this possibility but decided to propose a reduction of one district, thus resulting in nine districts in total, including one “extraordinary circumstances” district. Our Commission acknowledged that most of the eight non-extraordinary districts in Northern Ontario have significant deviations from the Quota (see Table 1B). However, we concluded that any further reduction in the number of districts in the North would imperil the principle of effective representation in this part of the province, considering its widely dispersed population and communities of interest.

The proposed redistribution plan established one “extraordinary circumstances” district, Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk, which encompassed and reflected the exceptional nature of the far North – an isolated and geographically substantial area, in large part not accessible by road, in which the majority of the population is Indigenous.

The eight other proposed electoral districts in Northern Ontario were what we believed to be of manageable geographic size, and accessible via the well-established roadway network anchored by Highways 11 and 17. Their boundaries were redrawn to reduce the large deviations from the Quota.

As set out in the proposed redistribution plan, where a community of Francophones represented a substantial percentage of a riding, the Commission endeavoured in its proposal to ensure that their representation was not diluted or diminished.

In addition to the proposed riding name of Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk, other reconfigured districts were renamed to reflect the communities comprising them.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed redistribution plan are shown below in Table 1B.

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Cochrane—Timmins—Timiskaming	107,092	-8.15%
Kenora—Thunder Bay—Rainy River	101,097	-13.29%
Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk (Extraordinary Circumstance)	36,325	-68.84%
Manitoulin—Nickel Belt	99,268	-14.86%
Nipissing	99,149	-14.96%
Parry Sound—Muskoka	102,255	-12.30%
Sault Ste. Marie	97,299	-16.55%

Table 1B – Northern Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Sudbury	113,618	-2.55%
Thunder Bay—Superior North	99,035	-15.06%
Average	95,015	-18.51%
Range (most populous to least populous)	77,293	66.29 pp
Average – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	102,352	-12.22%
Range – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	16,319	14.00 pp

The public feedback in the North

This proposal for Northern Ontario generated considerable public interest, input and criticism. There were submissions related to several topics; however, there was an especially high volume of submissions urging the Commission to maintain 10 ridings in this region. This included resolutions from dozens of municipalities, political representatives, various organizations operating in the North, and the general public.

There were repeated assertions that districts in rural Newfoundland & Labrador, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan have smaller populations than Northern Ontario's districts and yet their districts have been maintained. The reason for this is that the quota in these provinces is significantly less than Ontario's Quota, as the table below indicates.

Provincial Quotas - 2022 Redistribution

Province	Population Quota
Alberta	115,206
British Columbia	116,300
Manitoba	95,868
New Brunswick	77,561
Newfoundland and Labrador	72,936
Nova Scotia	88,126
Ontario	116,590
Prince Edward Island	38,583
Quebec	110,413
Saskatchewan	80,893

If, as elected representatives asserted, Northern Ontario should be represented by more elected representatives, Ontario would have to be assigned more seats, a differential Quota would have to be applied to northern regions of the province, or “guaranteed” districts within specified geographies would have to be identified in legislation. All of these alternatives are in the hands of Parliament.

The Commission noted that these recommendations have been previously considered. For example, see the Chief Electoral Officer’s 2005 Report, [Enhancing the Values of Redistribution](#), tabled to the House of Commons.

The Commission also noted that some municipalities passed a resolution to petition the federal government to introduce legislation guaranteeing a minimum number of ridings for Northern Ontario.

During public consultations, the Commission was asked to explain its reasoning for not maintaining ten constituencies in the North, despite the option to do so. Some submissions noted the 2011-12 Commission’s assertion that 10 districts were required to deliver effective representation in Northern Ontario. While we address the challenge of maintaining effective representation in another section of this report, we do note here that circumstances are not perfectly similar between 2012 and 2022.

As previously described, the population growth between Northern Ontario and the remainder of Ontario is starkly different: 2.8% compared to 11.2%, respectively. This mismatch in population growth, and the addition of only one seat to all of Ontario, has led to all districts in Northern Ontario falling further below the Quota. Indeed, if 10 districts were maintained in Northern Ontario, the average district population would be just 85,513, or 73% of the Quota (whereas in 2012 it was 78% of the Quota).

Continued gaps in population growth between Northern Ontario and the rest of the province will only make this disparity more acute. The historical record bears this out. The 1987-88 Commission established 11 districts in Northern Ontario; however, the subsequent Commission in 2001-02 reduced this to 10. The ability of the 2011-12 Commission to maintain 10 seats was facilitated by legislation (*The Fair Representation Act, 2011*) which increased the number of districts in some provinces. That legislative change gave Ontario 15 additional seats, whereas Ontario has only been allocated one additional seat in the current redistribution. Halting the further decline of the number of seats in the North will likely require legislative action.

The Commission considered a variety of alternative maps for the North, and reviewed proposals that would maintain 10 seats in this region by deducting one from elsewhere in the province. (Interestingly, we received and reviewed corollary proposals with respect to the City of Toronto that aimed to preserve 25 seats there, while reducing one from elsewhere in the province). In the Commission’s view, this would not be consistent with the broader and principal goal of assuring population equality between constituencies, while ensuring effective representation.

Redrawing of Northern Ontario

Many submissions applauded our efforts to increase the representation and the voting power of northern First Nations. However, concerns were expressed because of the significant challenges of managing a district of the proposed size of Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk.

The proposed new district was described as daunting in size and breadth, imposing multiple logistical difficulties. Among them is the fact that the fly-in communities of such a vast riding would not be accessible from one central hub, as flights to the Northwest must go through Thunder Bay and Sioux Lookout, flights to the Northeast must go through Timmins, and Thunder Bay and Timmins are a day's drive apart with no direct flights connecting them. While it was generally seen as a positive development to create a district that was majority or substantially Indigenous to give a strong voice and focus to Indigenous perspectives, the Commission agrees the size and navigation challenges make this proposal unworkable.

In addition, it became clear that the proposed district of Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk inappropriately divided the Anishinaabe Nation in Treaty #3. The Commission had failed to observe the Tribal Council lines that separate the northern and southern halves of Treaty #3.

The submissions from Indigenous people were very valuable. As the Commission noted previously, establishing within the federal redistribution process an opportunity for formal consultations with Indigenous communities at multiple stages of the process would be desirable.

The Commission also received many valuable submissions from the Franco-Ontarian community. Some submissions expressed concerns that the removal of a district from Northern Ontario would jeopardize the long-term survival of the French language and minority official language rights in this region.

The problem of slow population growth in the North is one confronting Franco-Ontarians and other population groups in the region. As discussed, it is this overall pattern of slow growth relative to the rest of the province that necessitates removing one seat from this region. Our Commission has nevertheless drawn district boundaries in a way that does not fragment the Franco-Ontarian community or reduce Francophone density within constituencies.

In response to the public submissions, and in consideration of the issues discussed above, the Commission significantly redrew the northern part of the province with an east-west division that retains largely intact the two-district configuration in the far northwestern and northeastern segments (KENORA—KIIWETINOONG and KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK). This final redistribution plan creates districts of more manageable geographic size, an important factor under the legislation. It better respects transportation networks, especially flight networks to remote fly-in communities. It better aligns the communities within Tribal Councils. This plan also protects Franco-Ontarian communities of interest. And, as much as possible, it aligns the electoral boundaries with Northern Ontario district boundaries (which are important lower-level governance structures with respect to service provision in this region). Finally, while it was not possible in this plan to create a district with a majority Indigenous population, the two geographically large districts referenced above each have significant northern Indigenous populations, which helps to ensure that Indigenous interests are not diluted and creates the potential for the election of Indigenous candidates.

The “extraordinary circumstances” in the North

The Commission initially proposed just one “extraordinary circumstances” district, Kiiwetinoong—Mushkegowuk, a vast land mass with a population of just 36,325 (-68.8% below the provincial Quota). This proposal far exceeded population deviations previously established in Ontario (for example, the existing “exceptional circumstances” district of Kenora has a deviation of -44.9%). And it would possibly be the largest intraprovincial deviation across the country (the largest in the 2013 federal redistribution being the district of Labrador, with a deviation of -63.6%). For reasons discussed below, this proposal is not maintained in the final plan, and the Commission views having three “extraordinary circumstance” districts with more manageable geographic size and populations with less variance from the Quota to be an improvement.

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act* provides that we must follow these rules:

- The population of each electoral district “shall, as close as reasonably possible, correspond to the electoral quota for the province.”
- The Commission may deviate from adherence to the Quota, where necessary or desirable, “to respect the community of interest or community of identity in or the historical pattern of an electoral district;” or “to maintain a manageable geographical size for districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions” of a province.
- Where the Commission deviates from the Quota, for any of the reasons above, it must make every effort to ensure a variance of less than +/- 25% from the Quota.
- The Commission may deviate more than +/- 25% from the Quota where it finds extraordinary circumstances.

While the legislation permits deviations within +/- 25% from Quota, it is clear that representation by population is to be the primary consideration in the Commission’s work, with leeway for divergence based on communities of interest and identity as well as cultural and geographical factors. Deviations beyond +/- 25%, while also permitted, must be justified as extraordinary cases.

The Commission received suggestions pertaining especially, though not exclusively, to the North, that it should allow variances greater than +/- 25% from Quota in many districts. However, only in the three northwestern districts – KENORA—KIIWETINOONG (population 61,962), THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH (population 86,147), and THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER (population 82,357) – have we identified “extraordinary circumstances” to justify such deviations.

This merits examination of the features that make these districts extraordinary.

Our assessment relates first to geographic size. These are among the geographically largest districts in the province, covering respectively 258,813, 132,054 and 32,688 square kilometres (see Final Electoral Districts Table in the Summary).

While there are others of somewhat comparable size (KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK, MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT, and SAULT STE. MARIE—ALGOMA), additional features, together with their large land base, make these three districts extraordinary. In particular, their social and physical geography (along the Manitoba border, the international border, or the north shore of Lake Superior) constrain the directions in which the boundaries of these districts can be adjusted.

Another distinctive feature is the sparsity of population, distance from urban centres, and lack of navigable year-round road networks in these districts. Transportation challenges are particularly acute in KENORA—KIIWETINOONG and THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH, which each have many fly-in communities. While the northeastern district of KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK also includes fly-in communities, there is sufficient population in the municipalities along the Highway 11 corridor that this district can be drawn without exceeding -25% from the Quota.

Where our proposal did attempt, in the context of these constraints, to add population by shifting boundaries, we learned that such changes were effectively unworkable given the sizable Indigenous populations, climate and transportation challenges, service networks, and communities of interest that would be disrupted. In short, the Commission concluded that effective representation would be impaired without three “extraordinary circumstance” districts.

As a result, the Commission found that “extraordinary circumstances” existed in three districts justifying deviations from the Quota of -46.9%, -26.1%, and -29.4% in KENORA—KIIWETINOONG (the original “extraordinary circumstance” district), THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH, and THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER, respectively.

The final plan for the North

In Northwestern Ontario, the Commission has made several changes to the proposed districts.

The proposed district of Kenora—Rainy River—Thunder Bay drew substantial criticism for joining Kenora and Thunder Bay in a single district. Several submissions referenced a Northern Policy Institute study that showed Thunder Bay and Kenora to be separate economic spheres. It was also pointed out that the travel time would be substantial: a Member of Parliament would need to travel over 1,000 km to drive the Highway 11 and Highway 17 circuit from Thunder Bay to Rainy River, to Kenora, and back to Thunder Bay. Further, as previously noted, the Anishinaabe of Grand Treaty #3 sent an invaluable submission indicating that the proposed boundaries had ignored well established Tribal Council groupings.

The Commission found all of these arguments persuasive, and set out to establish three northwestern districts based on this feedback.

THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER has been returned to the boundaries of the existing district. Several municipal councils in the region adopted resolutions requesting this. In the City of Thunder Bay, the boundary was returned to Highway 11 and Harbour Expressway, respecting the old boundary of the amalgamated City of Fort William. The Municipality of Oliver Paipoonge (including the community of Kakabeka Falls) has been returned to the THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER district. This municipality was opposed to their municipality being split between two districts.

With KENORA—KIIWETINOONG, the Commission has largely restored the existing district of Kenora, a shift that respects the strong connection between the Municipalities of Kenora and Sioux Lookout and includes communities such as Dryden, Machin, Pickle Lake, Red Lake, Ear Falls, Sioux Narrows-Nestor Falls and Ignace, which are the nine municipalities working together as the Kenora District Municipal Association, which has a longstanding history of collaboration and advocacy in the region. This redrawing also respects the District Social Service Boards and the Northwestern Health Unit.

However, adjustments have been made in the area occupied by the First Nations aligning with the Matawa First Nations Management Tribal Council. These First Nations are now in THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH. This will be further discussed below.

The final district of THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH is similar to the existing district of the same name. As discussed above, adjustments have been made to restore the well-established boundary along Highway 11 and the Harbour Expressway.

The First Nations of the Matawa First Nations Management Tribal Council have also been moved into THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH. This allows the entire Tribal Council to be in the same district and has the added benefit of keeping these First Nations communities connected to established transportation networks, as flights to these communities depart from Thunder Bay. This is important as the members of these First Nations access many services within the District of Thunder Bay, and the Tribal Council office is located in the City of Thunder Bay.

THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER, THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH and KENORA—KIIWETINOONG respectively have deviations of -29.4%, -26.1% and -46.9%. As discussed above, there are “extraordinary circumstances” justifying these variances.

The Commission was satisfied that to maintain effective representation in THUNDER BAY—RAINY RIVER, the existing alignment had to be maintained and it was necessary and desirable to permit the “extraordinary circumstances” this drawing created.

Similarly, the large geographic size and the sparse population of THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH and KENORA—KIIWETINOONG was the basis for our conclusion that it was necessary and desirable in relation to these districts.

The Cree communities of the James Bay coast and Peawanuck have been reunited with Timmins in the district of KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK. The district’s western boundary has been drawn to include Winisk Indian Reserve No. 90, matching the provincial electoral boundaries. This allows the Weenusk First Nation in Peawanuck to be in the same districts as their reserve lands.

The Commission was advised that the James Bay Cree are connected to Timmins and Cochrane. It was noted that there is a vital link between the James Bay coastal communities and the City of Timmins for health care, transportation, education and economic development. The Mayor of Timmins reported that Timmins has established a Relationship Agreement with the Mushkegowuk Council. Flights to these northeastern communities depart from Timmins.

This district also includes the Matachewan First Nation, Brunswick House, Chapleau Ojibway, Chapleau Cree First Nation and the Township of Chapleau. These First Nations are all members of the Wabun Tribal Council and the Mushkegowuk Council, which are mostly based out of KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK. It was also noted that Timmins is the closest major centre to each of these communities.

The Highway 11 corridor between Hearst and Smooth Rock Falls has also been added to KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK. The Commission noted there was support for including Hearst in the same district as Timmins and Cochrane. The joining of these communities with the cities and communities of the existing district of Timmins—James Bay has made for a district with strong Franco-Ontarian influence: 35% of this district is Francophone, based on estimates using the 2021 Census data.

The cities of the “Tri-Towns” area have been moved into NIPISSING—TIMISKAMING. While the Commission did receive submissions indicating that these communities would prefer the status quo, the population numbers simply did not support this. The final redistribution plan reflects the submission that the whole of the Municipality of Temagami, Temiskaming Shores and North Bay should be within the same district. The southern portions of NIPISSING—TIMISKAMING have been returned to the existing boundaries.

The district of MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT has been substantially altered from the proposal, particularly based on feedback from the Franco-Ontarian community.

To identify boundaries that will protect effective representation for Franco-Ontarians, notwithstanding the reduction of one district in the North, the Commission has drawn on Census data on *First Official Language Spoken* as well as data on the *Potential demand for federal communications and services in the minority official language* to largely regroup the northern Franco-Ontarian community into two districts which now have substantial Franco-Ontarian populations, KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK (35% Francophone) and MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT (31% Francophone), plus two others that maintain strong Franco-Ontarian influence, SUDBURY (17% Francophone) and NIPISSING—TIMISKAMING (14% Francophone).

These four districts include all the municipalities in Northern Ontario that have a *Potential demand for federal communications and services in the minority official language* of over 20%, with the exception of Wawa, Dubreuilville, and Greenstone. These three communities are part of the districts that they are geographically connected to: SAULT STE. MARIE—ALGOMA for Wawa and Dubreuilville, and THUNDER BAY—SUPERIOR NORTH for Greenstone.

It was correctly pointed out that the proposed boundaries between Nickel Belt and Nipissing divided the Francophone communities existing in West Nipissing, Markstay-Warren, St.-Charles, French River, and the City of Sudbury.

These communities, which along with Killarney, work together under the umbrella of the Sudbury-East Municipal Association on projects and community issues, have been restored in the district of MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT. This has created a second district in Northern Ontario with a very strong Franco-Ontarian influence: 31% of this district is Francophone.

The community of Gogama and the Mattagami First Nation have been placed in MANITOULIN—NICKEL BELT. This decision was made in consideration of submissions from the Gogama Chamber of Commerce, residents, and the Member of Parliament, who all stressed the alignment of their community’s interests with Nickel Belt, rather than Timmins.

The Commission received support for the proposed boundary changes for the district of SUDBURY which brought the district closer to the footprint of the City of Greater Sudbury, providing for continuity of service and better reflected communities of interest. It was observed that the proposed district consolidates the urban portions of the City of Greater Sudbury. The Commission was also advised that the proposed boundary changes accurately accounted for the natural boundaries that make up Sudbury such as highways, roadways, rivers and lakes.

The only modifications to SUDBURY's proposed boundary is the inclusion of the community of Skead. This was in response to submissions made by individuals and elected municipal representatives that suggested that SUDBURY should contain all the neighbourhoods within the former City of Nickel Centre.

The district of SAULT STE. MARIE—ALGOMA has been largely drawn to match the City of Sault Ste. Marie and the upper-tier municipal District of Algoma. In light of this fact, the name has been changed to SAULT STE. MARIE—ALGOMA.

The boundary with KAPUSKASING—TIMMINS—MUSHKEGOWUK has been drawn around the Missanabie Cree First Nation's reserves, keeping these lands in the same district as their band office in Sault Ste. Marie.

The territories of the Sagamok Anishnawbek First Nation have also been included in SAULT STE. MARIE—ALGOMA, allowing them to be linked with most of the other First Nations within Mamaweswen, The North Shore Tribal Council.

PARRY SOUND—MUSKOKA has been mostly returned to its existing boundaries. The Township of Machar and the Village of South River had been moved to the district of Nipissing in the proposal. The Commission has moved these municipalities back into PARRY SOUND—MUSKOKA based on submissions received from the Village of South River and its residents.

One additional small change in the PARRY SOUND—MUSKOKA proposed boundary is being maintained. At the very southern tip of the district, a small change has been made to the existing boundaries to coincide with updated Census subdivision boundaries for the Township of Georgian Bay, affecting the area around Green Island and Canary Island.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Northern Ontario's final districts are shown in Table 1C.

Table 1C – Northern Ontario Final Electoral Districts


Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk	93,948	-19.42%
Kenora—Kiiwetinoong (Extraordinary Circumstance)	61,962	-46.85%
Manitoulin—Nickel Belt	99,827	-14.38%
Nipissing—Timiskaming	98,237	-15.74%
Parry Sound—Muskoka	104,504	-10.37%
Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma	113,772	-2.42%
Sudbury	114,384	-1.89%
Thunder Bay—Rainy River (Extraordinary Circumstance)	82,357	-29.36%
Thunder Bay—Superior North (Extraordinary Circumstance)	86,147	-26.11%
Average	95,015	-18.50%
Range (most populous to least populous)	52,422	44.96 pp
Average – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	104,112	-10.70%
Range – Excluding Extraordinary Circumstance	20,436	17.53 pp

pp = percentage points

City of Toronto

City of Toronto - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.
 Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario



0 2 4 km

For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

City of Toronto - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.
 Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




Table 2A – City of Toronto Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Beaches—East York	107,084	+0.82%	109,359	-6.20%
Davenport	102,360	-3.63%	105,946	-9.13%
Don Valley East	93,007	-12.43%	95,039	-18.48%
Don Valley North	103,073	-2.96%	113,663	-2.51%
Don Valley West	99,820	-6.02%	101,959	-12.55%
Eglinton—Lawrence	113,150	+6.53%	115,832	-0.65%
Etobicoke Centre	114,910	+8.19%	118,483	+1.62%
Etobicoke—Lakeshore	115,437	+8.68%	141,751	+21.58%
Etobicoke North	117,601	+10.72%	116,003	-0.50%
Humber River—Black Creek	108,198	+1.87%	111,593	-4.29%
Parkdale—High Park	105,103	-1.05%	106,750	-8.44%
Scarborough—Agincourt	104,499	-1.61%	104,423	-10.44%
Scarborough Centre	108,826	+2.46%	113,104	-2.99%
Scarborough—Guildwood	101,914	-4.05%	103,449	-11.27%
Scarborough North	101,080	-4.83%	94,717	-18.76%
Scarborough—Rouge Park	102,646	-3.36%	102,254	-12.30%
Scarborough Southwest	106,733	+0.49%	111,994	-3.94%
Spadina—Fort York	82,480	-22.35%	136,213	+16.83%
Toronto Centre	93,971	-11.53%	119,901	+2.84%
Toronto—Danforth	104,017	-2.07%	105,472	-9.54%
Toronto—St. Paul's	103,983	-2.10%	116,953	+0.31%
University—Rosedale	98,605	-7.16%	106,216	-8.90%
Willowdale	109,680	+3.26%	118,218	+1.40%
York Centre	100,277	-5.59%	108,307	-7.10%
York South—Weston	116,606	+9.78%	116,757	+0.14%
Average	104,602	-1.52%	111,774	-4.13%
Range (most populous to least populous)	35,121	33.07 pp	47,034	40.34 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission noted that this overrepresentation in Toronto has emerged due to uneven population growth between Toronto and surrounding areas, which is expected to continue or increase in the future.

The Commission heard several submissions opposing the reduction of the number of districts in Toronto. A large share of these submissions argued that unique features of Toronto — namely its highly diverse population, its economic centrality, and its rapid growth — necessitated maintaining the current number of constituencies. In the Commission’s view, these arguments apply with equal or greater weight to constituencies surrounding Toronto, which are on average faster-growing, similarly diverse, and economically dynamic.

As a result, the Commission concluded that the districts in Toronto be reduced by one.

This reduction, together with the obligation to address the wide population disparities of electoral districts within the City of Toronto, has required shifting many boundaries.

In the proposal, the most significant changes fell in the eastern portion of the City of Toronto, in the historical City of Scarborough. Here, deviations below the Quota were most pronounced. This area, historically described as lying to the east of Victoria Park Avenue, was reduced from six districts to five. This change affected the entire city as district boundaries were generally shifted eastward to generate greater population equality. Boundaries were also shifted to fix the excessively large deviations in Spadina—Fort York and Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

Several district names were changed to better describe their locations or reflect the neighbourhoods and communities that comprise these proposed reconfigured districts.

With 24 proposed districts, the average population in each proposed district was 116,432. The maximum deviation from the Quota was 6%. The populations and deviations from the Quota in the proposed redistribution plan are shown in Table 2B.

Table 2B – City of Toronto Proposed Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Bayview—Finch	110,908	-4.87%
Black Creek	117,740	+0.99%
Davenport	116,728	+0.12%
Don Valley East	115,456	-0.97%
Don Valley North	113,537	-2.62%
Don Valley West	114,229	-2.03%
Eglinton—Lawrence	116,139	-0.39%
Etobicoke Centre	120,157	+3.06%
Etobicoke Lakeshore	114,714	-1.61%
Etobicoke North	121,107	+3.87%

Table 2B – City of Toronto Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Humber	122,220	+4.83%
Scarborough Centre	115,260	-1.14%
Scarborough—Guildwood	118,754	+1.86%
Scarborough Northwest	109,568	-6.02%
Scarborough—Rouge Park	111,713	-4.18%
Scarborough Southwest	121,947	+4.59%
Spadina—Harbourfront	119,497	+2.49%
St. Clair—Mount Pleasant	119,935	+2.87%
Taiaiaiko'n—High Park	119,421	+2.43%
The Beaches—East York	111,805	-4.10%
Toronto Centre	121,703	+4.39%
Toronto—Danforth	112,119	-3.83%
University—Rosedale	117,119	+0.45%
York Centre	112,580	-3.44%
Average	116,432	-0.14%
Range (most populous to least populous)	12,652	10.85 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission's proposed redistribution plan for Toronto's districts was widely criticized by elected officials, civic organizations, and the general public.

Focusing on Scarborough, several submitters noted that Scarborough has a very high share of immigrants and visible minorities. This is a fact borne out in the recent 2021 Census data. As such, it was argued that it was especially inappropriate to eliminate a Scarborough district.

It was also pointed out that Scarborough has a unique identity. The old municipal boundary on Victoria Park Avenue is a very important landmark to the residents of Scarborough. It was argued that it was inappropriate to move areas of Scarborough into districts where the majority of the population is drawn from districts in the historical boundaries of North York.

It was further noted that many residents of Scarborough feel they have a history of being underrepresented by various levels of government. The Commission received many submissions about the forced municipal amalgamation in 1998 which Scarboroughians overwhelmingly voted against in a referendum; the lack of subway service; and the relatively poorer state of Scarborough's hospitals. In short, the Commission's redistribution plan was seen

as another act against a part of Toronto which feels it has suffered a long series of setbacks and disappointments from governments of all levels.

The Commission also received submissions criticizing its proposed plan in the remainder of Toronto. It was frequently commented that the boundary changes were unwarranted and excessive in parts of the City where the existing district's deviations were already close to the Quota. It was further pointed out that the proposed districts split up several long-established neighbourhoods.

Based on this criticism, the Commission has significantly reconfigured its plan for Toronto. Instead of eliminating a district in Scarborough, the commission is merging the existing district of Don Valley East into Don Valley North, Don Valley West (which is being renamed DON VALLEY SOUTH), and Scarborough Centre (renamed SCARBOROUGH CENTRE—DON VALLEY EAST). We note that Don Valley East was also substantially below the Quota.

There are two main advantages to this new approach.

First, it allows the Commission to maintain six districts that are mostly based in Scarborough. While the final districts of SCARBOROUGH CENTRE—DON VALLEY EAST and SCARBOROUGH—AGINCOURT both cross over Victoria Park Avenue, the majority of residents of these districts are still in the former City of Scarborough. In SCARBOROUGH CENTRE—DON VALLEY EAST, 61,400 of its residents live east of Victoria Park Avenue, making up 55% of the district. In SCARBOROUGH—AGINCOURT, 104,400 of the residents live east of Victoria Park Avenue, making up 84% of the district.

Secondly, the cascading effects of eliminating a district are constrained to the eastern portion of the City. In the proposal, a district in the far eastern edge of the City was eliminated, and the majority of Toronto's districts were shifted eastward in compensation. In the final boundaries, Don Valley East is being merged into neighbouring districts with large negative deviations from the Quota. This constrains the major changes to those districts in the eastern half of the City and allows the remainder of the City to remain very close to the existing boundaries. In fact, seven of Toronto's 24 final districts have been returned to their existing boundaries.

The other districts have received minor changes that do not substantially change their layout or overall configuration.

Many proposed names have also been changed back to their existing names, representing the fact that in our final redistribution plan, we have imposed only minor changes in these districts.

In developing the plan for the final boundaries, the Commission discussed at length the issue of Victoria Park Avenue and the former City of Scarborough. The idea of using Victoria Park Avenue from Toronto's northern boundary to Lake Ontario was considered. In this layout, Scarborough could receive either five or six districts. The Commission did not feel that either option was reasonable.

Scarborough's population is 629,941. In a five district Scarborough scenario, the average deviation from the Quota would be +8%. While this is within 10% from the Quota, this would have the unfair impact of eliminating a district exclusively in Scarborough. By moving the

boundaries of two Scarborough-based districts across Victoria Park Avenue, the loss of a district is shared between Scarborough and the rest of Toronto.

In a six Scarborough district scenario, the Scarborough districts would have an average deviation of -10% from the Quota. This would unfairly reduce representation in the remainder of Toronto. This would also have the unfavourable effect of forcing large scale changes to the remainder of Toronto's districts.

The Commission has thus concluded that it is necessary to cross Victoria Park Avenue.

In developing its final plan for Toronto as a whole, the Commission endeavours to use major geographical features such as railroads, rivers, ravines, and major roads.

The Commission received some submissions suggesting that ravines and rivers should not be used as boundaries in order to keep parks, ecological areas, and protected areas in the same district. However, the Commission noted that rivers and ravines are clearly discernible boundaries between neighbourhoods. The Humber River in particular has been a major boundary for Toronto's former municipalities, municipal wards, and electoral districts. Further, in terms of protecting ecologically fragile areas, it seems advantageous that residents of two districts would identify with such features, rather than just one.

The Commission relies on the City of Toronto's 158 official neighbourhoods and communities ([Neighbourhoods & Communities – City of Toronto](#)) in drawing the final boundaries (hereafter referred to as official neighbourhoods, and indicated in parentheses by their official number). We follow official neighbourhood boundaries, and keep neighbourhoods and communities whole, where possible.

The Commission has also maintained the existing district boundaries where possible.

In SCARBOROUGH—GUILDWOOD—ROUGE PARK, the final plan restores a district that resembles the existing district. Similar to the existing district, the final district spans over Highway 401 and covers the eastern extremity of the City of Toronto. Given that the existing district had a deviation of -12.3% and its two neighbouring districts had deviations of -18.8% and -11.3%, the existing district could not be restored exactly. Starting in the North, the western boundary has been drawn along Rouge River, the power line running north of the Morningside Heights neighbourhood, and down Morningside Avenue

South of Highway 401, the boundary follows Highland Creek to the GO Transit rail line. South of the GO Transit rail line, the boundary deviates from the official neighbourhood boundaries based on a joint written submission from the Guildwood Village Community Association and the Cliffcrest Scarborough Village Southwest Residents Association. This submission gave clearly laid-out details showing how the City's official neighbourhood, Census tracts, and proposed electoral districts do not properly account for the local street network and topography, which includes an escarpment that divides these communities in half. The final boundaries have been drawn to reflect the escarpment and local travel patterns explained by these two neighbourhood associations.

SCARBOROUGH SOUTHWEST's eastern boundaries have been drawn to reflect the above-referenced submission and also to keep Scarborough Village whole. The remainder of the district matches the existing and proposed boundaries.

Scarborough—Guildwood's eastern and western boundaries have both been shifted towards the west from the proposed and existing boundaries. These shifts were done to reflect population equality and to draw boundaries on clear, straight, easily-explained features. As the new boundaries no longer include the Guildwood Village, the district has been renamed SCARBOROUGH—WOBURN.

In SCARBOROUGH NORTH, the eastern boundary has been drawn as described above. The western boundary has been restored on Midland Avenue, matching its location in the existing boundaries. Several submitters urged the Commission to reconsider the proposed boundary on McCowan Road. Submissions to this effect were received from many individuals, community groups, and elected representatives.

In SCARBOROUGH—AGINCOURT, the eastern boundary was restored to the existing district boundary on Midland Avenue, as described above. The western boundary was moved to Highway 404. While the Commission acknowledges that many submitters would prefer the boundary on Victoria Park Avenue, the infeasibility of this has been discussed above. The Commission has chosen Highway 404 because it is a clear, discernible boundary. As previously noted, this extends the district into North York. However, this district remains primarily based in Scarborough as 84% of the residents live east of Victoria Park Avenue.

The name of this district has been returned to the existing name of SCARBOROUGH—AGINCOURT. Many submissions discussed the important identity and long history of Agincourt, going back to its founding in 1858. The Commission appreciates the importance of this historic identity and agrees that Agincourt should remain as an electoral district and also as a name.

SCARBOROUGH CENTRE—DON VALLEY EAST's boundaries also extend over Victoria Park Avenue to include parts of North York. With 55% of this district still residing in the former City of Scarborough, this makes for a Scarborough-majority district.

The Commission had initially deliberated on drawing the western boundary on the Don Valley Parkway (similar to SCARBOROUGH—AGINCOURT). However, the boundary has been drawn on the East Don River. Based on public submissions from the residents of Wynford Drive and comments from elected officials, it was recognized that the official neighbourhood of Flemingdon Park (44) is better placed in DON VALLEY SOUTH. Using the East Don River as a boundary also keeps the official neighbourhoods of Victoria Village (43), Parkwoods-O'Connor Hills (149), and Fenside-Parkwoods (150) whole.

The proposed southern boundary for Scarborough Centre and The Beaches—East York was drawn on Eglinton Avenue. However, the Commission was encouraged to return the boundary to Sunrise Avenue, as in the existing districts. This was based on concerns surrounding development (spurred by the new LRT line) on both sides of Eglinton Avenue. In the final plan, the Commission has chosen to return the southern boundary to Sunrise Avenue.

The districts of BEACHES—EAST YORK and TORONTO—DANFORTH have been returned to their existing boundaries, with one small exception. In the southwestern corner of TORONTO—DANFORTH, the boundary has been shifted to the Gardiner Expressway to simplify the boundary.

The proposal had shifted the boundary between these two districts to Glebe Avenue and Hillingdon Avenue. Submissions were mixed on this idea. The Commission ultimately decided that keeping the boundary on Coxwell Avenue is the preferred option as this matches the historical configuration and also represents a simple, easily-explained boundary.

The proposed district of The Beaches—East York was extended to Eglinton Avenue and also included the eastern portions of the official neighbourhood of Flemingdon Park (44). As discussed above, the final boundaries of BEACHES—EAST YORK have been returned to match the existing boundary.

In the proposal, the Commission had also changed the name of the existing district to *The Beaches—East York*. This was done on the recommendation of the Geographical Names Board of Canada, which has the official name listed as “The Beaches.” The Commission has heard from several people associated with all the main political parties that district name changes force a burdensome administrative hassle on the party’s infrastructure, staff, and volunteers. The Commission recognizes this and has restored the existing name of BEACHES—EAST YORK (as we have done in other districts).

DON VALLEY NORTH’s boundary has been considerably redrawn compared to both the existing and proposed districts. As previously described, the eastern boundary was shifted from Victoria Park Avenue to Highway 404. The majority of the western boundary has been returned to the existing boundary of Bayview Avenue. The major change to this district is the expansion to include the official neighbourhood of St. Andrew-Windfields (40). This change was made as a result of the merger of Don Valley East into its neighbouring districts.

The Commission recognizes that it is preferable to keep the district entirely north of Highway 401. The Commission also acknowledges that this is a significant change from the proposed or existing boundaries and that the public has no opportunity to submit feedback on this change. However, the Commission sees no other option. In adding this area to DON VALLEY NORTH, the Commission has respected the official neighbourhoods. The entirety of St. Andrew-Windfields (40), including the segment north of Old York Mills Road, has been incorporated into DON VALLEY NORTH.

DON VALLEY SOUTH has also seen considerable changes since the proposal. This is in account of the merger of Don Valley East into neighbouring districts. The Commission was also notified by the submissions that it made several errors in this part of Toronto.

As part of the merger of Don Valley East into neighbouring districts, DON VALLEY SOUTH’s eastern boundary has been placed on the East Don River. This allows the official neighbourhoods of Flemingdon Park (44) and Banbury-Don Mills (42) to remain whole.

The northern boundary has been moved from Highway 401 to York Mills Road and Old York Mills Road. The Commission recognizes that Highway 401 is a preferable boundary. However, it is impossible to keep the boundary on Highway 401 while respecting the principle of population

equality and limiting changes to neighbouring districts. The Commission is comfortable with the boundary on York Mills Road and Old York Mills Road as this is a major artery and also matches the official neighbourhood boundaries.

The Commission's proposed boundary through the community of Leaside was heavily criticized. Leaside had been split between the proposed districts of Don Valley West and St. Clair—Mount Pleasant. The Commission received dozens of submissions from members of the public urging the Commission to make Leaside whole. The Commission found these arguments persuasive. Leaside has been reunited in its entirety in the district of DON VALLEY SOUTH.

The western border matches the existing district of Don Valley West's boundary with one major modification. South of Eglinton Avenue, the final boundary will follow Bayview Avenue instead of Mount Pleasant Road. This respects a well-researched submission from the South Eglinton Davisville Residents' Association requesting that the community of Davisville remain whole.

In the extreme south of DON VALLEY SOUTH, the boundary has been extended to the Bayview-Bloor interchange. This incorporates the southern portion of the official neighbourhood of Leaside-Bennington (56) which was previously in University—Rosedale.

UNIVERSITY—ROSEDALE has received considerable changes since the proposal and the existing boundaries. The southern boundary has been moved from Dundas Street to Queen Street. Submissions informed the Commission that Queen Street was preferable to Dundas Street for two reasons. First, Queen Street is the dividing line between high-density condo towers and lower- to medium-density residential units. Second, and more importantly, Dundas Street runs through the centre of downtown Chinatown. Placing the boundary on Queen Street allows Chinatown to remain whole.

The eastern boundary of UNIVERSITY—ROSEDALE will remain on Yonge Street, as it was in the proposal. The Commission feels that this is an improvement over the existing boundary as it follows a simple, straight line that matches the official neighbourhood boundaries. This also places the Chinese community in between Bay Street and Yonge Street, which was previously in Toronto Centre, into UNIVERSITY—ROSEDALE along with the rest of Chinatown.

In the areas around Deer Park and Moore Park, the Commission has made some changes from the proposal. The Commission received submissions about splitting both of these communities. In order to make these communities whole, achieve population parity, and make clear, easily understood boundaries, it was decided to draw the northern boundary along the CP rail line.

The Commission's final boundaries for TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S resemble those of the existing district, with some changes. The boundaries for this district had been considerably altered in the proposal, and it had also been renamed to St. Clair—Mount Pleasant. Both the proposed boundaries and proposed name were ill-received by the public.

In the final plan, the name TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S matches that of the existing district. The Commission was informed in several submissions (from the MP, the residents of Christie Gardens Retirement Residence, and others) that there is a strong identity going back several decades around this name.

However, several changes to the district's borders have been made as a result of changes to neighbouring districts and the goal of achieving population parity. While the Commission has not followed the exact letter of the many submissions requesting a return to the status quo, we have attempted to comply with the spirit of these submissions in respecting the history, community, and identity of this district.

The Commission received two submissions from neighbourhood associations concerning this district. The first submission was from the South Eglinton Davisville Residents' Association. This association supported the proposed boundaries as it keeps the Davisville neighbourhood whole. A few submissions from individuals in the neighbourhood echoed this sentiment. This neighbourhood was wholly in TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S after the 2003 redistribution, but was split up after the 2013 redistribution. The Commission has placed TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S eastern boundary on Bayview Avenue, keeping all of Davisville in TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S.

The Commission also received several submissions concerning Deer Park, including from the Deer Park Residents Group. The proposed boundaries for St. Clair—Mount Pleasant had split Deer Park in half. The Commission agrees that Deer Park should be kept whole and has thus moved the southern boundary for TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S to the CP railway track.

The CP railway track forms the entirety of TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S southern boundary. As previously discussed, this means that Moore Park is being moved into TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S.

The small area in between Broadway Avenue and Eglinton Avenue and in between Yonge Street and Mount Pleasant Road was moved to Don Valley West in the proposal. However, due to other changes to the neighbouring districts, the Commission has had to put this area back into TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S. The Commission notes that placing this in DON VALLEY SOUTH would better reflect the official neighbourhood boundaries and make for a cleaner, straight boundary. However, this boundary has been returned to its existing configuration based on the need to maintain population equality.

For the western boundary of TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S, the boundary has been shifted back to the existing district boundary on Ossington Avenue and Winona Drive. The section north of Holland Park Avenue and Rogers Road was moved to Vaughan Road. The reason for using a slightly modified version of the existing boundary was to respect population equality. With the changes to the neighbouring districts, the proposed boundary was no longer feasible. The western boundary takes a diagonal on Vaughan Road in order to protect the integrity of Little Jamaica along Eglinton Avenue from Marlee Avenue to Dufferin Street.

EGLINTON—LAWRENCE has been returned to its existing boundaries. Several submitters had requested that the Commission do this. The Commission felt that this was a reasonable request, given that the existing district had a deviation of only -0.7% from the Quota.

The final plan for TORONTO CENTRE matches the proposed district. This represents minor changes to the existing districts. The western and northern boundary has been moved to Yonge Street and Bloor Street. This simplifies the boundaries by placing them on major streets, and matches the official neighbourhood boundaries. In the south, the boundary has been shifted to the Gardiner Expressway. This was positively received by submitters, who appreciated that the St. Lawrence Market neighbourhood and the Distillery District were made whole. The Gardiner Expressway also makes for a clear boundary.

Spadina—Fort York grew by 53,733 people between the 2011 and 2021 Census, giving it a deviation from the Quota of +16.8%. This is the second largest population growth in Ontario. This necessitated large changes from the existing boundaries. The northern boundary has been shifted from Dundas Street to Queen Street. This allows downtown Chinatown to remain whole in UNIVERSITY—ROSEDALE.

In the proposal, Liberty Village was moved from Spadina—Fort York to Taiaiko'n—High Park. Submissions were evenly split on this issue. In the end, the Commission decided to move this boundary to match the official neighbourhood on Atlantic Avenue. The Commission has also opted to retain the proposed name of SPADINA—HARBOURFRONT for this district.

DAVENPORT has received minor changes since the proposal. The portions of the existing district south of Queen Street have been returned to DAVENPORT. This keeps the official neighbourhood of Little Portugal (84) whole. The eastern boundary with TORONTO—ST. PAUL'S has been moved to the existing boundary, with a slight modification north of Rogers Road and Holland Park Avenue. This boundary has been moved to Vaughan Road in the interests of promoting population equality.

In the proposal, Parkdale—High Park's name was changed to Taiaiko'n—High Park. This was done in a spirit of reconciliation in recognition of the Haudenosaunee village and burial mounds on the site of High Park. While commenters generally appreciated and approved of using an Indigenous name, several people felt that removing "Parkdale" from the name was inappropriate. The Commission was told that Parkdale had a strong identity and history. As was suggested by many submitters, the Commission has decided to change the name to TAIIAKO'N—PARKDALE—HIGH PARK.

As for TAIIAKO'N—PARKDALE—HIGH PARK's boundaries, the Commission received mixed feedback on the proposed boundary changes in both the southeast and in the north.

In the southeast, submissions were mixed on the appropriateness of moving Liberty Village into the proposed district of Taiaiko'n—High Park. The Commission has decided to place the boundary on Atlantic Avenue, representing a compromise between the existing boundary and the proposed boundary. Atlantic Avenue also has the benefit of matching the official neighbourhood boundaries. It also keeps Little Tibet whole inside TAIIAKO'N—PARKDALE—HIGH PARK.

The proposed district of Taiaiko'n—High Park's northern boundary was also unpopular. The Commission was told that St. Clair Avenue was a poor choice. Some submitters suggested that the boundary be returned to the railway tracks, where the existing boundary was placed. The Commission ultimately decided to use the high-tension powerline along Lavender Creek, as was argued by other submitters, allowing the Tibetan community to remain whole.

The proposed elimination of York South—Weston and the creation of Humber proved to be unpopular. The proposed district of Humber crossed the Humber River and incorporated portions of the existing districts of Etobicoke Centre and York South—Weston. Some submitters from the Etobicoke side supported this new district. It was seen as adding representation to Etobicoke, as Etobicoke was receiving an extra half seat. It was also pointed out that historically districts have crossed the Humber River.

However, submitters from the existing district of York South—Weston were highly critical of this decision. It was pointed out that the Humber River is a major boundary with very different communities on both sides of it. The western side of the river (the portions in the former City of Etobicoke) is much more affluent, while the portions on the eastern side of the Humber River have a much higher share of visible minorities, immigrants, renters, and lower average income.

Given that the final plan for the City of Toronto allows the Commission to keep many of the existing districts, a district largely resembling the existing district of York South—Weston has been restored. This district will be named YORK SOUTH—WESTON—ETOBICOKE as a portion of the boundary still crosses the Humber River. The Commission has chosen to keep the official neighbourhood of Humber Heights-Westmount (8) in this district in the interests of population equality.

The existing district of Etobicoke—Lakeshore has a deviation from the Quota of +21.6%, necessitating changes in the area. In the proposal, the Commission opted to draw the boundary on Dundas Street and Bloor Street. While the boundary on Dundas Street was well-received, the boundary on Bloor Street was not. Submitters urged the Commission to keep the boundary on Dundas Street through the entirety of the district.

There were three concerns with the boundary on Bloor Street. First, the Kingsway Business Improvement Area is centred on Bloor Street. The Commission was encouraged not to split the Kingsway Business Improvement Area in half. The Commission was also informed that the official neighbourhood of Kingsway South (15) (between Dundas Street and Bloor Street) would be better suited in ETOBICOKE—LAKESHORE. Finally, the neighbourhood of high-rise condo towers around Mabelle Avenue would also be better suited in ETOBICOKE—LAKESHORE.

The Commission is unable to put both the Mabelle Avenue neighbourhoods and the Kingsway area into ETOBICOKE—LAKESHORE, as this would give the district an unreasonably high deviation from the Quota. The Commission has returned the official neighbourhood of Kingsway South (15) to ETOBICOKE—LAKESHORE. However, west of Mimico Creek, the Commission has opted to use the CP rail line as the boundary, leaving the Mabelle Avenue neighbourhoods and the other high-rise developments along Dundas Street in ETOBICOKE CENTRE.

In the proposal, the Commission had opted to drop the *em dash* (“—”) from the name of Etobicoke Lakeshore. This was done because the *em dash* generally denotes when multiple cities, neighbourhoods, and locations are appended to district names. The *em dash* is generally not used when a name gives directional context. However, based on the feedback from political parties, the Commission recognizes that name changes can impose a burdensome task on political parties' infrastructure, staff, and volunteers. It was also pointed out that the term “Lakeshore” is not merely providing directional context, but refers to literal places in this district, such as Lakeshore Village. Thus, the Commission has opted to return the *em dash* and restore the existing name of ETOBICOKE—LAKESHORE.

For ETOBICOKE CENTRE, many of the areas that had been moved to the proposed district of Humber have been returned to ETOBICOKE CENTRE. The southern and eastern boundaries were modified as described above.

The northern boundary of the proposed district was on Highway 401. This received much support. However, in response to the other changes in this area, this boundary had to be moved south. The boundary was drawn on Dixon Road, Kipling Avenue, and The Westway. This configuration was chosen because it allows the official neighbourhood of Kingsview Village-The Westway (6) to remain whole, within ETOBICOKE NORTH.

ETOBICOKE NORTH's southern boundary was drawn as described above, allowing all the official neighbourhood of Kingsview Village-The Westway (6) to be added to the district. The Commission notes that much of this neighbourhood was in the existing district of Etobicoke North.

ETOBICOKE NORTH's eastern boundaries were returned to its existing boundary on the Humber River. This allows the Commission to restore the existing boundaries for HUMBER RIVER—BLACK CREEK, YORK CENTRE, and WILLOWDALE. In all three of these districts, the Commission had been informed that the proposal had inappropriately separated neighbourhoods and communities.

In HUMBER RIVER—BLACK CREEK, it was requested that the western boundary be returned to the Humber River so that the neighbourhoods of Humberlea, Humbermede and Humber Summit could be returned to the district. The Commission was also told of the importance of keeping the Jane and Finch neighbourhoods together in HUMBER RIVER—BLACK CREEK, as it had been in the existing and proposed districts.

In YORK CENTRE, the Commission heard that it was important to keep Downsview in a single district. The Commission was also urged to restore the boundary on Grandravine Drive. Downsview had been one of the main neighbourhoods in YORK CENTRE for several redistribution cycles, and the Commission was told that it was inappropriate to split up this community.

It was also stated that Yonge Street was a poor boundary between the proposed district of York Centre and Bayview—Finch, as Yonge Street splits up the Willowdale Business Improvement Area and the Willowdale neighbourhoods. There were also submissions encouraging the Commission to restore the name of Willowdale.

The Commission accepts all these submissions related to the districts north of Highway 401. These issues were resolved by restoring the existing boundaries and names for HUMBER RIVER—BLACK CREEK, YORK CENTRE, and WILLOWDALE.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for the City of Toronto's final districts are shown in Table 2C.

Table 2C – City of Toronto Final Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Beaches—East York	109,359	-6.20%
Davenport	125,048	+7.25%
Don Valley North	111,122	-4.69%
Don Valley South	121,147	+3.91%
Eglinton—Lawrence	115,832	-0.65%
Etobicoke Centre	125,606	+7.73%
Etobicoke—Lakeshore	120,956	+3.74%
Etobicoke North	116,886	+0.25%
Humber River—Black Creek	111,593	-4.29%
Scarborough—Agincourt	123,969	+6.33%
Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East	111,377	-4.47%
Scarborough—Guildwood—Rouge Park	114,100	-2.14%
Scarborough North	116,177	-0.35%
Scarborough Southwest	123,232	+5.70%
Scarborough—Woburn	110,589	-5.15%
Spadina—Harbourfront	105,739	-9.31%
Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park	117,873	+1.10%
Toronto Centre	121,703	+4.39%
Toronto—Danforth	105,472	-9.54%
Toronto—St. Paul's	125,438	+7.59%
University—Rosedale	123,244	+5.71%
Willowdale	118,218	+1.40%
York Centre	108,307	-7.10%
York South—Weston—Etobicoke	111,369	-4.48%
Average	116,432	-0.14%
Range (most populous to least populous)	20,134	17.27 pp

pp = percentage points

Eastern Ontario





0 15 30 km

Eastern Ontario - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario





The population of Eastern Ontario grew by 7.3%, from 624,416 in 2011 to 669,976 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.8% in the same period.

The existing six electoral districts in Eastern Ontario would have an average 2021 population of 111,663 and an average deviation of -4.2% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 18.9 percentage points.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 3A.

Table 3A – Eastern Ontario Existing Electoral Districts				
Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	106,240	+0.02%	116,463	-0.11%
Kingston and the Islands	116,996	+10.15%	126,106	+8.16%
Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston	98,424	-7.33%	111,424	-4.43%
Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes	99,306	-6.50%	104,070	-10.74%
Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	102,537	-3.46%	107,420	-7.87%
Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	100,913	-4.99%	104,493	-10.38%
Average	104,069	-2.02%	111,663	-4.23%
Range (most populous to least populous)	18,572	17.48 pp	22,036	18.90 pp

pp = percentage points

In the proposed redistribution plan, changes to boundaries in this geographic piece resulted from the goal of achieving population equality. The Commission endeavoured to maintain districts of manageable size and respect communities of interest. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 3B.

Table 3B – Eastern Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke	116,900	+0.27%
Gananoque—Brockville—Prescott	113,266	-2.85%
Kingston and the Islands	126,106	+8.16%
Lanark—Frontenac	109,784	-5.84%
Prescott—Russell	111,163	-4.65%
Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry	114,637	-1.68%
Average	115,309	-1.10%
Range (most populous to least populous)	16,322	14.00 pp

pp = percentage points

Several changes have been made to the proposed boundaries in response to submissions. The Commission received many submissions about the portions of Kingston north of Highway 401, the splitting of several counties, and the transfer of the Township of North Glengarry from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell to Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry.

With respect to Kingston and The Islands, there were many submissions that the parts of Kingston north of Highway 401 should be included in that district to preserve their community of interest and to enhance their representation.

The Commission concluded that this should be implemented. All of the City of Kingston is now in the final district of KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS, along with the Township of Frontenac Islands. This has given the district a deviation from the Quota of +15.3%, the highest in the province.

The Commission determined that this is necessary based on geographical circumstances. There are limitations on where this district can be divided considering that the southern part of the district consists of islands. Further, there was an overwhelming number of independent submissions to maintain the municipal boundary as the district boundary, where the anticipated growth is relatively modest. The Commission observes that it may not be reasonably possible to maintain these boundaries in the future.

The Commission also received submissions from residents in the Township of South Frontenac. Some residents requested that they be placed in KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS. However, the Commission concluded that the resulting deviation from the Quota would be unreasonably large. Other submissions, including one from the Township itself, suggested that the Township of South Frontenac should be maintained with the rest of Frontenac County in Lanark—Frontenac. The Commission found these arguments persuasive as such a change preserves effective representation. LANARK—FRONTENAC has been restored to its existing boundaries, with the exception of the areas that were within the City of Kingston.

The district of Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes has been returned to its existing boundary. The name has been changed to LEEDS—GRENVILLE—THOUSAND ISLANDS—RIDEAU LAKES, as recommended by the Geographic Names Board of Canada, allowing for the same name to be used in English and French.

The proposed redistribution plan had split the ten townships which make up the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville across the proposed districts of Lanark—Frontenac and Gananoque—Brockville—Prescott.

The Commission received requests to keep these ten townships together, where numerous economic, social and historical ties exist. The Commission concluded that this request was reasonable and would preserve the existing effective representation of the lower-tier municipalities. Implementing this request also permitted the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley to remain whole, as requested, for the same purpose and permitted the municipalities of Rideau Lakes, Westport and Merrickville-Wolford to remain within this district. Similarly, the municipalities of Brockville, Gananoque and Prescott have also been returned to this district.

The Commission implemented the widely supported request to maintain Rideau Lakes in the district name.

ALGONQUIN—RENFREW—PEMBROKE (formerly Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke) has been returned to its former boundaries. In the proposal, the Commission had removed the Township of Greater Madawaska, separating it from the rest of Renfrew County. We heard compelling submissions that this division compromised effective representation and would disrupt coherent communication with elected representatives and service delivery across Renfrew County. Greater Madawaska has thus been returned to ALGONQUIN—RENFREW—PEMBROKE and the southeastern boundary for this district has been moved back to the existing boundary on the Arnprior-Ottawa municipal border.

The name of this district has been changed from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke to ALGONQUIN—RENFREW—PEMBROKE, representing the fact that only a very small portion of Nipissing is in this district. The new name also recognizes the importance of the Algonquin people's history and presence in this region.

In the most eastern portion of Ontario, the Commission made small but notable changes to boundaries. In doing so, we took careful consideration of the impact of boundary changes for the significant Franco-Ontarian population of this part of the province.

The Commission received submissions to add Cumberland to the name of Prescott—Russell, recognizing that the district extends into the City of Ottawa and includes the former historic township of Cumberland. The Commission agreed with these submissions and has renamed the district PRESCOTT—RUSSELL—CUMBERLAND. There has been a minor change to the western boundary of the proposed district. This simplifies the border by aligning it to Highway 417 and the Ottawa-Russell municipal limits.

In the proposed redistribution plan, the Township of North Glengarry was moved from the existing district of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell to the proposed district of Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry, lying immediately south. This change is maintained in the final districts of PRESCOTT—RUSSELL—CUMBERLAND and STORMONT—DUNDAS—GLENGARRY.

There was considerable support from municipal leaders for this change. The Township of North Glengarry engaged its community regarding the proposed redistribution. The Township posted information on social media and in local newspapers and conducted a survey in French and English. The reported survey results showed overwhelming support for this change, which resulted in the Township being aligned with its upper-tier municipality. In addition, this realignment was also strongly supported by a submission from the Glengarry Federation of Agriculture.

However, there were a few expressions of concern by the Francophone community in the Township of North Glengarry (which itself is 35% First Official Language French, according to the 2021 Census). One submission noted that, under the proposed redistribution plan, the Township would be moving to a more Anglophone district. (In fact, this Township would shift from a district where presently 56% of the population identifies as First Official Language French to a district that would be 19% First Official Language French, as per Tables: Existing and Final Districts – Mother Tongue and First Official Language Estimates on pages 27 and 28). It was asserted that, for Franco-Ontarians in North Glengarry, there was little alignment of interests with the upper-tier municipality (the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry) and that the continued association with the majority Francophone district to the north would better ensure that “Francophone issues remain at the forefront of priorities within the riding and the regional

municipality.” As evidence for this assertion, the Commission was informed that the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry did not translate their website into French, and that an issue around resources for French and English schools had brought North Glengarry into conflict with the other lower-tier municipalities.

In reviewing this issue, the Commission weighed whether it would be more advantageous to Franco-Ontarian interests to place this community with the majority Francophone population in PRESCOTT—RUSSELL—CUMBERLAND than with the minority Francophone population in STORMONT—DUNDAS—GLENGARRY, and whether any such benefit outweighed the interest in restoring the territorial integrity of the United Counties.

Among the municipalities in STORMONT—DUNDAS—GLENGARRY, North Glengarry has the largest Francophone population (35%); however, there are several others (South Glengarry at 26%, North Stormont at 26%, Cornwall at 19%) that ensure substantial weight of Franco-Ontarian interests in the riding. The Commission noted that there is a strong record of the existing minority Francophone district (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) having elected Francophone MPs.

The Commission also noted that the issue of French language services within their community was a key expression of concern by those opposing the North Glengarry change. As we have already indicated, Franco-Ontarians continue to exert their rights to such services notwithstanding the change in electoral boundaries.

The Commission concluded, given all of these circumstances, that it was reasonable to implement the proposed change in relation to the Township of North Glengarry.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Eastern Ontario’s final districts are shown in Table 3C.

Table 3C – Eastern Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke	107,420	-7.87%
Kingston and the Islands	134,415	+15.29%
Lanark—Frontenac	103,120	-11.55%
Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes	104,075	-10.73%
Prescott—Russell—Cumberland	109,125	-6.40%
Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry	114,637	-1.68%
Average	112,132	-3.82%
Range (most populous to least populous)	31,295	26.84 pp

pp = percentage points


Ottawa

Ottawa - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario

0 5 10 km




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

Ottawa - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries
Commission for the Province of Ontario

0 5 10 km




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

Ottawa - Final Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries
Commission for the Province of Ontario

0 5 10 km



For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

The population of the Ottawa geographic piece grew by 15.4%, from 872,783 in 2011 to 1,006,769 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.3% in the same period.

The existing eight electoral districts in the Ottawa geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 125,846 and an average deviation of 7.9% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 19.7 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 4A.

Table 4A – Ottawa Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Carleton	89,522	-15.72%	131,375	+12.68%
Kanata—Carleton	100,846	-5.05%	116,651	+0.05%
Nepean	104,775	-1.35%	132,769	+13.88%
Orléans	119,247	+12.27%	139,309	+19.49%
Ottawa Centre	113,619	+6.97%	126,360	+8.38%
Ottawa South	121,894	+14.76%	125,090	+7.29%
Ottawa West—Nepean	111,881	+5.34%	116,409	-0.16%
Ottawa—Vanier	110,999	+4.51%	118,806	+1.90%
Average	109,098	+2.72%	125,846	+7.94%
Range (most populous to least populous)	32,372	30.48 pp	22,900	19.65 pp

pp = percentage points

When the proposed redistribution plan was prepared, significant redrawing was required, given the large deviations from the Quota in the suburban area comprised of the existing districts of Carleton, Nepean, and Orléans. The Commission noted that these three districts are underrepresented with populations that are, respectively, 12.7%, 13.9% and 19.5% above the Quota. The proposed boundary changes brought these districts closer to the Quota. The populations and deviations from the Quota are shown in Table 4B.

Table 4B – Ottawa Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Carleton	119,737	+2.70%
Kanata	121,458	+4.18%
Nepean	122,229	+4.84%
Orléans	126,662	+8.64%
Ottawa Centre	118,950	+2.02%
Ottawa South	125,075	+7.28%
Ottawa—Vanier	127,255	+9.15%
Ottawa West—Nepean	123,533	+5.96%
Average	123,112	+5.60%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,305	7.13 pp

pp = percentage points

The most notable change in the proposed redistribution plan concerned the district of Orléans, where an adjustment to the southern boundary pushed it up towards the Ottawa River, bringing its population much closer to parity with surrounding districts.

Population growth in the existing districts of Nepean and Carleton necessitated further boundary changes that in turn impacted the existing district of Kanata—Carleton. The Commission proposed shifting the boundaries of the proposed district of Kanata to the east to address these disparities.

The Commission endeavoured to respect the interests of the Francophone community by ensuring that their representation in the proposed districts of Orléans (31% Francophone), Ottawa—Vanier (27% Francophone) and Ottawa South (13% Francophone) was maintained.

Many submissions reflected support for the proposed boundaries of Kanata while many also asked that their communities be retained in Kanata.

Many submissions in this geographic piece focused on the distinctions between effective representation of urban and rural interests.

In particular, submissions were made regarding the fact that in the proposed redistribution plan West Carleton was divided into three ridings (two of which were large rural districts that extended well over 100 km outside of Ottawa’s municipal limits). The Commission noted that West Carleton no longer officially exists as a township, having been amalgamated with Ottawa in 2001.

Many of these submissions requested that West Carleton be added back to the existing district of Kanata—Carleton. However, the Commission also received many submissions supporting the new boundaries for the proposed district of Kanata.

As a compromise solution, the Commission has added the West Carleton communities to the final district of CARLETON, allowing West Carleton to at least be maintained in a district entirely based in Ottawa. This aligns much of Ottawa’s rural neighbourhoods into a single district.

Two other changes have been made to CARLETON. First, the proposed boundary on 9th Line Road has been shifted to the Boundary Road and Highway 417, as was suggested by residents in the area. This simplifies the boundary and better aligns the district with the municipal boundaries.

Secondly, the suburban neighbourhood of Findlay Creek has been moved to OTTAWA SOUTH. The Commission received submissions requesting that Findlay Creek be part of the suburban OTTAWA SOUTH district as opposed to the more rural district of CARLETON. The Commission recognized the value of creating a district within the rural boundaries of the City of Ottawa and maintaining the suburban districts created by our proposal.

The transfer of Findlay Creek into OTTAWA SOUTH precipitated some domino effects on Ottawa’s proposed urban districts. The neighbourhoods of Carleton Heights and Riverside Park were moved into OTTAWA CENTRE. The Commission felt it was appropriate to move these communities into OTTAWA CENTRE, based on submissions explaining the importance of keeping the Rideau River communities together. Heron Park also had to be placed into OTTAWA CENTRE, in order to bring OTTAWA SOUTH’s deviation from the Quota to acceptable limits.

These shifts also allowed the Commission to move Glabar Park and Carlingwood into OTTAWA WEST—NEPEAN, as was suggested in the public consultations. Carlington will also remain in OTTAWA WEST—NEPEAN, as it was in the proposal. Several submissions supported this, especially noticing the improvement of placing the neighbourhood entirely within a single district.

The Commission also received several requests to allow the community of Blackburn Hamlet to remain in ORLÉANS. The Commission concluded that it was not necessary or desirable to allow the deviation from Quota for this district to move as high as 18%. ORLÉANS remains unchanged from the proposed redistribution plan.

However, the Commission agreed with the alternative suggestion that the district in which Blackburn Hamlet has been located be renamed OTTAWA—VANIER—GLOUCESTER.


The Commission also received multiple submissions about the community of Bells Corners. The submissions were split as to whether Bells Corners was better in KANATA or NEPEAN. As such, the Commission opted to leave it in KANATA as it had decided in the proposal. Given the generally supportive comments for the proposed boundaries of these two districts, the KANATA and NEPEAN final boundaries will remain unchanged from the proposal.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Ottawa’s final districts are shown in Table 4C.


Table 4C – Ottawa Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Carleton	124,416	+6.71%
Kanata	121,458	+4.18%
Nepean	122,229	+4.84%
Orléans	126,662	+8.64%
Ottawa Centre	126,560	+8.55%
Ottawa South	126,791	+8.75%
Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester	127,255	+9.15%
Ottawa West—Nepean	128,592	+10.29%
Average	125,495	+7.64%
Range (most populous to least populous)	7,134	6.11 pp

pp = percentage points

Central East Ontario







The population of Central East Ontario grew by 9%, from 535,322 in 2011 to 583,287 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.8% in the same period.

The existing five electoral districts in Central East Ontario would have an average 2021 population of 116,657 and an average deviation of 0.1% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 21.3 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 5A.

Table 5A – Central East Ontario Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Bay of Quinte	109,488	+3.08%	116,016	-0.49%
Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	110,217	+3.77%	122,401	+4.98%
Hastings—Lennox and Addington	92,513	-12.90%	100,636	-13.68%
Northumberland—Peterborough South	107,840	+1.53%	118,756	+1.86%
Peterborough—Kawartha	115,264	+8.52%	125,478	+7.62%
Average	107,064	+0.80%	116,657	+0.06%
Range (most populous to least populous)	22,751	21.42 pp	24,842	21.30 pp

pp = percentage points

In preparing the proposed redistribution plan for this geographic piece, the Commission noted that the existing electoral boundaries were problematic, particularly for the existing district of Hastings—Lennox and Addington, which had a deviation from the Quota of -13.7%.

As a result, the Commission shifted boundaries to balance the population of the districts across this geographic piece. The proposed populations and deviations from the Quota are shown in Table 5B.

Table 5B – Central East Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Bay of Quinte	116,016	-0.49%
Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	120,254	+3.14%
Hastings—Lennox and Addington— Tyendinaga	111,331	-4.51%
Northumberland	114,335	-1.93%
Peterborough	121,336	+4.07%
Average	116,654	+0.06%
Range (most populous to least populous)	10,005	8.58 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission proposed shifting the boundaries of the existing district of Peterborough—Kawartha southward based on submissions received during the initial consultation phases that stressed the established connection of the Township of Otonabee-South Monaghan with Peterborough. It was also noted that the Alderville First Nation has territory on both sides of Rice Lake, so the boundary was shifted further south to ensure all of Alderville First Nation’s territory would be in the same district. The name PETERBOROUGH was proposed and will be maintained as the final district name, but its boundaries have been altered from the initial proposal, as described below.

We heard, over the course of public hearings, that this southward shift was inappropriate. The Commission was advised that the small portion of the proposed Peterborough district south of Rice Lake (comprising the hamlet of Roseneath and the main reserve of the Alderville First Nation) were more appropriately aligned with the district of Northumberland. This suggestion, which was initiated by the Township of Alnwick/Haldimand and the Alderville First Nation and supported by several other municipalities within Northumberland County, has been implemented by the Commission.

Relative to the foregoing change, there was support for dividing Clarington as proposed – that is maintaining Clarke as part of the Northumberland district (although others suggested that Clarington, which resulted from the merger of Clarke and Darlington, should not be divided).

The Commission accepted the suggestion that the name should include a reference to “Clarke,” the Clarke township being the historical Durham County township which is now all of Ward 4 of Clarington. The name for the district will be NORTHUMBERLAND—CLARKE.

With respect to other proposed changes impacting the Peterborough area, the Commission received some support for creating a more compact urban riding, while others expressed the desire for the existing boundaries to remain the same.

Residents from five municipalities within Peterborough County, with support from municipal officials, indicated a desire to be aligned with the City of Peterborough and ultimately be part of the PETERBOROUGH district. These are the Municipality of Trent Lakes, the Township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, the Township of Asphodel-Norwood, the Township of Otonabee-South Monaghan and the Township of North Kawartha.

The Commission was able to implement the request of two townships and the alternative request of a third township. Ultimately, the Commission concluded that the Township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, the Township of Asphodel-Norwood and the Township of Otonabee-South Monaghan be included within the PETERBOROUGH district.

The Township of North Kawartha and the Municipality of Trent Lakes are being moved into HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES. The Commission was unable to keep Trent Lakes and North Kawartha in PETERBOROUGH given that the district has a high deviation of 10.1%. It was decided that North Kawartha and Trent Lakes should go into HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES together, as this would create three Peterborough County municipalities within this district.

The Township of Cavan Monaghan is also being returned to the district of HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES, as it was in the existing districts. This was requested by the Township and residents. The Commission acknowledges that the proposed boundaries would have been problematic given that the Township was split into three districts.

Concern was also expressed that the proposed redistribution arbitrarily divided the Municipality of Highlands East. This municipality noted the value of maintaining political cohesion with Haliburton County with respect to federal policies affecting its region. The Commission implemented the suggestion, supported by other municipalities, to maintain the whole of the Municipality of Highlands East in the district of HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES.

The Township of Brock has been moved to YORK—DURHAM, aligning it with several other municipalities within the Regional Municipality of Durham. As a consequence of this, the new district name will be HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES.


These changes also resulted in a cascading effect on the HASTINGS—LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—TYENDINAGA and BAY OF QUINTE districts. The boundary between these districts was redrawn to divide the City of Quinte West on Highway 401 and the Trent River, in a similar manner to how Belleville has been historically divided, and to place rural portions of Quinte West in the riding of HASTINGS—LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—TYENDINAGA. Care has been taken to not divide the community of Frankford.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Central East Ontario’s final districts are shown in Table 5C.


Table 5C – Central East Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Bay of Quinte	110,164	-5.51%
Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes	119,150	+2.20%
Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga	106,468	-8.68%
Northumberland—Clarke	106,574	-8.59%
Peterborough	128,349	+10.09%
Average	114,141	-2.10%
Range (most populous to least populous)	21,881	18.77 pp

pp = percentage points

Central Ontario







The population of Central Ontario grew by 17.9%, from 625,530 in 2011 to 737,495 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.3% in the same period.

The existing six electoral districts in Central Ontario have an average 2021 population of 122,916 and fall 5.4% above the Quota. As indicated by the deviation range (38.5 percentage points), there are substantial disparities in the population size of districts. Simcoe—Grey has grown especially large, whereas other districts fall reasonably close to the 2022 Quota.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 6A.

Table 6A – Central Ontario Existing Electoral Districts				
Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Barrie—Innisfil	101,584	-4.36%	120,378	+3.25%
Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	97,876	-7.85%	106,871	-8.34%
Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	106,475	+0.25%	113,348	-2.78%
Simcoe—Grey	116,307	+9.50%	151,784	+30.19%
Simcoe North	108,672	+2.31%	120,656	+3.49%
York—Simcoe	94,616	-10.92%	124,458	+6.75%
Average	104,255	-1.85%	122,916	+5.43%
Range (most populous to least populous)	21,691	20.42 pp	44,913	38.53 pp

pp = percentage points

A new proposed district, Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge, encompassed a portion of the existing district of York—Simcoe plus portions of the existing districts of Markham—Stouffville (which is part of Northern GTA), and Pickering—Uxbridge and Durham (which are part of Eastern GTA).

In addition to this new district in the proposed redistribution plan, boundaries were redrawn to balance the populations of the other six districts. In particular, the southern boundary of the existing district of Simcoe—Grey was shifted north, and it was proposed that this district be renamed Collingwood—Blue Mountains. The growing community of New Tecumseth was placed in a newly named district, New Tecumseth—Bradford.

The Commission also proposed a small adjustment made between Simcoe North and Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, aligning the boundary with the Township of Oro-Medonte’s municipal limits. The proposed name for this district was Penetanguishene—Couchiching.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 6B.

Table 6B – Central Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Barrie—Innisfil	120,378	+3.25%
Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	115,495	-0.94%
Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	118,588	+1.71%
Collingwood—Blue Mountains	116,511	-0.07%
Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge	118,867	+1.95%
New Tecumseth—Bradford	118,958	+2.03%
Penetanguishene—Couchiching	112,022	-3.92%
Average	117,260	+0.57%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,356	7.17 pp

pp = percentage points

There were many submissions regarding the Commission’s choice of names for districts in this geographic piece.

While there was some support for the proposed name Penetanguishene—Couchiching as a symbol of reconciliation, it was noted that the name did not reference the largest current Indigenous communities in the district. Further, there were extensive submissions emphasizing the historic nature of the original name, Simcoe North, which has been used since Confederation. The Commission concluded that the historic name of SIMCOE NORTH should be retained for this district.

The Commission received submissions, including a joint submission from two Members of Parliament from Barrie, urging greater geographic differentiation in the two proposed Barrie district names. The Commission accepted these practical suggestions and Barrie—Innisfil has been renamed BARRIE SOUTH—INNISFIL while Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte has been renamed BARRIE NORTH—SPRINGWATER—ORO-MEDONTE.

The Commission also received submissions, from individuals and many municipal leaders and elected representatives, in opposition to the name Collingwood—Blue Mountains suggesting that this name was too narrow and specific to only the northwestern portion of the riding and does not reflect the makeup of the proposed riding. The Commission agreed with these submissions and concluded that the existing name, SIMCOE—GREY, should be retained.

The Commission also received submissions criticizing the proposed new district's name of Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge. Submitters pointed out that this name is unclear and does not adequately represent the area captured by this district. The Commission has opted to change this district's name to YORK—DURHAM, acknowledging that this district makes up parts of the Regional Municipalities of York and Durham and that both names have a long history of being used as district names.

There were also several submissions relating to boundaries. Some of these submissions have resulted in changes to the proposal.

While there were many submissions to the contrary, significant submissions, including from the Township itself, supported the inclusion of all the Township of Oro-Medonte within BARRIE NORTH—SPRINGWATER—ORO-MEDONTE, noting the effectiveness of advocacy with one, rather than two, Members of Parliament for this smaller municipality.

In addition, comparable submissions, from the Township and residents, were made requesting that the whole of the Township of Adjala-Tosorontio be included in the proposed Collingwood—Blue Mountains district (now SIMCOE—GREY) to allow the maintenance of its established, effective and cohesive fiscal relationship with the upper-tier Simcoe County. The Township of Mulmur requested that it be placed in DUFFERIN—CALEDON in order to align it with Dufferin County.

These requests to retain effective representation could be achieved without undue impact on the principle of voter parity.

For similar reasons, there was a submission from the Municipality and its residents that the Municipality of Grey Highlands not be included in the proposed Collingwood—Blue Mountains district (now SIMCOE—GREY) because of its strong relationship with the upper-tier of Grey County and its eight other lower-tier municipalities, noting the successful collaboration in the delivery of many services and the momentum for federal and provincial government-supported initiatives. Retaining this community in the BRUCE—GREY—OWEN SOUND electoral district would allow for more effective representation, and importantly would not unreasonably compromise voter parity.

Similarly, the Municipalities of South Bruce and Brockton have been moved to HURON—BRUCE. This means that BRUCE—GREY—OWEN SOUND has been returned to its existing boundaries.

In the eastern portion of this geographic piece, changes have also been made to the proposed district of Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge, which is being renamed YORK—DURHAM. Changes have been made in order to avoid splitting municipalities, to align municipalities with their upper-tier municipalities and to improve voter parity.

In particular, the Township of Brock was moved to this district to alleviate population pressure on HALIBURTON—KAWARTHA LAKES and also to align it with the Regional Municipality of Durham. Other changes have been made to match the boundary with Clarington, Oshawa, and East Gwillimbury’s municipal limits, limiting the number of districts that these cities are split across.


East Gwillimbury has been moved wholly into the proposed district of New Tecumseth—Bradford. Since the district now includes the entirety of both the Town of East Gwillimbury and the Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury (with one small exception south of Green Line), the Commission decided to rename the district NEW TECUMSETH—GWILLIMBURY.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Central Ontario’s final districts are shown in Table 6C.


Table 6C – Central Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Barrie North—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	115,495	-0.94%
Barrie South—Innisfil	120,378	+3.25%
Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	113,348	-2.78%
New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury	120,533	+3.38%
Simcoe—Grey	107,836	-7.51%
Simcoe North	112,022	-3.92%
York—Durham	116,560	-0.03%
Average	115,167	-1.22%
Range (most populous to least populous)	12,697	10.89 pp

pp = percentage points

Eastern Greater Toronto Area (GTA)







The population of Eastern GTA grew by 14.6%, from 582,132 in 2011 to 667,211 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.5% in the same period.

The existing five electoral districts in Eastern GTA would have an average 2021 population of 133,442 and an average deviation of 14.5% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 25.3 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 7A.

Table 7A – Eastern GTA Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Ajax	109,600	+3.19%	126,666	+8.64%
Durham	115,395	+8.64%	150,235	+28.86%
Oshawa	125,771	+18.41%	131,067	+12.42%
Pickering—Uxbridge	109,344	+2.95%	120,742	+3.56%
Whitby	122,022	+14.88%	138,501	+18.79%
Average	116,426	+9.61%	133,442	+14.45%
Range (most populous to least populous)	16,427	15.46 pp	29,493	25.30 pp

pp = percentage points

In preparing the proposed redistribution plan, the Commission noted that the population growth over the past decade in the Durham Region necessitated a number of significant boundary adjustments in this geographic piece. Most notably, a new district (Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge, renamed YORK—DURHAM) was created out of the northern portions of Durham Region, combining it with areas in Central Ontario and Northern GTA.

In the proposed redistribution plan, the boundaries of Ajax were unchanged and the Commission proposed more compact districts for Oshawa and Whitby, with populations much closer to the Quota.

The area constituting the southern portion of the current district of Durham was renamed BOWMANVILLE—OSHAWA NORTH. The remainder of Durham was placed in the proposed new district of Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge (renamed YORK—DURHAM), as was discussed in the Central Ontario section.

The proposed district of Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge incorporated the northern portions of the existing districts of Pickering—Uxbridge and Durham. As a result of this change and of population growth in the City of Whitby (and the community of Brooklin in particular), the Commission proposed to place Brooklin in the district of PICKERING—BROOKLIN.

The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 7B.

Table 7B – Eastern GTA Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Ajax	126,666	+8.64%
Bowmanville—Oshawa North	123,036	+5.53%
Oshawa	126,499	+8.50%
Pickering—Brooklin	122,430	+5.01%
Whitby	120,078	+2.99%
Average	123,742	+6.13%
Range (most populous to least populous)	6,588	5.65 pp

pp = percentage points

Some aspects of the Commission’s proposed redistribution plan received positive comments, other areas received criticism. Several boundary changes were made as a result of the public submissions.

The Commission appreciated the submission from the Town of Ajax supporting the Commission’s proposal to leave the Ajax district unchanged. AJAX will continue to remain unchanged in the final boundaries.

In a number of submissions made in response to the proposed plan, including from the City of Whitby and the Chamber of Commerce, the need to “rebalance” Whitby was acknowledged. Some indicated that it was appropriate to separate Brooklin which, it was asserted, had its own history and was separated geographically from Whitby. However, the community of Brooklin, supported by the Town of Whitby, suggested that Brooklin should not become part of the Pickering district and should remain with Whitby, or at a minimum, be placed with Northern Oshawa.

The Commission concluded that this request could not be implemented. In 2012, the previous commission had proposed that Brooklin could no longer be aligned with Whitby, but this change was not ultimately made. Ten years later it is more apparent that Brooklin cannot remain in the same district as Whitby if the principle of voting parity is respected.

Various alternative maps were examined and experimented with by the Commission (including some maps submitted by members of the public). The Commission has decided on this final configuration because this map does a better job of limiting municipal splits and also separates the urban and suburban municipalities along Highways 401 and 407 from the rural municipalities to the north.

The fact that the Commission’s proposal split the City of Oshawa into four districts was a point of concern for a number of parties. The final OSHAWA district boundaries now mirror the existing boundaries. The resulting deviations from Quota exceed what the Commission had endeavoured to achieve; however, the Commission concluded it was reasonable to divide Oshawa into only two districts thus reducing the risk of diminishing the City’s effective representation throughout four districts. The Commission also sees the value in retaining the historical pattern of the electoral district.

BOWMANVILLE—OSHAWA NORTH has also been changed in order to reduce municipal splits. The western and northern boundary has been moved to Oshawa and Clarington’s municipal limits. As discussed above in relation to the geographic piece of Central East Ontario, the Commission did receive submissions on the east-west split of Clarington. Some submissions argued that it was preferable to place the municipality into a single district, while others argued that the more rural eastern half of the municipality was better off with NORTHUMBERLAND—CLARKE. The Commission has opted to maintain this split, as it was in the existing and proposed districts.


The boundaries for WHITBY have been simplified, as described above. The final district of WHITBY will constitute the Town of Whitby south of Highway 407.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Eastern GTA’s final districts are shown in Table 7C.

Table 7C – Eastern GTA Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Ajax	126,666	+8.64%
Bowmanville—Oshawa North	128,534	+10.24%
Oshawa	131,067	+12.42%
Pickering—Brooklin	122,430	+5.01%
Whitby	115,257	-1.14%
Average	124,791	+7.03%
Range (most populous to least populous)	15,810	13.56 pp

pp = percentage points


Northern Greater Toronto Area (GTA)




Northern GTA - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.
Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries
Commission for the Province of Ontario

0 2.5 5 km



For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.



The population of Northern GTA grew by 13%, from 965,985 in 2011 to 1,091,756 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.5% in the same period.

The existing nine electoral districts in Northern GTA would have an average 2021 population of 121,306 and an average deviation of 4% from the Quota. The range between the least and most populous districts would be 43.1 percentage points. As shown in Table 8A below, there are wide population disparities among the electoral districts within this geographic piece.

Table 8A – Northern GTA Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	106,064	-0.14%	118,883	+1.97%
King—Vaughan	109,235	+2.84%	147,695	+26.68%
Markham—Stouffville	109,780	+3.36%	135,944	+16.60%
Markham—Thornhill	102,221	-3.76%	97,510	-16.37%
Markham—Unionville	104,693	-1.43%	128,308	+10.05%
Newmarket—Aurora	109,457	+3.05%	127,134	+9.04%
Richmond Hill	108,658	+2.30%	114,180	-2.07%
Thornhill	110,427	+3.97%	115,292	-1.11%
Vaughan—Woodbridge	105,450	-0.72%	106,810	-8.39%
Average	107,332	+1.05%	121,306	+4.04%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,206	7.73 pp	50,185	43.05 pp

pp = percentage points

In its proposed redistribution plan, the Commission noted that significant changes were required to ensure voter parity as much as reasonably possible. Notably, a new district of Lake Simcoe—Uxbridge (renamed YORK—DURHAM) was created out of portions of Markham—Stouffville combined with areas in Eastern GTA and Central Ontario. This allowed the Commission to shift the remaining boundaries in order to achieve population parity. The proposed populations and deviations from the Quota are shown in Table 8B.

Table 8B – Northern GTA Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	114,676	-1.64%
King—Vaughan	116,118	-0.40%
Markham—Stouffville	121,176	+3.93%
Markham—Thornhill	123,400	+5.84%
Markham—Unionville	122,401	+4.98%
Newmarket—Aurora	118,666	+1.78%
Richmond Hill South	118,679	+1.79%
Vaughan—Thornhill	119,771	+2.73%
Vaughan—Woodbridge	115,957	-0.54%
Average	118,983	+2.05%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,724	7.48 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission received many submissions with respect to boundary changes in this geographic piece.

In Markham, there were many submissions pertaining to the proposed boundaries on Highway 7, Markham Road, and Main Street North. Many submitters suggested that the establishments and amenities along these streets are important community gathering spots and, as such, these streets make poor boundaries. Given other changes, the Commission noted that reasonable population equality could be achieved by moving boundaries back to Highway 407 and McCowan Road. Final districts reflect this change.

The Commission learned that the proposed boundary for Markham—Stouffville would cut Markham Village in two and would also cut off the community of Raymerville-Markville East, which is connected to Markham Village. It was asserted that splitting this community of interest would disrupt existing relationships, weaken Markham Village's voice and could potentially play a role in diminishing the community's unique identity.

The Commission was asked to preserve the existing boundary of Markham—Stouffville to protect the asserted community of interest of Markham Village and Raymerville-Markville East, which does not have a significant impact on voter parity. The Commission found these arguments persuasive and maintained the boundary of MARKHAM—STOUFFVILLE along McCowan Road in the west and Highway 407 in the south. However, the boundary on 16th Avenue has been shifted north to Bur Oak Avenue.

As such, MARKHAM—UNIONVILLE has largely been returned to its existing boundaries, with the boundary transfer from 16th Avenue to Bur Oak Avenue being the only exception.

MARKHAM—THORNHILL's eastern boundary has been shifted eastward to the municipal limit in response to submissions commenting that the proposed boundary on Markham Road was inappropriate because it cuts off the Cedarwood and the Rouge River neighbourhoods.

There were also several differing suggestions as to where to place the boundary between MARKHAM—THORNHILL and VAUGHAN—THORNHILL, with suggestions ranging from Yonge Street to Highway 404. The Commission decided to restore this boundary to its previous location on Bayview Avenue.

There were also submissions that Dufferin Street rather than Peter Rupert Avenue, a residential street, be used to define the boundary between VAUGHAN—THORNHILL and KING—VAUGHAN. In the interests of not splitting up neighbourhoods, the Commission has acceded to this request.

The Commission has also shifted a small section of the boundary between these two districts southward in order to transfer the Sherwood Park neighbourhood into KING—VAUGHAN. This area had previously been in VAUGHAN—THORNHILL, but submitters told the Commission that this was a poor alignment because residents were cut off from the remainder of the district by an industrial zone.

With respect to KING—VAUGHAN, the Commission agreed with submissions to move the northerly boundary to Highway 9 and Davis Drive. This keeps King Township whole except for the portion north of Highway 9 and Davis Drive which is close to the community of Bradford.

The Commission also received submissions opposing how the proposed boundaries had divided the community of Kleinburg in two. The Commission agreed with the suggestion to keep the community whole in the riding of KING—VAUGHAN. This submission was implemented by moving the boundary in the southwest to follow Major MacKenzie Drive. This also shifts the neighbourhood of Park Ridge into KING—VAUGHAN, which was requested by submitters.

To offset the population change caused by unifying the community of Kleinburg, the Commission opted to move the boundary between KING—VAUGHAN and VAUGHAN—WOODBIDGE to Teston Road and close to Pine Valley Drive. It was suggested to the Commission that it was appropriate to include the Vellore Village neighbourhood in VAUGHAN—WOODBIDGE with which it has a strong association and connection. The new boundary follows the City of Vaughan's Ward 3 with one exception. The western boundary was moved westward to the creek in order to avoid splitting the new developments along Pine Valley Drive.

The boundary for AURORA—OAK RIDGES—RICHMOND HILL west of Yonge Street was moved northward in part to align with the Aurora-Newmarket municipal boundary.

While it was reported to the Commission that it had been hoped that Town of Aurora could remain whole as a distinct urban community, if that could not be accomplished, the transition of the very northwest corner of Aurora into the district of AURORA—OAK RIDGES—RICHMOND HILL was supported.

The Commission also moved the proposed northern boundary of NEWMARKET—AURORA to Green Lane to place the Harvest Hills community with Newmarket, as was asked by multiple submitters. This matches the existing boundary.

RICHMOND HILL SOUTH has received one small change to the proposed boundaries. The southern boundary has been returned to the existing boundary on Highway 407. This is part of the general plan of using Highway 407 instead of Highway 7 as the boundary throughout this geographic piece, as was suggested by several submitters.

Overall, most of the revisions requested in this geographic piece could be made without unreasonably infringing on voter parity.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Northern GTA’s final districts are shown in Table 8C.

Table 8C – Northern GTA Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	117,750	+0.99%
King—Vaughan	123,226	+5.69%
Markham—Stouffville	120,845	+3.65%
Markham—Thornhill	111,087	-4.72%
Markham—Unionville	116,972	+0.33%
Newmarket—Aurora	117,699	+0.95%
Richmond Hill South	124,748	+7.00%
Vaughan—Thornhill	124,866	+7.10%
Vaughan—Woodbridge	121,705	+4.39%
Average	119,878	+2.82%
Range (most populous to least populous)	13,779	11.82 pp


pp = percentage points

Mississauga

Mississauga - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.


Mississauga - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario



For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.



The population of Mississauga has remained relatively constant, with population growth of 0.6%, from 713,443 in 2011 to 717,961 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 11.3% in the same period.

The existing six electoral districts in Mississauga would have an average 2021 population of 119,660 and an average deviation of 2.6% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 9.5 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 9A.

Table 9A – Mississauga Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Mississauga Centre	118,756	+11.81%	127,377	+9.25%
Mississauga East—Cooksville	121,792	+14.67%	116,346	-0.21%
Mississauga—Erin Mills	117,199	+10.34%	123,371	+5.82%
Mississauga—Lakeshore	118,893	+11.94%	117,095	+0.43%
Mississauga—Malton	118,046	+11.14%	116,908	+0.27%
Mississauga—Streetsville	118,757	+11.81%	116,864	+0.24%
Average	118,907	+11.95%	119,660	+2.63%
Range (most populous to least populous)	4,593	4.33 pp	11,031	9.46 pp

pp = percentage points

In the proposed redistribution plan, the Commission proposed minor boundary adjustments to balance the populations of the six existing districts in Mississauga. These six proposed districts were within the municipal boundaries of the City of Mississauga, and their boundaries aligned with major roads, the Credit River, and the Canadian Pacific rail line. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 9B.

Table 9B – Mississauga Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Mississauga Centre	119,975	+2.90%
Mississauga East—Cooksville	120,196	+3.09%
Mississauga—Erin Mills	119,526	+2.52%
Mississauga Lakeshore	119,936	+2.87%
Mississauga—Malton	119,741	+2.70%
Mississauga—Meadowvale	118,587	+1.71%
Average	119,660	+2.63%
Range (most populous to least populous)	1,609	1.38 pp

pp = percentage points

Concern was expressed that the proposed redistribution, to create the proposed district of Mississauga—Meadowvale, divided the Streetsville community. There were requests to reconfigure the proposed district so as not to divide Streetsville, which has a significant community identity and history within the larger City of Mississauga. There were also requests to include reference to the Streetsville community as part of the district's name, as has been the case since 2003.

There were also submissions to expand the proposed Mississauga—Erin Mills district to include that segment captured by Highway 407, Britannia Road and Erin Mills Parkway. It was submitted that the proposed boundaries drew an unnatural boundary through the middle of the Churchill Meadows neighbourhood. The proposed new boundary drawn at Thomas Street placed the top third of the Churchill Meadows community in the new riding of Mississauga—Meadowvale. The Commission was requested to recognize the community interest identified by the residents of Erin Mills living south of Britannia Road and north of Thomas Street.

The Commission concluded that it was reasonable to implement these submissions, given that such implementation did not significantly impact voter parity. This encompasses three changes to the proposed redistribution plan.

Firstly, Streetsville was moved back into Mississauga—Meadowvale. This district's name has been returned to the existing name of MISSISSAUGA—STREETSVILLE.

Secondly, the Churchill Meadow neighbourhood has been returned to MISSISSAUGA—ERIN MILLS.

Thirdly, MISSISSAUGA CENTRE's southwestern boundary has been moved to the Credit River.

All other boundaries in Mississauga are unchanged from the proposal, including those of MISSISSAUGA—MALTON, MISSISSAUGA EAST—COOKSVILLE and MISSISSAUGA—LAKESHORE.

In the case of MISSISSAUGA—LAKESHORE, the *em dash* (“—”) is being returned to the name of the district, as it was in the existing name. The Commission recognizes the administrative burden that comes with name changes and has decided that the existing name is preferable.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Mississauga's final districts are shown in Table 9C.


Table 9C – Mississauga Final Electoral Districts


Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Mississauga Centre	124,084	+6.43%
Mississauga East—Cooksville	120,196	+3.09%
Mississauga—Erin Mills	120,241	+3.13%
Mississauga—Lakeshore	119,936	+2.87%
Mississauga—Malton	119,741	+2.70%
Mississauga—Streetsville	113,763	-2.42%
Average	119,660	+2.63%
Range (most populous to least populous)	10,321	8.85 pp

pp = percentage points

Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin







Brampton was noted as an area that had seen considerable population growth over the past decade. The City of Brampton itself, with a current population of 656,480, had grown by 25.3% since 2011, with density spreading northward into Caledon and Dufferin County. This is the largest population growth of any Ontario city with a population over 100,000. Taken as a geographic piece, the population of Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin grew by 24.8%, from 640,247 in 2011 to 799,318 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 9.9% in the same period.

The six existing electoral districts in this geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 133,220, which falls 14.3% above the Quota. Brampton West (with 162,353 residents) currently has the highest population of all districts in the province, while Dufferin—Caledon also falls near the top. As indicated by the deviation range (49.6 percentage points) relative to the 2022 Quota, there are substantial disparities in population size between districts, particularly between the adjacent ridings of Brampton West and Brampton Centre. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 10A.

Table 10A – Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brampton Centre	103,122	-2.91%	104,557	-10.32%
Brampton East	99,712	-6.12%	131,677	+12.94%
Brampton North	111,951	+5.40%	125,141	+7.33%
Brampton South	107,364	+1.08%	132,752	+13.86%
Brampton West	101,757	-4.20%	162,353	+39.25%
Dufferin—Caledon	116,341	+9.53%	142,838	+22.51%
Average	106,708	+0.46%	133,220	+14.26%
Range (most populous to least populous)	16,629	15.65 pp	57,796	49.57 pp

pp = percentage points

Given its population size and pattern of growth, the Commission concluded that this area required a new electoral district.

The proposed addition of a seventh district, together with the obligation to address the wide population disparities described above, required significant boundary reconfigurations, especially of those districts that lay within the City of Brampton. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed redistribution plan are shown in Table 10B.

Table 10B – Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brampton Centre	114,422	-1.86%
Brampton—Chinguacousy	113,201	-2.91%
Brampton—Mayfield West	112,994	-3.08%
Brampton North	112,082	-3.87%
Brampton Southeast	114,952	-1.40%

Table 10B – Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brampton Southwest	110,855	-4.92%
Dufferin—Caledon	119,767	+2.72%
Average	114,039	-2.19%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,912	7.64 pp

pp = percentage points

One of the main issues of the submissions respecting the proposed redistribution plan for this geographic piece related to the riding names proposed by the Commission which reflected cardinal directions. It was revealed that the existing names and directions were preferred, which correspond to the road grid instead of the literal directions. The Commission felt it was appropriate to acknowledge local orientations and the traditional district names were therefore restored — BRAMPTON EAST, BRAMPTON SOUTH, and BRAMPTON WEST.

It was noted that “Mayfield” in the proposed name Brampton—Mayfield West was not historically significant nor was that name significant to anyone other than those who lived in that immediate area. As a result, the Commission has revised the name to BRAMPTON NORTH—CALEDON as it was suggested this better reflected the location of the district as it straddled the boundary between the municipalities of Brampton and Caledon.

Concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of “Chinguacousy” which is in use throughout the City of Brampton and thus would not reference the specific location of the district. As a result, it was decided that the riding should be named BRAMPTON—CHINGUACOUSY PARK as suggested, to reflect that the riding now encompasses the 40-hectare Donald M. Gordon Chinguacousy Park.

The focus of other submissions related to historical patterns and communities of interest.

In the proposed redistribution plan, the historical centre of the City of Brampton was divided, and the Commission was urged to retain historical Brampton, including Armbro Heights, Peel Village and Four Corners, within the same district, BRAMPTON CENTRE. Significant community projects and infrastructure improvements are in progress which would benefit from cohesive common representation.

Similarly, the Commission was advised of the importance of keeping together the newly established developments around Mississauga Road and Steeles Avenue, including the Susan Fennell Sportsplex and the Churchville community in the district of Brampton South; Heart Lake, Loafer’s Lake, and Springdale in Brampton North; and the Cassie Campbell Community Centre and multiple places of worship in Brampton West. The Commission implemented these submissions which respected communities of interest and did not disturb the achievement of voter parity.

BRAMPTON EAST has been mostly shifted back to its existing position, except in the northwestern corner. The final western boundary will follow Tobram Road in its entirety, making for a clear, simple boundary.


The Township of East Garafraxa and the Township of Mulmur sought to join DUFFERIN—CALEDON which would keep them with all the other municipalities in Dufferin County. Again, because these additions supported effective representation and did not interfere with voter parity, the Commission implemented these submissions.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin’s final districts are shown in Table 10C.


Table 10C – Brampton, Caledon, and Dufferin Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brampton Centre	109,450	-6.12%
Brampton—Chinguacousy Park	115,568	-0.88%
Brampton East	119,214	+2.25%
Brampton North—Caledon	106,762	-8.43%
Brampton South	113,252	-2.86%
Brampton West	114,260	-2.00%
Dufferin—Caledon	120,812	+3.62%
Average	114,188	-2.06%
Range (most populous to least populous)	14,050	12.05 pp

pp = percentage points

Halton, Guelph, and Wellington







The population of Halton, Guelph, and Wellington grew by 18.4%, from 680,234 in 2011 to 805,299 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.2% in the same period.

The six electoral districts in this geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 134,217 and an average deviation of 15.1% above the Quota. The existing districts of Oakville North—Burlington, Guelph and Milton are at the highest end for population size across the province, with populations that are, respectively, 27.7%, 23.3% and 17.5% above the Quota. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 11A.

Table 11A – Halton, Guelph, and Wellington Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Burlington	120,569	+13.52%	125,435	+7.59%
Guelph	121,688	+14.57%	143,740	+23.29%
Milton	88,065	-17.09%	136,993	+17.50%
Oakville	119,649	+12.65%	122,322	+4.92%
Oakville North—Burlington	114,378	+7.69%	148,936	+27.74%
Wellington—Halton Hills	115,885	+9.11%	127,873	+9.68%
Average	113,372	+6.74%	134,217	+15.12%
Range (most populous to least populous)	33,623	31.66 pp	26,614	22.82 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission proposed a new electoral district to resolve the underrepresentation in this area, so that it would comprise seven districts with more balanced populations. In this process, several other changes were made, significantly altering the existing districts. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 11B.

Table 11B – Halton, Guelph, and Wellington Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Burlington Lakeshore	116,984	+0.34%
Burlington—Milton West	114,218	-2.03%
Georgetown—Milton East	118,559	+1.69%
Guelph	118,686	+1.80%
Oakville Lakeshore	114,917	-1.43%
Oakville North	113,574	-2.59%
Wellington—Halton	111,155	-4.66%
Average	115,442	-0.98%
Range (most populous to least populous)	7,531	6.46 pp

pp = percentage points

While the additional seat was welcomed, there were nevertheless objections where district boundaries did not align with municipal borders. Some of these concerns are unnecessary. For example, there is no risk that residents' property taxes or access to their local hospital will be impacted as a result of being in a district that crosses into the neighbouring city.

Nevertheless, the Commission appreciates that where municipalities are too populous to be contained within a single district, it is generally preferable to divide them into larger portions across a maximum of two ridings, than to distribute small segments among three or four, as the proposal did in some instances. Several adjustments were thus made so that communities now hold sufficient weight in their new districts.

Consistent with the motion received from the Town of Oakville, and widely endorsed in submissions from residents, we have reorganized the two Oakville districts (Oakville and Oakville North—Burlington) from their current north-south alignment into eastern and western halves, creating OAKVILLE EAST and OAKVILLE WEST. Sixteen Mile Creek serves as a clear natural boundary that divides the Town neatly in half. This solution offers at least two substantial improvements over the initial proposal: it better respects Oakville's municipal boundaries with Burlington (to the west) and Milton (to the north); and it allows for a better blending of differential north/south population growth across both Oakville districts. A third benefit is that the east-west alignment produces two districts that are more socioeconomically balanced, thereby avoiding what one submission referred to as the “gentrifying” of one district over another.

There were also strong objections to the Commission's initial proposal as it impacted the City of Burlington, which had been divided across four electoral districts. The adjustment to Oakville described above allows us to return the district of BURLINGTON to its existing boundaries, thus keeping the communities of Tyandaga, Brant Hills and Elizabeth Gardens, which had been severed in the proposal. As the district has returned to its existing boundaries, the name will be changed back to its original name of BURLINGTON.

The quadrant of the City of Burlington that lies within the existing district of Oakville North—Burlington now transfers to BURLINGTON NORTH—MILTON WEST. It is important to note that Burlington comprises 49% of the population of this new district, with Milton comprising 51%.

In light of the population growth in and around Milton, there was general acceptance of the Commission's proposal to establish two districts in this area with the Town of Milton divided into eastern and western halves. However, we have shifted the boundary to Ontario Street, following advice that this serves as a clearer dividing line.

Given the need to respect reasonable variances from Quota, it was not possible to satisfy requests to keep the Town of Halton Hills whole within this piece. While Acton will stay in the district of WELLINGTON—HALTON HILLS NORTH, Georgetown now falls within the district of MILTON EAST—HALTON HILLS SOUTH.

WELLINGTON—HALTON HILLS NORTH has received some other small changes since the proposal. The Township of East Garafraxa was moved into DUFFERIN—CALEDON, with the remainder of Dufferin County. The boundary with BURLINGTON NORTH—MILTON WEST has been changed to match the municipal limits.

The Commission has made only modest adjustments to the boundaries concerning GUELPH and WELLINGTON—HALTON HILLS NORTH. Like Milton, Guelph is another area of high population growth. Here, and in other areas of the province, we received a few objections to “donut” shaped arrangements where segments from the urban district are shaved off and transferred to the surrounding rural district to achieve relative population parity. While such solutions tend not to generate much immediate controversy (perhaps because they stay close to the status quo), over time they may become less reasonable as suburban populations continue to grow. If these growth patterns continue, in future it may be preferable to draw a more natural east-west or north-south split through the City of Guelph.


GUELPH’s new southern boundary will be along Hanlon Parkway, Hanlon’s Creek, and Arkell Road, with areas south of this line being in WELLINGTON—HALTON HILLS NORTH.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Halton, Guelph, and Wellington’s final districts are shown in Table 11C.


Table 11C – Halton, Guelph, and Wellington Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Burlington	125,435	+7.59%
Burlington North—Milton West	125,575	+7.71%
Guelph	118,498	+1.64%
Milton East—Halton Hills South	116,592	0.00%
Oakville East	108,735	-6.74%
Oakville West	105,024	-9.92%
Wellington—Halton Hills North	105,440	-9.56%
Average	115,043	-1.33%
Range (most populous to least populous)	20,551	17.63 pp

pp = percentage points

Hamilton and Niagara







The population of Hamilton and Niagara grew by 10.1%, from 951,295 in 2011 to 1,047,294 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.7% in the same period.

The existing nine electoral districts in this geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 116,366, which falls just 0.2% below the Quota. However, the Commission noted the unacceptably high range of deviation (42.4 percentage points) between the least and most populous districts. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing districts are shown in Table 12A.

Table 12A – Hamilton and Niagara Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Flamborough—Glanbrook	97,081	-8.60%	125,692	+7.81%
Hamilton Centre	101,932	-4.03%	106,439	-8.71%
Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	107,786	+1.48%	112,028	-3.91%
Hamilton Mountain	103,615	-2.45%	107,629	-7.69%
Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas	109,535	+3.13%	117,565	+0.84%
Niagara Centre	105,860	-0.33%	119,809	+2.76%
Niagara Falls	128,357	+20.85%	146,404	+25.57%
Niagara West	86,533	-18.53%	96,946	-16.85%
St. Catharines	110,596	+4.13%	114,782	-1.55%
Average	105,699	-0.48%	116,366	-0.19%
Range (most populous to least populous)	41,824	39.38 pp	49,458	42.42 pp

pp = percentage points

In preparing the proposed redistribution plan, the Commission noted unreasonable variations in the population size of the existing districts of Niagara Falls and Niagara West. Significant adjustments were required to achieve population equality, with resulting impacts on contiguous areas. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 12B.

Table 12B – Hamilton and Niagara Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Flamborough—Glanbrook	114,701	-1.62%
Hamilton Centre	123,520	+5.94%
Hamilton Mountain	115,634	-0.82%
Hamilton—Stoney Creek—Grimsby Lakeshore	121,709	+4.39%
Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas	120,551	+3.40%
Niagara Falls	113,503	-2.65%
Niagara South	112,928	-3.14%
Niagara West	118,158	+1.34%

Table 12B – Hamilton and Niagara Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
St. Catharines	119,873	+2.82%
Average	117,842	+1.07%
Range (most populous to least populous)	10,592	9.08 pp

pp = percentage points

There was support for the Commission’s proposal to place Niagara Falls and Niagara-on-the-Lake together in the same district. It was suggested that this riding be renamed NIAGARA NORTH. The Commission agreed that this suggested name was a more inclusive descriptor.

The Commission received many submissions to recognize the advocacy, collaboration, connectivity and synergy of the Welland Canal communities and that Welland, Thorold (which the Commission had proposed be part of Niagara West), Port Colborne and Fort Erie should be placed together in NIAGARA SOUTH. It was stated that the importance of the Welland Canal to the community identity of Thorold, both historically since Confederation and currently, cannot be underestimated. The Commission concluded that the demonstrated north/south economic development resulting from the canal communities’ aligned representation should be preserved. Thus, these suggestions were implemented.

There was a submission from an elected representative to include Fort Erie within the newly renamed NIAGARA NORTH riding, however such an inclusion created an unreasonably large deviation from Quota and other submissions supported the placement of Fort Erie with the other canal communities.

While the Commission received submissions in support of the proposed boundaries for the district of ST. CATHARINES, it was suggested that the neighbourhood of Western Hill be returned to the district. However, this would result in an unreasonably large disparity between the variances of the adjacent districts of ST. CATHARINES and NIAGARA WEST. The proposal to shift Western Hill into NIAGARA WEST is thus maintained.

The Commission also received submissions to keep Brock University within a single district. The southern boundary of the ST. CATHARINES district has therefore been adjusted to include all of the Brock University campus, as it was clear that the orientation of the University was toward this district and to the City of St. Catharines.

In NIAGARA WEST, several people raised objections to the inclusion of Thorold and Dunnville into this district. It was argued that Thorold’s industrial and urban nature made it a better fit with the Welland Canal communities rather than the rural and agricultural communities in NIAGARA WEST. Arguments were also made that the interests of Dunnville are better aligned with other communities along the Grand River than with those of NIAGARA WEST, and that the boundary

between Haldimand County and the Township of Wainfleet should be respected as much as possible. The Commission found these arguments persuasive and acceded to both requests.

The Commission also accepted the many submissions that portions of the Town of Grimsby not be divided as proposed. Many of these submissions, including one from the Mayor of Grimsby, pointed out the strong ties of identity and history between Grimsby and the Niagara region. All of Grimsby is now retained in the existing district of NIAGARA WEST.

In the Hamilton area, the Commission's proposal had made minor boundary adjustments to achieve voter parity. These changes, other than including portions of Grimsby within the proposed district of Hamilton—Stoney Creek—Grimsby Lakeshore were generally supported.

With the removal of Grimsby, the district is returned to the name HAMILTON EAST—STONEY CREEK. Given the need to gain more population, the southern boundary of this district is shifted further south to the powerline. Specifically, the area that lies between the powerline and the edge of the escarpment, bounded on the west by Glover Road and on the east by Upper Centennial Parkway is added to HAMILTON EAST—STONEY CREEK. This added area (taken from the more rural district of Flamborough—Glanbrook) is relatively suburban and urban in character, and its population demographics are fairly similar to those of HAMILTON EAST—STONEY CREEK.

While these adjustments respect the Town of Grimsby's alignment to the Niagara Region rather than to the City of Hamilton, they in turn create a need to gain additional population for the district of Flamborough—Glanbrook. To solve this problem, and to respond to a series of objections to the Commission's proposal impacting the Counties of Brant and Oxford, the boundaries of the existing district of Flamborough—Glanbrook are extended west to the Brant-Oxford County Line, encompassing the communities of Paris and St. George. This district is renamed FLAMBOROUGH—GLANBROOK—BRANT NORTH. The discussion of Paris, St. George, and the remainder of Brant County is continued in the *South Central Ontario* section.

The Commission recognizes that this is a relatively significant set of changes to make after the proposal phase, however these adjustments best respond to the legitimate concerns made in submissions regarding the Hamilton and Niagara region.

HAMILTON—MOUNTAIN and HAMILTON WEST—ANCASTER—DUNDAS have received no changes since the proposal. HAMILTON CENTRE has received one modification. The boundary with HAMILTON EAST—STONEY CREEK on Walter Avenue and Strathearne Avenue has been moved to Parkdale Avenue, making for a simple, clear boundary.


The resulting deviations are wider than the Commission had originally proposed; however, the submissions to make the changes described were compelling. The submissions demonstrated that effective representation required these deviations from absolute voter parity.


The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Hamilton and Niagara’s final districts are shown in Table 12C.


Table 12C – Hamilton and Niagara Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North	103,836	-10.94%
Hamilton Centre	126,188	+8.23%
Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	126,570	+8.56%
Hamilton Mountain	115,634	-0.82%
Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas	120,551	+3.40%
Niagara North	113,503	-2.65%
Niagara South	132,396	+13.56%
Niagara West	112,065	-3.88%
St. Catharines	119,977	+2.91%
Average	118,969	+2.04%
Range (most populous to least populous)	28,560	24.50 pp

pp = percentage points

South Central Ontario







The population of South Central Ontario grew by 13.1%, from 857,968 in 2011 to 970,608 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.5% in the same period.

The existing eight electoral districts in South Central Ontario would have an average 2021 population of 121,326 and an average deviation of 4.1% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 28.3 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 13A.

Table 13A – South Central Ontario Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brantford—Brant	132,443	+24.69%	140,139	+20.20%
Cambridge	111,693	+5.16%	121,301	+4.04%
Haldimand—Norfolk	108,051	+1.73%	116,706	+0.10%
Kitchener Centre	102,433	-3.56%	113,452	-2.69%
Kitchener—Conestoga	93,827	-11.66%	107,134	-8.11%
Kitchener South—Hespeler	97,673	-8.04%	119,851	+2.80%
Oxford	108,656	+2.30%	124,790	+7.03%
Waterloo	103,192	-2.85%	127,235	+9.13%
Average	107,246	+0.97%	121,326	+4.06%
Range (most populous to least populous)	38,616	36.35 pp	33,005	28.31 pp

pp = percentage points

In preparing the proposed redistribution plan, the Commission noted the significant deviation from the Quota in the prior redistribution in the existing district of Brantford—Brant. A reduced geographic size of this district was thus proposed in order to balance populations. This resulted in several communities in this area being re-assigned to other districts.

Additionally, in the interest of achieving voter parity, a series of boundary changes was proposed in the districts surrounding Kitchener, Waterloo, and Cambridge. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 13B.

Table 13B – South Central Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brantford	118,167	+1.35%
Cambridge	122,099	+4.73%
Haldimand—Norfolk—Six Nations	122,813	+5.34%
Kitchener Centre	114,595	-1.71%
Kitchener—Conestoga	114,856	-1.49%
Kitchener South—North Dumfries	114,179	-2.07%
Oxford—Brant	124,844	+7.08%
Waterloo	121,436	+4.16%

Table 13B – South Central Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Average	119,124	+2.17%
Range (most populous to least populous)	10,665	9.15 pp

pp = percentage points

Public submissions endorsed some aspects of these proposals. However, there were strong objections to the transfer of several towns into districts that did not align with their county seats. Fortunately, many of these issues could be addressed by a set of more-or-less reciprocal population transfers among districts.

The Commission has revised its proposal in order to keep the boundaries of the district of OXFORD aligned with Oxford County boundaries, thus retaining Tillsonburg in the district as requested by the County and the Town of Tillsonburg to maintain their advocacy partnership. The final district of OXFORD will be very similar to the existing district of Oxford, with the exceptions of the parts located in the County of Brant which have been added to BRANTFORD—BRANT SOUTH—SIX NATIONS.

The population of the County of Brant and the City of Brantford are too large to be contained in a single electoral district. The combined populations of Brant and Brantford would have an unreasonably high deviation of 24% above the Quota, so requests to keep this county whole could not be accommodated.

The Commission had proposed to split Brantford and Brant into east and west halves, with the western half (including the communities of Paris, Burford, and Scotland) joining with Oxford County in Oxford—Brant.

The Commission received much feedback from the communities of Burford and Paris. These submissions objected to being removed from the City of Brantford, with which they claim to have strong social and economic ties. They also objected to being added to a district primarily based on Oxford County with a population centre in Woodstock and Ingersoll. Based on this feedback, the Commission has significantly altered the proposed plan for Brantford and the County of Brant.

The Commission has returned Burford to within county lines, restoring it and the remainder of southwestern Brant County to the district of BRANTFORD—BRANT SOUTH—SIX NATIONS.

However, the population of Paris (at approximately 15,000) is too large to accommodate within that district. It has been shifted, together with the northern portions of Brant County, into the district of FLAMBOROUGH—GLANBROOK—BRANT NORTH.

The town of Paris will carry greater demographic weight within this district, compared to the Commission's initial proposal that placed Paris in a district dominated by Oxford County and a population centred in Woodstock.

This solution is also consistent with a submission received from the Council of the County of Brant, which suggested that the Commission examine a north-south split and requested that any split be drawn to match ward boundaries. Wards one, two and three have been placed in FLAMBOROUGH—GLANBROOK—BRANT NORTH, while Wards four and five are in BRANTFORD—BRANT SOUTH—SIX NATIONS.

The proposal had shifted the Six Nations of the Grand River and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nations out of the existing district of Brantford—Brant and into the proposed district of Haldimand—Norfolk—Six Nations. One oversight in this proposal was that the Woodland Cultural Centre (established on the site of the former Mohawk Institute Residential School and serving as a significant cultural heritage centre for the Haudenosaunee people) is situated within the City of Brantford, some distance from the main reserve. Returning the two First Nations to the district of BRANTFORD—BRANT SOUTH—SIX NATIONS resolves this error. It also better reflects the historical alignment of these communities with the City of Brantford, which we were advised is much stronger than their alignment with Caledonia.

These adjustments facilitate restoring Dunnville to the district of HALDIMAND—NORFOLK, rather than putting it across the county line in the NIAGARA WEST district. The Commission had received several submissions about this issue. These modifications return HALDIMAND—NORFOLK to its existing boundaries.

In the Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge areas, the Commission heard support for its proposal to transfer the Bridgeport area from the district of WATERLOO into KITCHENER—CENTRE.

Suggestions were also made to re-join the historically aligned communities of Forest Hills and Forest Heights, which had been divided in the prior redistribution, as well as to return the community of Rosenberg to KITCHENER—CONESTOGA. Both these requests could be satisfied while balancing populations.

The Commission had intended to better unify the various parts of the City of Cambridge; however, through submissions the Commission learned that keeping each of the distinct communities of Cambridge whole was a greater priority. In particular, the Commission heard strong objections to the division of Hespeler. Whereas the proposal endeavoured to reunite most of Hespeler within Cambridge (effectively dissolving the district of Kitchener South—Hespeler), the Commission was told that it made no sense to transfer the established urban portion of Hespeler that lies north of the Mill Pond into the more expansive rural district of Kitchener—Conestoga. Hearing this message repeatedly both from elected representatives and residents of North Hespeler, and from rural residents in various parts of Kitchener—Conestoga, the Commission has heeded this recommendation. To keep Hespeler united, the Commission has thus maintained the district of KITCHENER SOUTH—HESPELER, which reflects the Commission's retention of the original name, an issue that was raised by elected representatives and many residents.

With Hespeler now fully removed from CAMBRIDGE, the Commission can satisfy the request of the Township and residents of North Dumfries to be returned to the district, respecting that it is a key partner community with the City of Cambridge. Whereas the proposal had divided the City of Cambridge across three districts, this has now been reduced to two. The final district of CAMBRIDGE is the same as the existing district, with the exception of those areas that were within the County of Brant, which are transferred to FLAMBOROUGH—GLANBROOK—BRANT NORTH.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for South Central Ontario’s final districts are shown in Table 13C.

Table 13C – South Central Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations	121,511	+4.22%
Cambridge	119,493	+2.49%
Haldimand—Norfolk	116,706	+0.10%
Kitchener Centre	113,404	-2.73%
Kitchener—Conestoga	112,981	-3.10%
Kitchener South—Hespeler	119,851	+2.80%
Oxford	121,781	+4.45%
Waterloo	121,436	+4.16%
Average	118,395	+1.55%
Range (most populous to least populous)	8,800	7.55 pp


pp = percentage points

Southwestern Ontario

Southwestern Ontario - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

Southwestern Ontario - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

Southwestern Ontario - Final Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario



For more detailed maps, please consult the maps in the appendix or the Online Map Viewer.

The population of Southwestern Ontario grew by 11.1%, from 782,285 in 2011 to 869,137 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.6% in the same period.

The existing seven electoral districts in this geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 124,162 and an average deviation of 6.5% from the Quota. The absolute range between the least and most populous districts would be 24.1 percentage points. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 14A.

Table 14A – Southwestern Ontario Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Elgin—Middlesex—London	110,109	+3.67%	126,428	+8.44%
Huron—Bruce	104,842	-1.29%	112,929	-3.14%
Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	105,919	-0.28%	111,242	-4.59%
London—Fanshawe	119,334	+12.35%	127,068	+8.99%
London North Centre	118,079	+11.17%	138,255	+18.58%
London West	119,090	+12.12%	139,305	+19.48%
Perth—Wellington	104,912	-1.23%	113,910	-2.30%
Average	111,755	+5.22%	124,162	+6.49%
Range (most populous to least populous)	14,492	13.64 pp	28,063	24.07 pp

pp = percentage points

With respect to the proposed redistribution plan for Southwestern Ontario, the Commission noted that the three existing and largely urban districts within the City of London are underrepresented with populations that are 9%, 18.6% and 19.5% above the Quota. Consequently, considerable redrawing was required. The boundaries of these three districts were reconfigured to better balance populations with adjacent and more rural districts. The southern part of the City of London and the northern part of the City of St. Thomas were both included in the proposed district of London South—St. Thomas.

In the more northern part of the City of London, the boundaries of London West and London Centre (the existing district of London North Centre) were modestly changed. The boundaries of the existing district of London—Fanshawe are shifted to the east, and this proposed district was renamed London Northeast.

In the southern portion of this geographic piece, the newly named proposed district of Elgin—Middlesex—Thames was extended from Kent Bridge Road (County Road 15) in Chatham-Kent at its western edge, and wrapped around the City of London along the east. This proposed district comprised portions of the existing districts of Elgin—Middlesex—London and Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

In the northern portion of this geographic piece, the proposed districts of Perth—Wellington and the newly named South Huron Shores (the existing district of Huron—Bruce) had received minor changes.

Many of these proposed districts were renamed to, in the belief of the Commission, better describe their locations and reflect their communities of interest. The populations and deviations from Quota of the proposed districts are shown in Table 14B.

Table 14B – Southwestern Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Elgin—Middlesex—Thames	117,082	+0.42%
London Centre	123,531	+5.95%
London Northeast	123,241	+5.70%
London South—St. Thomas	120,208	+3.10%
London West	121,199	+3.95%
Perth—Wellington	117,974	+1.19%
South Huron Shores	118,316	+1.48%
Average	120,222	+3.11%
Range (most populous to least populous)	6,449	5.53 pp

pp = percentage points

The Commission received many submissions concerning this geographic piece from residents, municipalities, counties, agricultural associations, the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus, and elected representatives. There were two major themes across these submissions.

First, the Commission was urged to restore three primarily urban districts in London, as opposed to the two urban districts and two urban-rural mixed districts contemplated in the proposal.

Secondly, many submissions suggested that municipalities and counties should be maintained whole within a single electoral district to preserve their effective and cohesive representation. These submissions were made by municipal leaders and supported by individuals, business organizations, and not-for-profit entities, such as the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus and various agricultural federations.

For the final districts, the Commission has generated a new map that meets these goals. London will receive three compact urban districts that are similar in layout to the existing districts. Rural districts in both Southwestern Ontario and Southernmost Ontario have been drawn to largely match county boundaries (as was generally done across all of rural Ontario).

The proposed districts of London South—St. Thomas and Elgin—Middlesex—Thames received much criticism for their division of municipalities, the division of Elgin County, and the joining of the City of St. Thomas with urban portions of London.

The County of Elgin, an upper-tier municipality, expressed concern that under the proposed redistribution plan, two of its seven constituent municipalities, namely the Municipality of Central Elgin and the Township of Southwold, were split between two federal districts. The County made a persuasive case, supported by submissions from the Township of Southwold and the

Municipality of Central Elgin. There was further support for this reconfiguration from the Town of Aylmer with its shared local identity with these communities, from the Municipality of Dutton/Dunwich with its partnership through Elgin County with the City of St. Thomas, and from the Municipality of Bayham which coordinates efforts with Elgin County and the City of St. Thomas.

The Commission also heard that St. Thomas's interests are aligned with the more rural character of Elgin County and not the City of London.

The Commission recognized that placing the whole of the County of Elgin in one district along with the City of St. Thomas respected communities of interest and preserved relationships fostering effective representation.

The final district of ELGIN—ST. THOMAS—LONDON SOUTH encompasses the entirety of the County of Elgin, the City of St. Thomas, and the portions of the City of London south of Southdale Road, Exeter Road, and Highway 401. This represents the less urban areas within the City of London's boundaries, including the community of Lambeth. This portion of London was part of the existing district of Elgin—Middlesex—London, providing for historical continuity.

The Commission heard similar arguments from municipalities within the County of Middlesex. The County of Middlesex and its residents expressed concern that under the proposed redistribution plan the County was divided into five districts creating issues of engagement with, and access to, elected representatives and diluting rural influence. One of the eight local municipalities within the County, the Municipality of Thames Centre, was divided among four districts in the proposal.

The final district of MIDDLESEX—LONDON has been created in response to these concerns. This district encompasses the entirety of the County of Middlesex, including the whole of the Municipality of Thames Centre and the other seven municipalities within the County.

The final district of MIDDLESEX—LONDON also includes a portion of the City of London north of Fanshawe Park Road. While the Commission endeavoured to keep the urban areas of London in three distinctly urban districts, it was impossible to meet this goal in full. Middlesex County has a population of approximately 78,000, which would have a deviation of -33%. At the same time, the three existing urban London districts had a population of 404,628, giving the three districts an average deviation of 16% above Quota. By shifting some of urban London into MIDDLESEX—LONDON, the Commission was able to achieve a deviation of -0.8% for MIDDLESEX—LONDON and an average of 5% for the three London districts.

As noted above, with respect to districts in the City of London, the Commission received several complaints focused on the creation of mixed urban-rural districts which, it was argued, would diminish representation of both urban and rural voters.

The three existing urban districts in London have largely been restored, with changes to bring them as close as reasonably possible to the Quota while respecting neighbourhoods and community boundaries. However, as discussed above, certain parts of London needed to be moved into MIDDLESEX—LONDON. The Commission has drawn the northern boundary for London's three urban districts at Fanshawe Park Road. Approximately 37,000 residents of London have been moved into MIDDLESEX—LONDON, giving the residents considerable demographic weight.

In addition to the northern area discussed above, LONDON WEST's southeastern boundary has been drawn on Wharncliffe Road, keeping Wortley Village in LONDON CENTRE. There were different submissions on exactly where the Commission should draw this boundary. We heard many submissions about the importance of Wortley Village, Manor Park, and Berkshire Village. Ultimately, the Commission chose to draw it on Wharncliffe Road because it is a clear boundary that avoids splitting any of these neighbourhoods.

LONDON CENTRE's northern boundary has been placed on Fanshawe Park Road, as previously discussed. The eastern and western boundaries have been put back to Highbury Avenue and Wonderland Road, as they were in the existing boundaries. This has ensured that the Old East Village has remained wholly within this district, as was requested by several submitters. A large portion of LONDON CENTRE's southern boundary has been moved southward, bringing the neighbourhood of Wortley Village into the district.

The proposed district of London Northeast has been re-drawn to a district that closely resembles the existing district of London—Fanshawe, with the only exception being the previously discussed section north of Fanshawe Park Road. In light of this, the Commission has chosen to restore the existing name of LONDON—FANSHAWE. The Commission received several submissions requesting the preservation of this name, noting that this has been a district name for decades.

The City of Stratford supported the proposed boundaries for the riding of PERTH—WELLINGTON and observed that it was of vital importance that the City of Stratford, the County of Perth and the Town of St. Marys be in the same district given their long history of integration and cooperation and their social and economic intertwinement. There was also support for the retention of Municipality of North Perth and northern Wellington County in the same district.

One change has been made to the proposed district of PERTH—WELLINGTON. The Township of Howick has been moved into South Huron Shores (renamed HURON—BRUCE). PERTH—WELLINGTON's boundaries now match the existing district boundaries.

In relation to the proposed district of South Huron Shores, the Commission received criticism for ignoring county limits, and also for its proposed name on the basis that such a name was not descriptive of the whole district. The Commission found these submissions reasonable and reverted to the original district name HURON—BRUCE.

HURON—BRUCE has been returned to its existing boundaries. By returning to its existing boundaries, the municipalities of Huron County have been united. The southern boundary has been shifted northward to the Huron County limit and the Township of Howick has been returned to the district.

The County of Huron, along with the Municipality of Central Huron, the Township of North Huron and the Municipality of Morris-Turnberry supported the request of the Township of Howick to be realigned with the County given its common concerns, partnerships and shared services with all of the other lower-tier municipalities in the County.

The Municipalities of Brockton and South Bruce also opposed its proposed alignment with Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound and sought to remain in what has been named the HURON—BRUCE district. This aligns them with several other municipalities in Bruce County. The Commission implemented this request focused on preserving that community’s representational relationships.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Southwestern Ontario’s final districts are shown in Table 14C.

Table 14C – Southwestern Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Elgin—St. Thomas—London South	112,448	-3.55%
Huron—Bruce	112,929	-3.14%
London Centre	126,597	+8.58%
London—Fanshawe	126,286	+8.32%
London West	114,374	-1.90%
Middlesex—London	115,610	-0.84%
Perth—Wellington	113,929	-2.28%
Average	117,453	+0.74%
Range (most populous to least populous)	14,149	12.13 pp


pp = percentage points

Southernmost Ontario

Southernmost Ontario - Existing Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.


Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario




Southernmost Ontario - Proposed Districts

Labels show deviation from the 2022 Quota.

Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario





The population of the southernmost part of Ontario grew by 6.1%, from 573,137 in 2011 to 608,347 in 2021. The remainder of Ontario grew by 10.9% in the same period.

The existing five electoral districts in this geographic piece would have an average 2021 population of 121,669 and an average deviation of 4.4% above the Quota. As indicated by the deviation range (23.7 percentage points), there are substantial disparities in the population size of districts. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the existing electoral districts are shown in Table 15A.

Table 15A – Southernmost Ontario Existing Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2011	Deviation from Quota – 2012	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Chatham-Kent—Leamington	111,866	+5.32%	113,654	-2.52%
Essex	120,477	+13.43%	134,656	+15.50%
Sarnia—Lambton	106,293	+0.07%	107,077	-8.16%
Windsor—Tecumseh	115,528	+8.77%	122,798	+5.32%
Windsor West	118,973	+12.01%	130,162	+11.64%
Average	114,627	+7.92%	121,669	+4.36%
Range (most populous to least populous)	14,184	13.36 pp	27,579	23.66 pp

pp = percentage points

In the proposed redistribution plan for Southernmost Ontario, the Commission aimed to reduce the significant population disparities among districts. This necessitated shifting the boundary of the existing district of Essex westward to reduce its population size. The community of Kingsville was incorporated into the proposed district of Chatham-Kent—Leamington—Kingsville. The communities of Wallaceburg and Dresden and the Walpole Island First Nation were added to the proposed district of Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong. The boundaries of the proposed districts of Windsor West and Windsor—Tecumseh were adjusted to balance population equality. The populations and deviations from the Quota for the proposed districts are shown in Table 15B.

Table 15B – Southernmost Ontario Proposed Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Chatham-Kent—Leamington—Kingsville	128,045	+9.83%
Essex	120,132	+3.04%
Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong	127,200	+9.10%
Windsor—Tecumseh	122,533	+5.10%
Windsor West	126,695	+8.67%
Average	124,921	+7.15%
Range (most populous to least populous)	7,913	6.79 pp

pp = percentage points

The Municipality of Chatham-Kent, a single tier municipality, expressed concern that it was being split from two into three districts. In this final plan, the Commission has reconfigured the boundaries so that the Municipality of Chatham-Kent is within one district. Leamington and Pelee Island have also been placed in this district, as they were in the existing boundaries. This reinforces effective representation of these communities. The name of this district has been returned to the existing name of CHATHAM-KENT—LEAMINGTON.

With respect to the Windsor districts, there were many submissions requesting that communities of interest be preserved and that historical patterns be respected. The Commission found these submissions persuasive and has revised the redistribution plan accordingly.

WINDSOR WEST has been returned to its existing boundaries. The Commission received submissions that the proposed southwestern boundary on Huron Church Road and the E.C. Row Expressway was not optimal because it needlessly cut off part of the city. The eastern boundary is also returned to its original boundary, based on submissions suggesting that the Walkerville neighbourhood should be returned to WINDSOR—TECUMSEH.

The boundary for WINDSOR—TECUMSEH has also been changed to include all of the Town of Tecumseh, as it was in the existing boundary. The eastern boundary is also pushed eastward to the Puce River; this satisfies the interests of population equality and is a clear and distinct boundary.

ESSEX has been re-configured based on these changes. This reconfiguration facilitates the Town of Kingsville remaining within the ESSEX district, pursuant to many submissions including from the Town of Kingsville itself. The eastern portion of the Municipality of Lakeshore has been moved into the district. The district of ESSEX has been drawn to match Essex County as much as possible, but with a population of approximately 193,000, this could not be fully achieved.

The district of SARNIA—LAMBTON—BKEJWANONG has received significant change. It has been re-drawn to match Lambton County, as was suggested in several submissions. This is generally consistent with the Commission's approach in rural Ontario to maintain the cohesiveness of upper-tier municipalities and to preserve effective representation.

The Commission also received multiple submissions about the negative impact on effective representation with the proposed division of the Township of Dawn-Euphemia. This included a submission from the municipality itself. Under the final boundaries, Dawn-Euphemia has been maintained wholly within SARNIA—LAMBTON—BKEJWANONG.

Walpole Island First Nation and Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation remain together in this new district, along with Aamjiwnaang First Nation. The Commission notes that the Aamjiwnaang First Nation and Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation are both members of the Southern First Nations Secretariat Tribal Council.

The Commission notes that the deviations from the Quota in this geographic piece are especially high. The Commission has concluded that geographic considerations and the need for effective representation warrants these deviations. The relatively fewer choices for boundary options on a peninsula, combined with the desire to keep lower-tier and upper-tier municipalities together, makes this plan reasonable. However, this will need to be re-assessed in the future, as the population in this geographic piece shifts.

The names, populations and deviations from the Quota for Southernmost Ontario's final districts are shown in Table 15C.

Table 15C – Southernmost Ontario Final Electoral Districts		
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022
Chatham-Kent—Leamington	134,226	+15.13%
Essex	131,691	+12.95%
Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong	128,154	+9.92%
Windsor—Tecumseh	131,097	+12.44%
Windsor West	130,162	+11.64%
Average	131,066	+12.42%
Range (most populous to least populous)	6,072	5.21 pp

pp = percentage points

Summary

The Commission's final redistribution plan reflects the following:

Final Electoral Districts			
Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022	Area (km ²)
Ajax	126,666	+8.64%	67
Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke	107,420	-7.87%	11,475
Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	117,750	+0.99%	96
Barrie North—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	115,495	-0.94%	1,156
Barrie South—Innisfil	120,378	+3.25%	331
Bay of Quinte	110,164	-5.51%	1,441
Beaches—East York	109,359	-6.20%	17
Bowmanville—Oshawa North	128,534	+10.24%	393
Brampton Centre	109,450	-6.12%	30
Brampton—Chinguacousy Park	115,568	-0.88%	37
Brampton East	119,214	+2.25%	81
Brampton North—Caledon	106,762	-8.43%	152
Brampton South	113,252	-2.86%	55
Brampton West	114,260	-2.00%	38
Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations	121,511	+4.22%	899
Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	113,348	-2.78%	6,125
Burlington	125,435	+7.59%	76
Burlington North—Milton West	125,575	+7.71%	377
Cambridge	119,493	+2.49%	257
Carleton	124,416	+6.71%	1,881
Chatham-Kent—Leamington	134,226	+15.13%	2,790
Davenport	125,048	+7.25%	15
Don Valley North	111,122	-4.69%	27

Final Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022	Area (km ²)
Don Valley South	121,147	+3.91%	33
Dufferin—Caledon	120,812	+3.62%	2,059
Eglinton—Lawrence	115,832	-0.65%	23
Elgin—St. Thomas—London South	112,448	-3.55%	2,060
Essex	131,691	+12.95%	1,255
Etobicoke Centre	125,606	+7.73%	38
Etobicoke—Lakeshore	120,956	+3.74%	36
Etobicoke North	116,886	+0.25%	49
Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North	103,836	-10.94%	1,099
Guelph	118,498	+1.64%	65
Haldimand—Norfolk	116,706	+0.10%	2,862
Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes	119,150	+2.20%	9,063
Hamilton Centre	126,188	+8.23%	43
Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	126,570	+8.56%	71
Hamilton Mountain	115,634	-0.82%	38
Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas	120,551	+3.40%	101
Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga	106,468	-8.68%	8,589
Humber River—Black Creek	111,593	-4.29%	31
Huron—Bruce	112,929	-3.14%	5,624
Kanata	121,458	+4.18%	213
Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk	93,948	-19.42%	269,356
Kenora—Kiiwetinoong	61,962	-46.85%	258,813
Kingston and the Islands	134,415	+15.29%	629
King—Vaughan	123,226	+5.69%	417
Kitchener Centre	113,404	-2.73%	49
Kitchener—Conestoga	112,981	-3.10%	903
Kitchener South—Hespeler	119,851	+2.80%	106
Lanark—Frontenac	103,120	-11.55%	6,202
Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes	104,075	-10.73%	3,372
London Centre	126,597	+8.58%	50

Final Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022	Area (km ²)
London—Fanshawe	126,286	+8.32%	108
London West	114,374	-1.90%	63
Manitoulin—Nickel Belt	99,827	-14.38%	32,640
Markham—Stouffville	120,845	+3.65%	79
Markham—Thornhill	111,087	-4.72%	59
Markham—Unionville	116,972	+0.33%	82
Middlesex—London	115,610	-0.84%	2,941
Milton East—Halton Hills South	116,592	0.00%	244
Mississauga Centre	124,084	+6.43%	23
Mississauga East—Cooksville	120,196	+3.09%	31
Mississauga—Erin Mills	120,241	+3.13%	32
Mississauga—Lakeshore	119,936	+2.87%	61
Mississauga—Malton	119,741	+2.70%	101
Mississauga—Streetsville	113,763	-2.42%	46
Nepean	122,229	+4.84%	81
Newmarket—Aurora	117,699	+0.95%	54
New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury	120,533	+3.38%	768
Niagara North	113,503	-2.65%	344
Niagara South	132,396	+13.56%	453
Niagara West	112,065	-3.88%	1,002
Nipissing—Timiskaming	98,237	-15.74%	16,793
Northumberland—Clarke	106,574	-8.59%	2,212
Oakville East	108,735	-6.74%	72
Oakville West	105,024	-9.92%	68
Orléans	126,662	+8.64%	62
Oshawa	131,067	+12.42%	61
Ottawa Centre	126,560	+8.55%	36
Ottawa South	126,791	+8.75%	97
Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester	127,255	+9.15%	55
Ottawa West—Nepean	128,592	+10.29%	44
Oxford	121,781	+4.45%	2,046

Final Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022	Area (km ²)
Parry Sound—Muskoka	104,504	-10.37%	12,551
Perth—Wellington	113,929	-2.28%	3,586
Peterborough	128,349	+10.09%	1,908
Pickering—Brooklin	122,430	+5.01%	291
Prescott—Russell—Cumberland	109,125	-6.40%	2,341
Richmond Hill South	124,748	+7.00%	44
Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong	128,154	+9.92%	3,020
Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma	113,772	-2.42%	40,066
Scarborough—Agincourt	123,969	+6.33%	27
Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East	111,377	-4.47%	30
Scarborough—Guildwood—Rouge Park	114,100	-2.14%	60
Scarborough North	116,177	-0.35%	35
Scarborough Southwest	123,232	+5.70%	30
Scarborough—Woburn	110,589	-5.15%	24
Simcoe—Grey	107,836	-7.51%	1,591
Simcoe North	112,022	-3.92%	1,587
Spadina—Harbourfront	105,739	-9.31%	11
St. Catharines	119,977	+2.91%	63
Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry	114,637	-1.68%	3,320
Sudbury	114,384	-1.89%	924
Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park	117,873	+1.10%	18
Thunder Bay—Rainy River	82,357	-29.36%	32,688
Thunder Bay—Superior North	86,147	-26.11%	132,054
Toronto Centre	121,703	+4.39%	6
Toronto—Danforth	105,472	-9.54%	20
Toronto—St. Paul's	125,438	+7.59%	16
University—Rosedale	123,244	+5.71%	13
Vaughan—Thornhill	124,866	+7.10%	67
Vaughan—Woodbridge	121,705	+4.39%	88
Waterloo	121,436	+4.16%	64
Wellington—Halton Hills North	105,440	-9.56%	1,372

Final Electoral Districts

Electoral Districts	Population – 2021	Deviation from Quota – 2022	Area (km ²)
Whitby	115,257	-1.14%	88
Willowdale	118,218	+1.40%	20
Windsor—Tecumseh	131,097	+12.44%	220
Windsor West	130,162	+11.64%	79
York Centre	108,307	-7.10%	35
York—Durham	116,560	-0.03%	1,823
York South—Weston—Etobicoke	111,369	-4.48%	24

*The land area figures mentioned in the table and elsewhere in the report are preliminary calculations and will be reviewed and certified after the proclamation of the Representation Order.

This plan and the accompanying report will be presented to the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada to be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Commons for consideration.


After Parliament has considered the report in accordance with the provisions of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, it is returned to the Commission with any objections, the minutes, and evidence of the House of Commons committee. Once the objections have been addressed, a certified copy of our report shall be returned by the Chief Electoral Officer to the Speaker.

Once the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada has received the final reports of all Commissions, a representation order is prepared describing and naming the electoral districts established by all Commissions.


The Governor in Council announces the new boundaries in a proclamation published in the Canada Gazette.

New boundaries can first be used in an election if at least seven months have passed between the date that the representation order was proclaimed and the date that Parliament is dissolved for a general election.


Respectfully submitted and dated at our respective locations, in the Province of Ontario, this 8th day of February 2023.



 The Honourable Justice Lynne C. Leitch, Chair



 Dr. Karen Bird, Member



 Dr. Peter Loewen, Member

Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario

APPENDIX – Maps, Boundaries and Names of Electoral Districts

There shall be in the Province of Ontario one hundred and twenty-two (122) electoral districts, named and described as follows, each of which shall return one member. In the following descriptions:

- (a) references to “roads,” “electric power transmission lines,” “water features” and “railways” signify their centre lines unless otherwise described;
- (b) any reference to a “township” signifies a township that has its own local administration;
- (c) any reference to a “geographic township” signifies a township without local administration;
- (d) all cities, municipalities, towns, villages, Indian reserves and First Nations territories lying within the perimeter of the electoral district are included unless otherwise described;
- (e) wherever a word or expression is used to denote a territorial division, such word or expression shall indicate the territorial division as it existed or was delimited on the first day of January 2021;
- (f) the translation of the terms “street,” “avenue,” and “boulevard” follows Treasury Board standards; the translation of all other public thoroughfare designations is based on commonly used terms but has no official recognition; and
- (g) all coordinates are in reference to the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83).

The population figure of each electoral district is derived from the 2021 decennial census.

Ajax

(Population: 126,666)

(Map 9)

Consists of the Town of Ajax.

Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke

(Population: 107,420)

(Maps 2 and 4)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Pembroke;

(b) the towns of Arnprior, Deep River, Laurentian Hills, Petawawa and Renfrew;

(c) the townships of Admaston/Bromley; Bonnechere Valley; Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan; Greater Madawaska; Head, Clara and Maria; Horton; Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards; Laurentian Valley; Madawaska Valley; McNab/Braeside; North Algona Wilberforce; South Algonquin; and Whitewater Region;

(d) that part of the Unorganized Area of Nipissing (South Part) lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said unorganized area and the northerly limit of Nightingale Geographic Township; thence easterly along said limit and the northerly limit of Airy Geographic Township to the westerly limit of Preston Geographic Township; thence northerly along said limit and the westerly limit of the Geographic Township of Dickson to the southerly limit of Anglin Geographic Township; thence westerly and northerly along the southerly and westerly limits of said geographic township to the northerly limit of Freswick Geographic Township; thence westerly along said limit to the westerly limit of Lister Geographic Township; thence northerly and easterly along the westerly and northerly limits of said geographic township to the westerly limit of Deacon Geographic Township; thence northerly along said limit to the northerly limit of said unorganized area; and

(e) the Pikwakanagan Indian Reserve (formerly known as Golden Lake Indian Reserve No. 39).

Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill

(Population: 117,750)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Richmond Hill lying northerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Elgin Mills Road East; thence westerly along said road and Elgin Mills Road West to the westerly limit of said city (Bathurst Street); and

(b) that part of the Town of Aurora lying southerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said town and Wellington Street East; thence westerly along said street to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to the northerly limit of said town.

Barrie North—Springwater—Oro-Medonte

(Population: 115,495)

(Maps 3 and 5)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Barrie lying northerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said city and Dunlop Street West; thence easterly along said street to Tiffin Street; thence easterly along said street and its northeasterly production to the easterly limit of said city (Kempenfelt Bay); and

(b) the townships of Oro-Medonte and Springwater.

Barrie South—Innisfil

(Population: 120,378)

(Maps 3 and 5)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Barrie lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said city and Dunlop Street West; thence easterly along said street to Tiffin Street; thence easterly along said street and its northeasterly production to the easterly limit of said city (Kempenfelt Bay); and

(b) the Town of Innisfil.

Bay of Quinte

(Population: 110,164)

(Maps 4 and 6)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Belleville lying southerly of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway);

(b) that part of the City of Quinte West lying southwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northeasterly limit of said city (Wallbridge-Loyalist Road) and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence southwesterly along said highway to the Trent River; thence generally northerly along said river to the southwesterly production of Harrington Road; thence northeasterly along said production and Harrington Road to McMullen Road; thence northwesterly and southwesterly along said road to Collins Lane; thence northwesterly along said lane and Collins Road to Frankford Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Flyboy Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Fish and Game Club Road; thence southwesterly along said road and its production to the Trent River (west of Bata Island); thence generally northeasterly and generally southwesterly along said river to a point at approximate latitude 44°14'54"N and longitude 77°38'23"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to the northwesterly limit of said city; and

(c) the County of Prince Edward.

Beaches—East York

(Population: 109,359)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Sunrise Avenue and Victoria Park Avenue; thence generally southerly along Victoria Park Avenue to Queen Street East; thence westerly along said street to Nursewood Road; thence southerly along said road and its southerly production to the southerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); thence generally southwesterly along said limit to approximate latitude 43°38'54"N and longitude 79°18'51"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the mouth of Ashbridges Bay; thence generally northwesterly along said bay to its northerly shoreline at approximate latitude 43°39'43"N and longitude 79°18'55"W; thence northeasterly in a straight line to the intersection of Lake Shore Boulevard East and Coxwell Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Coxwell Boulevard; thence generally northeasterly along said boulevard and its production to Taylor Massey Creek; thence generally westerly along said creek to the Don River East Branch; thence generally northeasterly along said river to the westerly production of Sunrise Avenue; thence easterly along said production and Sunrise Avenue to the point of commencement.

Bowmanville—Oshawa North

(Population: 128,534)

(Map 9)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Oshawa lying northerly of Taunton Road West and Taunton Road East; and

(b) that part of the Municipality of Clarington lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said municipality and a point on Regional Road 20 at approximate latitude 44°03'33"N and longitude 78°41'20"W; thence southerly along said road to Concession Road 10; thence easterly along said road to Darlington-Clarke Townline Road; thence generally southeasterly along said road and its intermittent productions to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Highway of Heroes); thence easterly along said highway to Cobble Dick Road; thence southeasterly along said road and its southeasterly production to the southerly limit of said municipality (Lake Ontario).

Brampton Centre

(Population: 109,450)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Brampton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Bovaird Drive East and Highway 410; thence southeasterly along said highway to Etobicoke Creek; thence generally westerly along said creek to Steeles Avenue East; thence southwesterly along said avenue and Steeles Avenue West to McLaughlin Road South; thence northwesterly along said road and McLaughlin Road North to the Canadian National Railway; thence westerly along said railway to Chinguacousy Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Bovaird Drive West; thence northeasterly along said drive and Bovaird Drive East to the point of commencement.

Brampton—Chinguacousy Park

(Population: 115,568)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Brampton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Sandalwood Parkway East and Torbram Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the southeasterly limit of said city; thence generally southerly along said limit to Highway 410; thence generally northwesterly along said highway to Bovaird Drive East; thence northeasterly along said drive to Dixie Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Sandalwood Parkway East; thence northeasterly along said parkway to the point of commencement.

Brampton East

(Population: 119,214)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Brampton lying northeasterly of Torbram Road.

Brampton North—Caledon

(Population: 106,762)

(Map 16)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Brampton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northwesterly limit of said city (Mayfield Road) and Torbram Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Sandalwood Parkway East; thence southwesterly along said parkway to Dixie Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Bovaird Drive East; thence southwesterly along said drive to Hurontario Street; thence northwesterly along said street to Wanless Drive; thence southwesterly along said drive to the former Orangeville-Brampton Railway; thence northwesterly along said railway to the northwesterly limit of said city (Mayfield Road); thence generally northeasterly along said limit to the point of commencement; and

(b) that part of the Town of Caledon lying southeasterly and southwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said town (Winston Churchill Boulevard) and King Street; thence generally northeasterly along said street to The Gore Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the southeasterly limit of said town (Mayfield Road).

Brampton South

(Population: 113,252)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Brampton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 410 and the southeasterly limit of said city; thence southwesterly and northwesterly along the southeasterly and southwesterly limits of said city to Bovaird Drive West; thence northeasterly along said drive to Mississauga Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Williams Parkway; thence northeasterly and generally northerly along said parkway to Chinguacousy Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the Canadian National Railway; thence easterly along said railway to McLaughlin Road North; thence southeasterly along said road and McLaughlin Road South to Steeles Avenue West; thence northeasterly along said avenue and Steeles Avenue East to Etobicoke Creek; thence generally easterly along said creek to Highway 410; thence southeasterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Brampton West

(Population: 114,260)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Brampton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Hurontario Street and Bovaird Drive West; thence southwesterly along said drive to Chinguacousy Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Williams Parkway; thence generally southerly and southwesterly along said parkway to Mississauga Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Bovaird Drive West; thence southwesterly along said drive to the southwesterly limit of said city; thence northwesterly and northeasterly along the southwesterly and northwesterly limits of said city to the former Orangeville-Brampton Railway; thence southeasterly along said railway to Wanless Drive; thence northeasterly along said drive to Hurontario Street; thence southeasterly along said street to the point of commencement.

Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations

(Population: 121,511)

(Maps 3 and 7)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Brantford;

(b) that part of the County of Brant lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said county (Governors Road) and Puttown Road; thence southerly along said road to King Edward Street; thence easterly along said street to Bishopsgate Road; thence generally southerly along said road to Bethel Road; thence easterly along said road and its easterly production to the westerly limit of the City of Brantford; thence generally northeasterly, easterly and generally southeasterly along the westerly, northerly and easterly limits of said city to Powerline Road; thence easterly along said road to the northeasterly limit of the County of Brant; and

(c) the Indian reserves of New Credit No. 40A and Six Nations No. 40.

Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound

(Population: 113,348)

(Map 2)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Owen Sound;

(b) the towns of Hanover and South Bruce Peninsula;

(c) the municipalities of Arran-Elderslie, Grey Highlands, Meaford, Northern Bruce Peninsula and West Grey;

(d) the townships of Chatsworth, Georgian Bluffs and Southgate; and

(e) the Indian reserves of Chief's Point No. 28, Neyaashiinigmiing No. 27, and Saugeen No. 29.

Burlington

(Population: 125,435)

(Map 12)

Consists of that part of the City of Burlington lying southeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said city (Kerns Road) and Dundas Street; thence northeasterly along said street to Highway 407; thence southerly along said highway to Guelph Line; thence southeasterly along said line to Upper Middle Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Walkers Line; thence southeasterly along said line to Queen Elizabeth Way (Highway 403); thence northeasterly along Queen Elizabeth Way to the northeasterly limit of said city (Burloak Drive).

Burlington North—Milton West

(Population: 125,575)

(Map 12)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Burlington lying northwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said city (Kerns Road) and Dundas Street; thence northeasterly along said street to Highway 407; thence southerly along said highway to Guelph Line; thence southeasterly along said line to Upper Middle Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Walkers Line; thence southeasterly along said line to Queen Elizabeth Way (Highway 403); thence northeasterly along Queen Elizabeth Way to the northeasterly limit of said city (Burloak Drive); and

(b) that part of the Town of Milton lying southwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southeasterly limit of said town (Lower Base Line West) and Regional Road 25; thence northwesterly along said road, Ontario Street South and Ontario Street North to Steeles Avenue East; thence southwesterly along said avenue to Martin Street; thence northwesterly along said street and Regional Road 25 to the northerly limit of said town (5 Side Road).

Cambridge

(Population: 119,493)

(Maps 3 and 8)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Cambridge lying southerly of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); and

(b) the Township of North Dumfries.

Carleton

(Population: 124,416)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Hawthorne Road and Hunt Club Road; thence northeasterly along Hunt Club Road to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence generally easterly along said highway to the easterly limit of said city; thence generally southwesterly, northwesterly and generally northeasterly along the easterly, southerly, westerly and northerly limits of said city to the northeasterly production of Berry Side Road; thence southwesterly along said production, Berry Side Road and its southwesterly production, Constance Lake Road, Murphy Side Road and its southwesterly production and Holland Hill Road to Carp Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Craig's Side Road; thence southwesterly along said road, Donald B. Munro Drive and Vaughan Side Road to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence easterly and southeasterly along said highway to Highway 7 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence generally southerly along said highway to Hazeldean Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Terry Fox Drive; thence generally southeasterly along said drive and northeasterly along Hope Side Road to Old Richmond Road; thence northerly along said road to West Hunt Club Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Highway 416 (Veterans Memorial Highway); thence generally southeasterly along said highway to Barnsdale Road; thence northeasterly along said road to the Rideau River (westerly of Long Island); thence generally northerly along said river (westerly of Nicolls Island) to Hunt Club Road; thence easterly along said road to Riverside Drive; thence southeasterly along said drive and Limebank Road to Leitrim Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Bowesville Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Earl Armstrong Road; thence northeasterly along said road to High Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Albion Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Rideau Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Bank Street; thence northwesterly along said street to Blais Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Hawthorne Road; thence northwesterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Chatham-Kent—Leamington

(Population: 134,226)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the municipalities of Chatham-Kent and Leamington;
- (b) the Township of Pelee; and
- (c) the Indian Reserve of Moravian No. 47.

Davenport

(Population: 125,048)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Eglinton Avenue West and the northwesterly production of Vaughan Road; thence generally southeasterly along said production and Vaughan Road to Winona Drive; thence generally southerly along said drive to Davenport Road; thence westerly along said road to Ossington Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Queen Street West; thence westerly along said street to Dovercourt Road; thence southerly along said road and its southerly production to the GO Transit rail line; thence generally northwesterly along said rail line and the Canadian Pacific railway to Eglinton Avenue West; thence generally easterly along said avenue to the point of commencement.

Don Valley North

(Population: 111,122)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city (Steeles Avenue East) and Highway 404; thence generally southerly along said highway to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence westerly along said highway to the Don River East Branch; thence generally southeasterly along said river to York Mills Road; thence westerly along said road to Old York Mills Road; thence generally westerly along said road to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence northeasterly along said highway to Bayview Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Don Valley South

(Population: 121,147)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of York Mills Road and the Don River East Branch; thence generally southeasterly and southwesterly along said river to the Don River; thence generally southwesterly along said river to the Don Valley Parkway ramp (to Bayview Avenue); thence southwesterly along said ramp to Bayview Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to the Beltline trail at approximate latitude 43°40'51"N and longitude 79°22'06"W; thence generally northerly and northwesterly along said trail to Moore Avenue; thence easterly along said avenue to Bayview Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Eglinton Avenue East; thence westerly along said avenue to Mount Pleasant Road; thence northerly along said road to Broadway Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to Old York Mills Road; thence generally easterly along said road to York Mills Road; thence easterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Dufferin—Caledon

(Population: 120,812)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

(a) the towns of Grand Valley, Mono, Orangeville and Shelburne;

(b) that part of the Town of Caledon lying northwesterly and northeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said town and King Street; thence generally northeasterly along said street to The Gore Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the southeasterly limit of said town; and

(c) the townships of Amaranth, East Garafraxa, Melancthon and Mulmur.

Eglinton—Lawrence

(Population: 115,832)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express) and Yonge Street; thence southerly along said street to Eglinton Avenue West; thence westerly along said avenue to the GO Transit rail line; thence northerly along said rail line to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence easterly and northeasterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Elgin—St. Thomas—London South

(Population: 112,448)

(Maps 3 and 14)

Consists of:

(a) the City of St. Thomas;

(b) that part of the City of London lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence westerly along said highway to Exeter Road; thence westerly along said road to White Oak Road; thence northerly along said road to Southdale Road East; thence westerly along said road and Southdale Road West to Westdel Bourne; thence southerly along Westdel Bourne to Dingman Creek; thence generally westerly along said creek to the westerly limit of said city;

(c) the Town of Aylmer;

(d) the municipalities of Bayham, Central Elgin, Dutton/Dunwich and West Elgin; and

(e) the townships of Malahide and Southwold.

Essex

(Population: 131,691)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

(a) the towns of Amherstburg, Essex, LaSalle and Kingsville; and

(b) that part of the Town of Lakeshore lying southerly and easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said town and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence easterly along said highway to the Puce River; thence generally northerly along said river to Lake St. Clair; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said town.

Etobicoke Centre

(Population: 125,606)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express) and Dixon Road; thence easterly along said road to Kipling Avenue; thence southeasterly along said avenue to The Westway; thence generally northeasterly and northerly along The Westway to Royal York Road; thence southerly along said road to Eglinton Avenue West; thence easterly along said avenue to

the Humber River; thence generally southerly and easterly along said river to Dundas Street West; thence southwesterly along said street to Islington Avenue; thence southeasterly along said avenue to Mimico Creek; thence southeasterly along said creek to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence southwesterly along said railway to the westerly limit of said city (shoreline of Etobicoke Creek); thence generally northerly, northwesterly, northeasterly and northwesterly along said limit to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence generally northeasterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Etobicoke—Lakeshore

(Population: 120,956)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Dundas Street West and the Humber River; thence generally southeasterly along said river and its southeasterly production to the southerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); thence generally southwesterly and generally northwesterly along the southerly and westerly limits of said city to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence generally northeasterly along said railway to Mimico Creek; thence northwesterly along said creek to Islington Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to Dundas Street West; thence northeasterly along said street to the point of commencement.

Etobicoke North

(Population: 116,886)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and the Humber River; thence generally southeasterly and generally southerly along said river to Saint Phillips Road; thence generally southerly along said road and Royal York Road to The Westway; thence generally southerly and southwesterly along The Westway to Kipling Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to Dixon Road; thence westerly along said road to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence generally southwesterly along said highway to the westerly limit of said city; thence northwesterly and easterly along the westerly and northerly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North

(Population: 103,836)

(Maps 7 and 13)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Hamilton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city on the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally westerly along said escarpment to the Upper Centennial Parkway; thence generally southerly along said parkway and Regional Road 56 to an electric power transmission line situated southerly of Dalgleish Trail; thence westerly and southwesterly along said electric power transmission line to Trinity Road South; thence generally northerly along said road, Highway 52 South and Highway 52 North to the Canadian National Railway; thence generally northeasterly along said railway to Highway 403 (Alexander Graham Bell Parkway); thence northeasterly along said highway to the northeasterly limit of said city (Highway 6); thence northwesterly, generally northeasterly, northwesterly, generally southwesterly, generally southeasterly and generally northerly along the northerly, westerly, southerly and easterly limits of said city to the point of commencement; and

(b) that part of the County of Brant lying northeasterly and northwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northwesterly limit of said county and Puttoun Road; thence southerly along said road to King Edward Street; thence easterly along said street to Bishopsgate Road; thence generally southerly along said road to Bethel Road; thence easterly along said road and its easterly production to the westerly limit of the City of Brantford; thence generally northeasterly, easterly, and generally southeasterly along the northwesterly and northeasterly limits of said city to Powerline Road; thence easterly along said road to the northeasterly limit of said county.

Guelph

(Population: 118,498)

(Map 11)

Consists of that part of the City of Guelph lying northwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwestly limit of said city and College Avenue West; thence northeasterly along said avenue to Hanlon Parkway; thence southeasterly along said parkway to Hanlon's Creek; thence generally northeasterly and northwesterly along said creek to Edinburgh Road South; thence northeasterly along said road to Gordon Street; thence southeasterly along said street to Arkell Road; thence northeasterly along said road to the northeasterly limit of said city (Victoria Road South).

Haldimand—Norfolk

(Population: 116,706)

(Map 3)

Consists of the cities of Haldimand County and Norfolk County.

Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes

(Population: 119,150)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Kawartha Lakes;
- (b) the municipalities of Dysart et al and Highlands East;
- (c) the Municipality of Trent Lakes, excepting the islands of the Curve Lake Indian Reserve No. 35A; and
- (d) the townships of Algonquin Highlands, Cavan Monaghan, North Kawartha and Minden Hills.

Hamilton Centre

(Population: 126,188)

(Map 13)

Consists of that part of the City of Hamilton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Highway 403 (Alexander Graham Bell Parkway); thence generally southerly and southwesterly along said highway to an electric power transmission line situated westerly of Chateau Court; thence southerly along said transmission line to the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally easterly, southerly and northeasterly along said escarpment to Red Hill Valley Parkway; thence generally northerly along said parkway to King Street East; thence northwesterly along said street to Parkdale Avenue South; thence northerly along said avenue and Parkdale Avenue North to Burlington Street East (Nikola Tesla Boulevard); thence westerly along said street to Strathearne Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Pier 24 Gateway; thence generally northeasterly along said gateway to the northeasterly shoreline of Hamilton Harbour; thence generally northwesterly along said shoreline to the northerly limit of said city; thence southwesterly, northwesterly and generally southwesterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Hamilton East—Stoney Creek

(Population: 126,570)

(Map 13)

Consists of that part of the City of Hamilton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally westerly along said escarpment to Upper Centennial Parkway; thence generally southerly along said parkway and Regional Road 56 to an electric power transmission line situated southerly of Dalgleish Trail; thence westerly along said electric power transmission line to Glover Road; thence northerly along said road and its northerly production to Anchor Road; thence generally northerly along said road, Arbour Road, its intermittent production and its northeasterly production to the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally northeasterly along said escarpment to Red Hill Valley Parkway; thence northerly along said parkway to King Street East; thence northwesterly along said street to Parkdale Avenue South; thence northerly along said avenue and Parkdale Avenue North to Burlington Street East (Nikola Tesla Boulevard); thence westerly along said street to Strathearne Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Pier 24 Gateway; thence generally northeasterly along said gateway to the northeasterly shoreline of Hamilton Harbour; thence generally northwesterly along said shoreline to the northerly limit of said city; thence generally southeasterly, easterly and southerly along the northerly and easterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Hamilton Mountain

(Population: 115,634)

(Map 13)

Consists of that part of the City of Hamilton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of James Mountain Road and the Niagara Escarpment; thence southerly along said road and West 5th Street to Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway; thence westerly along said parkway to Garth Street; thence generally southerly along said street to an electric power transmission line; thence easterly along said transmission line to Glover Road; thence northerly along said road and its northerly production to Anchor Road; thence generally northerly along said road, Arbour Road, its intermittent production and its northeasterly production to the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally northerly and westerly along said escarpment to the point of commencement.

Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas

(Population: 120,551)

(Map 13)

Consists of that part of the City of Hamilton described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 403 (Alexander Graham Bell Parkway) and the Canadian National Railway; thence generally southerly and generally southwesterly along said highway to an electric power transmission line situated westerly of Chateau Court; thence southerly along said

transmission line to the Niagara Escarpment; thence generally easterly along said escarpment to James Mountain Road; thence generally southerly along said road and West 5th Street to Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway; thence westerly along said parkway to Garth Street; thence generally southerly along said street to an electric power transmission line; thence westerly and southwesterly along said transmission line to Trinity Road South; thence generally northerly along said road, Highway 52 South and Highway 52 North to the Canadian National Railway; thence generally northeasterly and easterly along said railway to the point of commencement.

Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga

(Population: 106,468)

(Maps 4 and 6)

Consists of:

- (a) that part of the City of Belleville lying northerly of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway);
- (b) that part of the City of Quinte West lying northeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northeasterly limit of said city (Wallbridge-Loyalist Road) and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence southwesterly along said highway to the Trent River; thence generally northerly along said river to the southwesterly production of Harrington Road; thence northeasterly along said production and Harrington Road to McMullen Road; thence northwesterly and southwesterly along said road to Collins Lane; thence northwesterly along said lane and Collins Road to Frankford Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Flyboy Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Fish and Game Club Road; thence southwesterly along said road and its production to the Trent River (west of Bata Island); thence generally northeasterly and generally southwesterly along said river to a point at approximate latitude 44°14'54"N and longitude 77°38'23"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to the northwesterly limit of said city;
- (c) the towns of Bancroft, Deseronto and Greater Napanee;
- (d) the municipalities of Centre Hastings, Hastings Highlands, Marmora and Lake and Tweed;
- (e) the townships of Addington Highlands, Carlow/Mayo, Faraday, Limerick, Loyalist, Madoc, Stirling-Rawdon, Stone Mills, Tudor and Cashel, Tyendinaga and Wollaston; and
- (f) the Tyendinaga Mohawk Territory Indian Reserve.

Humber River—Black Creek

(Population: 111,593)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Keele Street; thence southerly along said street to Grandravine Drive; thence westerly along said drive to Black Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to Sheppard Avenue West; thence westerly along said avenue to Jane Street; thence southerly along said street to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence westerly along said highway to the Humber River; thence generally northerly and generally northwesterly along said river to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Huron—Bruce

(Population: 112,929)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the towns of Goderich and Saugeen Shores;
- (b) the municipalities of Bluewater, Brockton, Central Huron, Huron East, Kincardine, Morris-Turnberry, South Bruce and South Huron; and
- (c) the townships of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh, Howick, Huron-Kinloss and North Huron.

Kanata

(Population: 121,458)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Davidson's Side Road and Carling Avenue; thence generally northeasterly and easterly along said avenue to Moodie Drive; thence southerly along said drive to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway, Queensway); thence northeasterly along said highway to Highway 416 (Veterans Memorial Highway); thence southeasterly along said highway to West Hunt Club Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Old Richmond Road; thence southerly along said road to Hope Side Road; thence southwesterly along said road and generally northwesterly along Terry Fox Drive to Hazeldean Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Highway 7 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence northerly along said highway to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence generally northwesterly along said highway to Vaughan Side Road; thence northeasterly along said road, Donald B. Munro Drive and Craig's Side Road to Carp Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Holland Hill Road; thence northeasterly along Holland Hill Road and its northeasterly production, Murphy Side Road, Constance Lake Road and its northeasterly

production, Berry Side Road and its northeasterly production to the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec; thence southeasterly along said boundary to a point at approximate latitude 45°22'58"N and longitude 75°51'26"W; thence generally southerly to the northwesterly endpoint of Davidson's Side Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk

(Population: 93,948)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Timmins;

(b) the towns of Cochrane, Hearst, Iroquois Falls, Kapuskasing, Kirkland Lake, Moosonee and Smooth Rock Falls;

(c) the townships of Black River-Matheson, Chapleau, Fauquier-Strickland, Gauthier, Larder Lake, Matachewan, Mattice-Val Côté, McGarry, Moonbeam, Opasatika and Val Rita-Harty;

(d) the unorganized areas of Cochrane (South East Part), Cochrane (South West Part) and Timiskaming (East Part);

(e) that part of the Unorganized Area of Algoma (North Part) lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said unorganized area and a point at approximate latitude 48°26'59"N and longitude 84°00'53"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 49°26'57"N and longitude 84°00'52"W;

(f) that part of the Unorganized Area of Cochrane (North Part) lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area at a point at approximate latitude 49°42'31"N and longitude 84°41'09"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the Kenogami River at approximate latitude 50°13'33"N and longitude 84°41'20"W; thence generally northerly along said river to the northerly limit of said unorganized area;

(g) that part of the Unorganized Area of Kenora lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said unorganized area and a point at approximate latitude 51°31'11"N and longitude 86°32'53"W; thence northerly in a straight line to latitude 54°00'00"N; thence west to the Winisk River; thence generally northerly along said river to the southerly boundary of the Winisk Indian Reserve No. 90; thence southwesterly, northwesterly and northeasterly along the southeasterly, southwesterly and northwesterly boundaries of said Indian reserve to the Winisk River; thence generally northerly and easterly along said river to a point at approximate latitude 54°44'38"N and longitude 86°33'01"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 55°48'23"N and longitude 86°32'44"W;

(h) that part of the Unorganized Area of Sudbury (North Part) lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area at a point at approximate latitude 47°14'09"N and longitude 82°36'11"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 48°05'52"N and longitude 82°36'02"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the easterly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 48°06'14"N and longitude 81°51'25"W, excluding the Missanabie Cree First Nation Indian Reserve;

(i) that part of the Unorganized Area of Timiskaming (West Part) lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area at a point at approximate latitude 47°19'13"N and longitude 80°23'54"W; thence northerly in a straight line passing along the westerly limit of the Township of James to a point at latitude 47°56'30"N and longitude 80°24'22"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the westerly limit of the Township of Chamberlain; thence easterly along the northerly limit of said township to the easterly limit of said township; thence easterly in a straight line to the westerly limit of the Township of Larder Lake; thence easterly along the southerly limit of said township and its easterly production to the easterly limit of said unorganized area;

(j) the Indian reserves of Abitibi No. 70, Attawapiskat No. 91A, Chapleau No. 74A and No. 75, Chapleau Cree Fox Lake, Constance Lake No. 92, Duck Lake No. 76B, Factory Island No. 1, Flying Post No. 73, Fort Albany (Part) No. 67, Matachewan No. 72, Moose Factory No. 68, and New Post No. 69A; and

(k) the Indian Settlement of Peawanuck.

Kenora—Kiiwetinoong

(Population: 61,962)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

(a) the cities of Dryden and Kenora;

(b) the municipalities of Red Lake and Sioux Lookout;

(c) the townships of Ear Falls, Ignace, Machin, Pickle Lake and Sioux Narrows-Nestor Falls;

(d) that part of the Unorganized Area of Kenora lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said unorganized area and longitude 89°00'00"W; thence north to latitude 53°00'00"N; thence east to the westerly boundary of the Webequie Indian Reserve; thence generally northerly, easterly and southerly along the westerly, northerly and easterly boundaries of said Indian reserve to latitude 53°00'00"N; thence east to a point at longitude 86°33'08"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 54°00'00"N and longitude 86°33'09"W; thence westerly along said latitude to the Winisk River at approximate longitude 87°04'51"W; thence generally northerly along said river to the southerly boundary of the Winisk Indian Reserve No. 90; thence southwesterly, northwesterly and northeasterly along the southeasterly, southwesterly and northwesterly boundaries of said Indian reserve to the Winisk River; thence generally northerly and easterly along said river to a

point at approximate latitude 54°44'38"N and longitude 86°33'01"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 55°48'23"N and longitude 86°32'44"W;

(e) that part of the Unorganized Area Thunder Bay lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at a point on the northerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 51°08'01"N and longitude 90°10'01"W; thence southerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 50°03'49"N and longitude 90°10'12"W; thence westerly in a straight line to the westerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 50°03'46"N and longitude 90°57'58"W;

(f) the Indian reserves of Bearskin Lake, Cat Lake No. 63C, Deer Lake, Eagle Lake No. 27, English River No. 21, Fort Severn No. 89, Kasabonika Lake, Kee-Way-Win, Kenora No. 38B, Kingfisher Lake No. 1, Kitchenuhmaykoosib Aaki No. 84, Lac Seul No. 28, Lake of the Woods No. 37, Muskrat Dam Lake, North Spirit Lake, Northwest Angle No. 33B, Ojibway Nation of Saugeen (Savant Lake), Osnaburgh No. 63A, Osnaburgh No. 63B, Pikangikum No. 14, Poplar Hill, Rat Portage No. 38A, Sabaskong Bay No. 35D, Sachigo Lake No. 1, Sandy Lake No. 88, Shoal Lake No. 34B2 and 39A, Slate Falls Nation, The Dalles No. 38C, Wabaseemoong, Wabauskang No. 21, Wabigoon Lake No. 27, Wapekeka No. 2, Wawakapewin, Weagamow Lake No. 87, Whitefish Bay No. 32A, Whitefish Bay No. 33A, Whitefish Bay No. 34A and Wunnumin No. 1; and

(g) that part of Shoal Lake Indian Reserve No. 40 lying easterly of the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Manitoba.

Kingston and the Islands

(Population: 134,415)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Kingston; and
- (b) the Township of Frontenac Islands.

King—Vaughan

(Population: 123,226)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

- (a) that part of the City of Vaughan described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said city and Major Mackenzie Drive West; thence generally easterly along said drive to a creek at approximate latitude 43°50'12" N and longitude 79°35'56" W; thence

generally northerly along said creek to Teston Road; thence easterly along said road to Pine Valley Drive; thence northerly along said drive to Teston Road; thence easterly along said road to Highway 400; thence southerly along said highway to Rutherford Road; thence generally northeasterly along said road to the Don River West Branch; thence generally southeasterly along said river to Keele Street; thence northerly along said street to Rutherford Road; thence generally northeasterly along said road to Dufferin Street; thence northerly along said street to Major Mackenzie Drive West; thence easterly along said drive to the easterly limit of said city; thence northerly, generally westerly and generally southerly along the easterly, northerly and westerly limits of said city to the point of commencement; and

(b) that part of the Township of King lying southerly of Davis Drive West and Highway 9.

Kitchener Centre

(Population: 113,404)

(Map 8)

Consists of that part of the City of Kitchener described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Fischer-Hallman Road; thence generally northeasterly and southeasterly along the northerly and easterly limits of said city to the southeasterly production of Woolner Trail; thence northwesterly along said production and said trail to Fairway Road North; thence generally southwestwardly along said road and Fairway Road South to Highway 8; thence northwesterly along said highway to Highway 7/8 (Conestoga Parkway); thence southerly and southwestwardly along said highway to Westmount Road East; thence generally northwesterly along said road and Westmount Road West to Highland Road West; thence southwestwardly along said road to Fischer-Hallman Road; thence generally northwesterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Kitchener—Conestoga

(Population: 112,981)

(Maps 3 and 8)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Kitchener lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Fischer-Hallman Road; thence generally southeasterly along said road to Highland Road West; thence northeasterly along said road to Westmount Road West; thence generally southeasterly along said road and Westmount Road East to Highway 7/8 (Conestoga Parkway); thence southwestwardly along said highway to Fischer-Hallman Road; thence southeasterly and southerly along said road to the southerly limit of said city; and

(b) the townships of Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich.

Kitchener South—Hespeler

(Population: 119,851)

(Map 8)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Cambridge lying northerly of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); and

(b) that part of the City of Kitchener described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said city and Fischer-Hallman Road; thence northerly and northwesterly along said road to Highway 7/8 (Conestoga Parkway); thence northeasterly along said highway to Highway 8; thence southeasterly along said highway to Fairway Road South; thence northerly, northeasterly and easterly along said road and Fairway Road North to Woolner Trail; thence southeasterly along said trail and its southeasterly production to the easterly limit of said city (Grand River); thence generally southerly, southwesterly and westerly along the easterly and southerly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Lanark—Frontenac

(Population: 103,120)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

(a) the towns of Carleton Place, Mississippi Mills, Perth and Smiths Falls; and

(b) the townships of Beckwith, Central Frontenac, Drummond/North Elmsley, Lanark Highlands, Montague, North Frontenac, South Frontenac and Tay Valley.

Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes

(Population: 104,075)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Brockville;

(b) the towns of Gananoque and Prescott;

(c) the Municipality of North Grenville;

(d) the townships of Athens, Augusta, Edwardsburgh/Cardinal, Elizabethtown-Kitley, Front of Yonge, Leeds and the Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes; and

(e) the villages of Merrickville-Wolford and Westport.

London Centre

(Population: 126,597)
(Map 14)

Consists of that part of the City of London described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Fanshawe Park Road East and Highbury Avenue North; thence southeasterly along said avenue to the Canadian National Railway (south of Oakland Avenue); thence westerly and southerly along said railway to Commissioners Road East; thence westerly along said road to Wharncliffe Road South; thence northerly along said road to the Canadian National Railway (south of Stanley Street); thence westerly along said railway to the Thames River; thence westerly and southerly along said river to Wonderland Road North; thence generally northerly and northwesterly along said road to Fanshawe Park Road West; thence northeasterly along said road and Fanshawe Park Road East to the point of commencement.

London—Fanshawe

(Population: 126,286)
(Map 14)

Consists of that part of the City of London described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence westerly along said highway to Exeter Road; thence westerly along said road to White Oak Road; thence northerly along said road to Southdale Road East; thence westerly along said road to Wharncliffe Road South; thence northerly along said road to Commissioners Road East; thence easterly along said road to the Canadian National Railway; thence northwesterly, northerly and easterly along said railway to Highbury Avenue North (south of Oakland Avenue); thence northwesterly along said avenue to Fanshawe Park Road East; thence northeasterly along said road and its production to the easterly limit of said city; thence easterly and generally southerly along said limit to the point of commencement.

London West

(Population: 114,374)
(Map 14)

Consists of that part of the City of London described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Fanshawe Park Road West and Wonderland Road North; thence southeasterly and generally southerly along said road to the Thames River; thence generally northeasterly along said river to the Canadian National Railway; thence easterly along said railway to Wharncliffe Road South; thence southerly along said road to Southdale Road West; thence westerly along said road to Westdel Bourne; thence southeasterly along Westdel Bourne to Dingman Creek; thence

generally westerly along said creek to the westerly limit of said city; thence northwesterly, generally northeasterly and northerly along said limit to Fanshawe Park Road West; thence northeasterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Manitoulin—Nickel Belt

(Population: 99,827)

(Maps 1 and 10)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Greater Sudbury, excluding that part described as follows: commencing at a point on the easterly limit of said city at approximate latitude 46°37'29"N and longitude 80°41'39"W; thence southerly along said limit to the southerly limit of said city; thence generally westerly and northerly along the southerly limit of said city to Reserve Road; thence northerly along said road and its northerly production to Highway 144 (North-West Bypass); thence generally northerly along said highway to a point at approximate latitude 46°30'38"N and longitude 81°11'59"W; thence easterly in a straight line to a point at latitude 46°30'35"N and longitude 81°04'17"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 46°32'15"N and longitude 81°04'15"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the intersection of Maley Drive (Road 73) and Barry Downe Road; thence northerly along Barry Downe Road and its northerly production to the intersection of Notre Dame Avenue and Bodson Drive East; thence easterly along said drive and its easterly production to a point at latitude 46°37'21"N and longitude 80°49'10"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point on the southerly shoreline of Wanapitei Lake at latitude 46°43'15"N and longitude 80°49'05"W; thence generally southeasterly along said shoreline to the mouth of the Wanapitei River (Wanapitae Dam); thence generally southerly along the westerly shoreline of said river to the easterly limit of said city at approximate latitude 46°37'30"N and longitude 80°39'36"W; thence westerly along said limit to the point of commencement;

(b) the towns of Espanola and Gore Bay;

(c) the municipalities of Central Manitoulin, French River, Gordon/Barrie Island, Killarney, Markstay-Warren, Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands, St.-Charles and West Nipissing;

(d) the townships of Assiginack, Baldwin, Billings, Burpee and Mills, Cockburn Island, Nairn and Hyman, Sables-Spanish Rivers and Tehkummah;

(e) the Unorganized Area of Manitoulin (West Part);

(f) the Unorganized Area of Sudbury (North Part), excluding that part lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at a point on the southerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 47°14'09"N and longitude 82°36'11"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point at approximate latitude 48°05'52"N and longitude 82°36'02"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the easterly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 48°06'14"N and longitude 81°51'25"W; and

(g) the Indian reserves of M'Chigeeng No. 22, Mattagami No. 71, Point Grondine No. 3, Sheguiandah No. 24, Sheshegwaning No. 20, Sucker Creek No. 23, Wahnapiatae No. 11, Whitefish Lake No. 6, Whitefish River No. 4, Wikwemikong Unceded and Zhiibaahaasing No. 19A.

Markham—Stouffville

(Population: 120,845)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Markham described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Highway 48; thence southerly along said highway and Markham Road to Bur Oak Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue to McCowan Road; thence southerly along said road to Highway 407; thence generally northeasterly along said highway to the easterly limit of said city (York-Durham Line); thence northwesterly and generally westerly along the easterly and northerly limits of said city to the point of commencement; and

(b) that part of the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said town and Highway 48; thence northerly along said highway to Bethesda Road; thence easterly along said road to Ninth Line; thence northerly along Ninth Line to Bethesda Road; thence easterly along said road to the easterly limit of said town (York-Durham Line); thence southerly and generally westerly along the easterly and southerly limits of said town to the point of commencement.

Markham—Thornhill

(Population: 111,087)

(Map 21)

Consists of that part of the City of Markham described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Highway 407; thence generally southwesterly along said highway to Bayview Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to the southerly limit of said city; thence easterly and northerly along the southerly and easterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Markham—Unionville

(Population: 116,972)

(Map 21)

Consists of that part of the City of Markham described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Highway 48; thence southerly along said highway and Markham Road to Bur Oak Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue to McCowan Road; thence southerly along said road to Highway 407; thence westerly along said highway to Highway 404; thence northerly along said highway to the northerly limit of said city; thence generally easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Middlesex—London

(Population: 115,610)

(Maps 3 and 14)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of London lying northerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said city and Fanshawe Park Road West; thence northeasterly along said road, Fanshawe Park Road East and its easterly production to the easterly limit of said city;

(b) the municipalities of Middlesex Centre, Southwest Middlesex, North Middlesex, and Thames Centre;

(c) the townships of Adelaide-Metcalf, Lucan Biddulph and Strathroy-Caradoc;

(d) the Village of Newbury; and

(e) the Indian reserves of Chippewas of the Thames First Nation No. 42, Munsee-Delaware Nation No. 1 and Oneida No. 41.

Milton East—Halton Hills South

(Population: 116,592)

(Map 12)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the Town of Halton Hills lying southeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said town (Nassagaweya-Esquesing Townline) and 15 Side Road; thence generally northeasterly along said road to Trafalgar Road; thence northwesterly along said road and Highway 7 to 22 Side Road; thence northeasterly along said road and its intermittent production to the northeasterly limit of said town (Winston Churchill Boulevard); and

(b) that part of the Town of Milton lying northeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southeasterly limit of said town (Lower Base Line West) and Regional Road 25; thence northwesterly along said road, Ontario Street South and Ontario Street North to Steeles Avenue East; thence southwesterly along said avenue to Martin Street; thence northwesterly along said street and Regional Road 25 to the northerly limit of said town (5 Side Road).

Mississauga Centre

(Population: 124,084)
(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Hurontario Street and Bristol Road West; thence southeasterly along said street to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence southwesterly along said railway to Confederation Parkway; thence southeasterly along said parkway to Dundas Street West; thence southwesterly along said street to the Credit River; thence generally northerly and northwesterly along said river to Highway 403; thence northeasterly along said highway to Creditview Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Bristol Road West; thence generally northeasterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Mississauga East—Cooksville

(Population: 120,196)
(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Etobicoke Creek and The Queensway East; thence southwesterly along The Queensway East and The Queensway West to Stillmeadow Road; thence northwesterly along said road to approximate latitude 43°34'17"N and longitude 79°37'34"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to Dundas Street West; thence northeasterly along said street to Confederation Parkway; thence northwesterly along said parkway to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence northeasterly along said railway to Hurontario Street; thence northwesterly along said street to Highway 403; thence northeasterly and northwesterly along said highway to Eglinton Avenue East; thence northeasterly along said avenue to Etobicoke Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to the point of commencement.

Mississauga—Erin Mills

(Population: 120,241)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Britannia Road West and Erin Mills Parkway; thence southeasterly along said parkway to Highway 403; thence northeasterly along said highway to the Credit River; thence generally southeasterly along said river to Dundas Street West; thence southwesterly along said street and Dundas Street East to the southwesterly limit of said city; thence generally northwesterly along said limit to Britannia Road West; thence northeasterly along said road to the point of commencement.

Mississauga—Lakeshore

(Population: 119,936)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Etobicoke Creek with The Queensway East; thence southwesterly along The Queensway East and The Queensway West to Stillmeadow Road; thence northwesterly along said road to approximate latitude 43°34'17"N and longitude 79°37'34"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to Dundas Street West; thence southwesterly along said street to the southwesterly limit of said city; thence southeasterly, northeasterly and generally northwesterly along the southwesterly, southeasterly and northeasterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Mississauga—Malton

(Population: 119,741)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northwesterly limit of said city with the Credit River; thence generally southeasterly along said river to Creditview Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Bristol Road West; thence generally northeasterly along said road to Hurontario Street; thence southeasterly along said street to Highway 403; thence northeasterly and northwesterly along said highway to Eglinton Avenue East; thence northeasterly along said avenue to the northeasterly limit of said city; thence northwesterly, generally southwesterly, northwesterly and generally southwesterly along the northeasterly, northerly and northwesterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Mississauga—Streetsville

(Population: 113,763)

(Map 16)

Consists of that part of the City of Mississauga described as follows: commencing at the intersection of northwesterly limit of said city and the Credit River; thence generally southeasterly along said river to Creditview Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Highway 403; thence southwesterly along said highway to Erin Mills Parkway; thence northwesterly along said parkway to Britannia Road West; thence southwesterly along said road to the southwesterly limit of said city; thence northwesterly and generally northeasterly along the southwesterly and northwesterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Nepean

(Population: 122,229)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 416 (Veterans Memorial Highway) and the Canadian National Railway; thence generally easterly along said railway to the Rideau River; thence generally southerly along said river to Barnsdale Road (passing west of Nicolls Island and Long Island); thence southwesterly along said road to Highway 416 (Veterans Memorial Highway); thence generally northwesterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Newmarket—Aurora

(Population: 117,699)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

(a) the Town of Newmarket;

(b) that part of the Town of Aurora lying northerly and easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said town and Wellington Street East; thence westerly along said street to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to the northerly limit of said town; and

(c) that part of the Town of East Gwillimbury lying southerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said town and Green Lane West; thence easterly along said lane and Green Lane East to Highway 404; thence southerly along said highway to the southerly limit of said town.

New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury

(Population: 120,533)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the towns of Bradford West Gwillimbury and New Tecumseth;
- (b) that part of the Town of East Gwillimbury lying northerly and easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said town (Bathurst Street) and Green Lane West; thence easterly along said lane and Green Lane East to Highway 404; thence southerly along said highway to the southerly limit of said town; and
- (c) that part of the Township of King lying northerly of Highway 9 and Davis Drive West.

Niagara North

(Population: 113,503)

(Maps 3 and 17)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Niagara Falls; and
- (b) the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Niagara South

(Population: 132,396)

(Maps 3 and 17)

Consists of:

- (a) the cities of Port Colborne and Welland;
- (b) the City of Thorold, excepting an area described as follows: commencing at the northerly limit of said city and Highway 406; thence southerly along said highway to Decew Road; thence westerly along said road to Lake Moodie; thence northwesterly along said lake to the northerly limit of said city; thence northeasterly along said limit to the point of commencement; and
- (c) the Town of Fort Erie.

Niagara West

(Population: 112,065)

(Maps 3 and 17)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of St. Catharines lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said city and the southerly production of First Street Louth; thence northerly along said production and said street to Twelve Mile Creek; thence generally northerly along said creek to Highway 406; thence westerly and generally northerly along said highway to Queen Elizabeth Way; thence westerly along said way to Third Street Louth; thence northerly along said street, Courtleigh Road and its northerly production to the northerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario);

(b) the towns of Grimsby, Lincoln and Pelham; and

(c) the townships of Wainfleet and West Lincoln.

Nipissing—Timiskaming

(Population: 98,237)

(Maps 1 and 2)

Consists of:

(a) the cities of North Bay and Temiskaming Shores;

(b) the towns of Cobalt, Englehart, Latchford and Mattawa;

(c) the municipalities of Callander, Charlton and Dack, East Ferris, Powassan and Temagami;

(d) the townships of Armstrong, Brethour, Bonfield, Calvin, Casey, Chamberlain, Chisholm, Coleman, Ewanturel Harley, Harris, Hilliard, Hudson, James, Kerns, Mattawan, Nipissing and Papineau-Cameron;

(e) the Village of Thornloe;

(f) the Unorganized Area of Nipissing (North Part);

(g) that part of the Unorganized Area of Nipissing (South Part) lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said unorganized area and the northerly limit of Nightingale Geographic Township; thence easterly along said limit and the northerly limit of Airy Geographic Township to the westerly limit of Preston Geographic Township; thence northerly along said limit and the westerly limit of Dickson Geographic Township to the southerly limit of Anglin Geographic Township; thence westerly and northerly along the southerly and westerly limits of said geographic township to the northerly limit of Freswick Geographic Township; thence westerly along said limit to the westerly limit of Lister Geographic Township; thence northerly and easterly along the westerly and northerly limits of

said geographic township to the westerly limit of Deacon Geographic Township; thence northerly along said limit to the northerly limit of said unorganized area;

(h) the Unorganized Area of Timiskaming (West Part) excepting of the part lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area at a point at approximate latitude 47°19'13"N and longitude 80°23'54"W; thence northerly in a straight line passing along the westerly limit of the Township of James to a point at latitude 47°56'30"N and longitude 80°24'22"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the westerly limit of the Township of Chamberlain; thence easterly along the northerly limit of said township to the easterly limit of said township; thence easterly in a straight line to the westerly limit of the Township of Larder Lake; thence easterly along the southerly limit of said township and its easterly production to the easterly limit of said unorganized area; and

(i) the Indian reserves of Bear Island No. 1 and Nipissing No. 10.

Northumberland—Clarke

(Population: 106,574)
(Maps 4 and 9)

Consists of:

(a) the Town of Cobourg;

(b) the municipalities of Brighton, Port Hope and Trent Hills;

(c) that part of the Municipality of Clarington lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said municipality and a point on Regional Road 20 at approximate latitude 44°03'33"N and longitude 78°41'20"W; thence southerly along said road to Concession Road 10; thence easterly along said road to Darlington-Clarke Townline Road; thence generally southeasterly along said road and its intermittent productions to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Highway of Heroes); thence easterly along said highway to Cobble Dick Road; thence southeasterly along said road and its southeasterly production to the southerly limit of said municipality (Lake Ontario);

(d) the townships of Alnwick/Haldimand, Cramahe and Hamilton; and

(e) the Alderville First Nation Indian Reserve.

Oakville East

(Population: 108,735)

(Map 12)

Consists of that part of the Town of Oakville lying northerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northwesterly limit of said town and Sixteen Mile Creek; thence generally easterly along said creek to Lake Ontario; thence southeasterly in a straight line to the southeasterly limit of said town.

Oakville West

(Population: 105,024)

(Map 12)

Consists of that part of the Town of Oakville lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northwesterly limit of said town and Sixteen Mile Creek; thence generally easterly along said creek to Lake Ontario; thence southeasterly in a straight line to the southeasterly limit of said town.

Orléans

(Population: 126,662)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Regional Road 174 and Cardinal Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to Innes Road; thence westerly along said road to Frank Kenny Road; thence generally southeasterly along said road to Wall Road; thence generally southwesterly along said road to Tenth Line Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the Prescott-Russell Recreational Trail; thence westerly along said trail to a point at approximate latitude 45°25'22"N and longitude 75°31'43"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to Renaud Road at approximate latitude 45°25'28"N and longitude 75°31'47"W; thence northerly in a straight line to Navan Road at approximate latitude 45°26'02"N and longitude 75°31'59"W; thence westerly along said road to Blackburn Hamlet Bypass; thence northerly along said bypass and Innes Road to a point at approximate latitude 45°26'26"N and longitude 75°32'27"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec at approximate latitude 45°28'51"N and longitude 75°33'48"W; thence northeasterly along said boundary to a point at approximate latitude 45°30'44"N and longitude 75°28'54"W; thence southeasterly in a straight line to the mouth of Cardinal Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to the point of commencement.

Oshawa

(Population: 131,067)

(Map 9)

Consists of that part of the City of Oshawa lying southerly of Taunton Road West and Taunton Road East.

Ottawa Centre

(Population: 126,560)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the Rideau River and Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway, Queensway); thence generally southwesterly along said river to Bank Street; thence southeasterly along said street to the Canadian National Railway (north of Johnston Road); thence southwesterly and southerly along said railway to the Rideau River; thence northerly along said river to the easterly production of Borden Side Road; thence westerly along said production to Prince of Wales Drive; thence southerly along said drive to Fisher Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to Carling Avenue (eastbound); thence generally southwesterly along said avenue to Cole Avenue South (Clyde Avenue North); thence northwesterly along said avenue to Tillbury Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue and its westerly production to Golden Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to Richmond Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Berkley Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to Tay Street; thence southwesterly along said street to Dominion Avenue; thence northwesterly along said avenue to a point at approximate latitude 45°23'32"N and longitude 75°45'35"W; thence westerly in a straight line to the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec at approximate latitude 45°23'45"N and longitude 75°46'21"W; thence generally northeasterly along said boundary to the northwesterly production of the Rideau Canal; thence southeasterly along said production and along said canal to the northeasterly production of Waverley Street; thence easterly along said production to the intersection of Nicholas Street and Greenfield Avenue; thence generally southeasterly along Nicholas Street to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway, Queensway); thence easterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Ottawa South

(Population: 126,791)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the Rideau River with Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway, Queensway); thence generally easterly and southeasterly along said highway to Hunt Club Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Hawthorne Road; thence southeasterly along said road to Blais Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Bank Street; thence southeasterly along said street to Rideau Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Albion Road; thence northwesterly along said

road to High Road; thence westerly along said road to Earl Armstrong Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Bowesville Road; thence northwesterly along said road to Leitrim Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Limebank Road; thence northwesterly along said road and Riverside Drive to Hunt Club Road; thence westerly along said road to the Rideau River; thence generally northerly along said river to the Canadian National Railway (just south of Old Riverside Drive); thence northeasterly along said railway to Bank Street (north of Johnston Road); thence northwesterly along said street to the Rideau River; thence generally northerly along said river to the point of commencement.

Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester

(Population: 127,255)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at a point on the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec at approximate latitude 45°28'51"N and longitude 75°33'48"W; thence southeasterly in a straight line to a point on Innes Road at approximate latitude 45°26'26"N and longitude 75°32'27"W; thence generally southwesterly along said road, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Innes Road to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence northwesterly and westerly along said highway to Nicholas Street; thence northwesterly along said street to Greenfield Avenue; thence westerly in a straight line to the intersection of the Rideau Canal and the northeasterly production of Waverley Street; thence generally northwesterly along said canal and its production to the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec; thence northeasterly and easterly along said boundary to the point of commencement.

Ottawa West—Nepean

(Population: 128,592)

(Map 15)

Consists of that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at a point on the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec at latitude 45°23'45"N and longitude 75°46'21"W; thence easterly to a point on Dominion Avenue at latitude 45°23'32"N and longitude 75°45'35"W; thence southeasterly along said avenue to Tay Street; thence northeasterly along said street to Berkley Avenue; thence southeasterly along said avenue to Richmond Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Golden Avenue; thence southeasterly along said avenue to the westerly production of Tillbury Avenue (at the beginning of Tillbury Avenue West); thence easterly along said production and Tillbury Avenue to Cole Avenue South; thence southeasterly along said avenue to Carling Avenue (eastbound); thence generally northeasterly along said avenue to Fisher Avenue; thence southeasterly along said avenue to Prince of Wales Drive; thence northerly along said drive to Borden Side Road; thence easterly along the easterly production of said road to the Rideau River; thence southeasterly along said river to the Canadian National Railway; thence generally westerly along said railway to Highway 416 (Veterans Memorial Highway); thence northwesterly along said highway to Highway 417

(Trans-Canada Highway); thence westerly along said highway to Moodie Drive; thence northwesterly along said drive to Carling Avenue; thence westerly and southwesterly along said avenue to Davidson's Side Road; thence northwesterly along said road to the endpoint of said road; thence northerly to the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec at latitude 45°22'58"N and longitude 75°51'26"W; thence generally southeasterly and northeasterly along said boundary to the point of commencement.

Oxford

(Population: 121,781)
(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Woodstock;
- (b) the towns of Ingersoll and Tillsonburg; and
- (c) the townships of Blandford-Blenheim, East Zorra-Tavistock, Norwich, South-West Oxford and Zorra.

Parry Sound—Muskoka

(Population: 104,504)
(Maps 1 and 2)

Consists of:

- (a) the towns of Bracebridge, Gravenhurst, Huntsville, Kearney and Parry Sound;
- (b) the municipalities of Magnetawan, McDougall and Whitestone;
- (c) the townships of Armour, Carling, Georgian Bay, Joly, Lake of Bays, Machar, McKellar, McMurrich/Monteith, Muskoka Lakes, Perry, Ryerson, Seguin, Strong and The Archipelago;
- (d) the villages of Burk's Falls, South River and Sundridge;
- (e) the unorganized areas of Parry Sound (Centre Part) and Parry Sound (North East); and
- (f) the Indian reserves of Dokis No. 9, French River No. 13, Henvey Inlet No. 2, Magnetawan No. 1, Moose Point No. 79, Naiscoutaing No. 17A, Parry Island First Nation, Shawanaga No. 17 and the Wahta Mohawk Territory.

Perth—Wellington

(Population: 113,929)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Stratford;
- (b) the towns of Minto and St. Marys;
- (c) the municipalities of North Perth and West Perth; and
- (d) the townships of Mapleton, Perth East, Perth South and Wellington North.

Peterborough

(Population: 128,349)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Peterborough;
- (b) that part of the Municipality of Trent Lakes comprising the islands of the Curve Lake Indian Reserve No. 35A;
- (c) the townships of Asphodel-Norwood, Douro-Dummer, Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, Otonabee-South Monaghan and Selwyn; and
- (d) the Indian reserves of Curve Lake First Nation No. 35 and Hiawatha First Nation.

Pickering—Brooklin

(Population: 122,430)

(Map 9)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Pickering; and
- (b) that part of the Town of Whitby lying northerly of Highway 407.

Prescott—Russell—Cumberland

(Population: 109,125)

(Maps 4 and 15)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Clarence-Rockland;

(b) that part of the City of Ottawa described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec with the northwesterly production of Cardinal Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said production and said creek to Innes Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Frank Kenny Road; thence generally southeasterly along said road to Wall Road; thence generally southwesterly along said road to Tenth Line Road; thence southeasterly along said road to the Prescott-Russell Recreational Trail; thence westerly along said trail to a point at approximate latitude 45°25'22"N and longitude 75°31'43"W; thence northwesterly in a straight line to Renaud Road at approximate latitude 45°25'28"N and longitude 75°31'47"W; thence northerly in a straight line to Navan Road at approximate latitude 45°26'02"N and longitude 75°31'59"W; thence westerly along said road to Blackburn Hamlet Bypass; thence generally southwesterly along said bypass and Innes Road to Highway 417 (Trans-Canada Highway); thence generally southeasterly and easterly along said highway to the southeasterly limit of said city; thence generally northeasterly, northwesterly and westerly along the southeasterly, northeasterly and northerly limits of said city to the point of commencement;

(c) the Town of Hawkesbury;

(d) the Municipality of The Nation;

(e) the townships of Alfred and Plantagenet, Champlain, East Hawkesbury and Russell; and

(f) the Village of Casselman.

Richmond Hill South

(Population: 124,748)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Markham described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Bayview Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Highway 407; thence easterly along said highway to Highway 404; thence northerly along said highway to the northerly limit of said city (Highway 7); thence westerly along said limit to the point of commencement; and

(b) that part of the City of Richmond Hill lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Elgin Mills Road East; thence westerly along said road and Elgin Mills Road West to the westerly limit of said city (Bathurst Street).

Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong

(Population: 128,154)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Sarnia;
- (b) the towns of Petrolia and Plympton-Wyoming;
- (c) the municipalities of Brooke-Alvinston and Lambton Shores;
- (d) the townships of Dawn-Euphemia, Enniskillen, St. Clair and Warwick;
- (e) the villages of Oil Springs and Point Edward; and
- (f) the Indian reserves of Kettle Point No. 44, Sarnia No. 45 and Walpole Island No. 46.

Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma

(Population: 113,772)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

- (a) the cities of Elliot Lake and Sault Ste. Marie;
- (b) the towns of Blind River, Bruce Mines, Spanish and Thessalon;
- (c) the municipalities of Huron Shores and Wawa;
- (d) the townships of Dubreuilville, Hilton, Hornepayne, Jocelyn, Johnson, Laird, Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Additional, Plummer Additional, Prince, St. Joseph, Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional, The North Shore and White River;
- (e) the Village of Hilton Beach;
- (f) the Unorganized Area of Algoma (South East Part);

(g) the Unorganized Area of Algoma (North Part), excluding the area lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said unorganized area and a point at approximate latitude 48°26'59"N and longitude 84°00'53"W; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 49°26'57"N and longitude 84°00'52"W;

(h) that part of the Unorganized Area of Sudbury (North Part) comprising the Missanabie Cree First Nation Indian Reserve; and

(i) the Indian reserves of Garden River No. 14, Goulais Bay No. 15A, Gros Cap No. 49, Mississagi River No. 8, Obadjiwan No. 15E, Rankin Location No. 15D, Sagamok, Serpent River No. 7 and Thessalon No. 12.

Scarborough—Agincourt

(Population: 123,969)
(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Midland Avenue; thence generally southerly along said avenue to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence southwesterly along said highway to Highway 404; thence northerly along said highway to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East

(Population: 111,377)
(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express) and Midland Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to an electric power transmission line; thence southwesterly along said transmission line to the GO Transit rail line; thence southerly along said rail line to Eglinton Avenue East; thence westerly along said avenue to Victoria Park Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Sunrise Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue and its production to the Don River East Branch; thence generally northwesterly along said river to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence easterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Scarborough—Guildwood—Rouge Park

(Population: 114,100)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and the Rouge River; thence generally southerly along said river to an electric power transmission line; thence westerly along said transmission line to Morningside Avenue; thence generally southeasterly along said avenue to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence westerly along said highway to East Highland Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to Highland Creek; thence generally southerly along said creek and West Highland Creek to a point at approximate latitude 43°45'26"N and longitude 79°12'17"W; thence southerly in a straight line to the GO Transit rail line at latitude 43°45'13"N and longitude 79°12'17"W; thence easterly along said rail line to Kingston Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Guildwood Parkway (Cromwell Road); thence generally southerly along said parkway to a point at approximate latitude 43°44'49"N and longitude 79°12'16"W; thence southerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 43°44'24"N and longitude 79°12'27"W; thence southwesterly in a straight line to Bellamy Ravine Creek at approximate latitude 43°43'40"N and longitude 79°13'03"W; thence easterly and southerly along said creek and its production to the southerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); thence northeasterly, northerly and westerly along the southerly, easterly and northerly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Scarborough North

(Population: 116,177)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the northerly limit of said city and the Rouge River; thence generally southerly along said river to an electric power transmission line; thence southwesterly along said transmission line to Morningside Avenue; thence generally southeasterly along said avenue to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence westerly along said highway to Midland Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Scarborough Southwest

(Population: 123,232)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the GO Transit rail line and Kingston Road; thence southwesterly along said road to Guildwood Parkway (Cromwell Road); thence generally southerly along said parkway to a point at approximate latitude 43°44'49"N and longitude 79°12'16"W; thence southerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 43°44'24"N and longitude 79°12'27"W; thence southwesterly in a straight

line to Bellamy Ravine Creek at approximate latitude 43°43'40"N and longitude 79°13'03"W; thence easterly and southerly along said creek and its production to the southerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); thence southwesterly along said limit to the southerly production of Nursewood Road; thence northerly along said production and Nursewood Road to Queen Street East; thence easterly along said street to Victoria Park Avenue; thence generally northerly along said avenue to Eglinton Avenue East; thence easterly along said avenue to the GO Transit rail line (easterly of McCowan Road); thence northeasterly along said rail line to the point of commencement.

Scarborough—Woburn

(Population: 110,589)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express) and East Highland Creek; thence generally southeasterly along said creek to Highland Creek; thence generally southerly along said creek and West Highland Creek to a point at approximate latitude 43°45'26"N and longitude 79°12'17"W; thence southerly in a straight line to the GO Transit rail line at approximate latitude 43°45'13"N and longitude 79°12'17"W; thence westerly and southwesterly along said rail line to Eglinton Avenue East; thence westerly along said avenue to the GO Transit rail line; thence northerly along said rail line to an electric power transmission line; thence northeasterly along said transmission line to Midland Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence easterly along said highway to the point of commencement.

Simcoe—Grey

(Population: 107,836)

(Map 3)

Consists of:

- (a) the towns of Collingwood, The Blue Mountains and Wasaga Beach; and
- (b) the townships of Adjala-Tosorontio, Clearview and Essa.

Simcoe North

(Population: 112,022)

(Map 2)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Orillia;

(b) the towns of Midland and Penetanguishene;

(c) the townships of Ramara, Severn, Tay and Tiny; and

(d) the Indian reserves of Chippewas of Rama First Nation, Christian Island No. 30 and Christian Island No. 30A.

Spadina—Harbourfront

(Population: 105,739)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the F.G. Gardiner Expressway and Parliament Street; thence generally southeasterly along said street, its southeasterly production, the Inner Harbour and Eastern Channel to the mouth of said channel; thence southerly in a straight line to the southerly limit of said city at approximate latitude 43°36'45"N and longitude 79°20'39"W (south of the Outer Harbour East Headland [Tommy Thompson Park]); thence generally westerly along said limit to the southeasterly production of Spencer Avenue; thence northwesterly along said production to the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; thence northeasterly along said expressway to the southerly production of Atlantic Avenue; thence northerly along said production, Atlantic Avenue, its northerly production and Dovercourt Road to Queen Street West; thence easterly along said street to Yonge Street; thence southerly along said street to the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; thence easterly along said expressway to the point of commencement.

St. Catharines

(Population: 119,977)

(Map 17)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of St. Catharines lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said city and the southerly production of First Street Louth; thence northerly along said production and said street to Twelve Mile Creek; thence generally northerly along said creek to Highway 406; thence westerly and generally northerly along said highway to Queen Elizabeth Way; thence westerly along said way to Third

Street Louth; thence northerly along said street, Courtleigh Road and its northerly production to the northerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); and

(b) that part of the City of Thorold described as follows: commencing at the northerly limit of said city and Highway 406; thence southerly along said highway to Decew Road; thence westerly along said road to Lake Moodie; thence northwesterly along said lake to the northerly limit of said city; thence northeasterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry

(Population: 114,637)

(Map 4)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Cornwall;

(b) the Municipality of South Dundas;

(c) the townships of North Dundas, North Glengarry, North Stormont, South Glengarry and South Stormont; and

(d) the Akwesasne Indian Reserve No. 59.

Sudbury

(Population: 114,384)

(Map 10)

Consists of that part of the City of Greater Sudbury described as follows: commencing at a point on the easterly limit of said city at approximate latitude 46°37'29"N and longitude 80°41'39"W; thence southerly along said limit to the southerly limit of said city; thence generally westerly and northerly along the southerly limit of said city to Reserve Road; thence northerly along said road and its northerly production to Highway 144 (North-West Bypass); thence generally northerly along said highway to a point at approximate latitude 46°30'38"N and longitude 81°11'59"W; thence easterly in a straight line to a point at latitude 46°30'35"N and longitude 81°04'17"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point at latitude 46°32'15"N and longitude 81°04'15"W; thence easterly in a straight line to the intersection of Maley Drive (Road 73) and Barry Downe Road; thence northerly along Barry Downe Road and its northerly production to the intersection of Notre Dame Avenue and Bodson Drive East; thence easterly along said drive and its easterly production to a point at latitude 46°37'21"N and longitude 80°49'10"W; thence northerly in a straight line to a point on the southerly shoreline of Wanapitei Lake at latitude 46°43'15"N and longitude 80°49'05"W; thence generally southeasterly along said shoreline to the mouth of the Wanapitei River (Wanapitae Dam); thence generally southerly along the westerly shoreline of said river to the easterly limit of said city (at approximate latitude 46°37'30"N and longitude 80°39'36"W); thence westerly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Taiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park

(Population: 117,873)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the Humber River and an electric power transmission line lying northerly of Dundas Street West; thence generally northeasterly along said transmission line to the GO Transit rail line; thence generally southeasterly along said rail line to the northerly production of Atlantic Avenue; thence southerly along said production, Atlantic Avenue and its southerly production to the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; thence southwesterly along said expressway to the southeasterly production of Spencer Avenue; thence southeasterly along said production to the southerly limit of said city (Lake Ontario); thence generally westerly along said limit to the southeasterly production of the Humber River; thence generally northwesterly along said production and Humber River to the point of commencement.

Thunder Bay—Rainy River

(Population: 82,357)

(Maps 1 and 18)

Consists of:

- (a) that part of the City of Thunder Bay lying southerly of Highway 11/17 (Trans-Canada Highway), Harbour Expressway, Main Street and its easterly production to the easterly limit of said city;
- (b) the towns of Atikokan, Fort Frances and Rainy River;
- (c) the municipalities of Neebing and Oliver Paipoonge;
- (d) the townships of Alberton, Chapple, Conmee, Dawson, Emo, Gillies, La Vallee, Lake of the Woods, Morley, O'Connor;
- (e) the Unorganized Area of Rainy River;
- (f) that part of the Unorganized Area of Thunder Bay lying southerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the westerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 50°03'46"N and longitude 90°57'58"W; thence easterly in a straight line to a point at latitude 50°03'45"N and longitude 90°00'00"W; thence south to the Dog River; thence generally southeasterly along said river, Taman Lake and the westerly shoreline of Dog Lake to the northerly limit of Silver Falls Provincial Park; thence westerly, southerly, and easterly along the northerly, westerly and southerly limits of said park to the Kaministiquia River; thence generally southerly along said river to the southerly limit of said unorganized area; and

(g) the Indian reserves of Agency No. 1, Assabaska, Big Grassy River No. 35G, Big Island Mainland No. 93, Couchiching No. 16A, Fort William No. 52, Lac des Mille Lacs No. 22A1, Manitou Rapids No. 11, Nequaguon Lake No. 25D, Rainy Lake nos. 17A, 17B, 18C and 26A, Saug-a-Gaw-Sing No. 1, Seine River No. 23A and Sturgeon Falls No. 23.

Thunder Bay—Superior North

(Population: 86,147)

(Maps 1 and 18)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Thunder Bay lying northerly of Highway 11/17 (Trans-Canada Highway), Harbour Expressway, Main Street and its easterly production to the easterly limit of said city;

(b) the Town of Marathon;

(c) the municipalities of Greenstone and Shuniah;

(d) the townships of Dorion, Manitouwadge, Nipigon, Red Rock, Schreiber and Terrace Bay;

(e) that part of the Unorganized Area of Cochrane (North Part) lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area at approximate latitude 49°42'31"N and longitude 84°41'09"W; thence northerly in a straight line to Kenogami River at approximate latitude 50°13'33"N and longitude 84°41'20"W; thence generally northerly along said river to the northerly limit of said unorganized area;

(f) that part of the Unorganized Area of Kenora described as follows: commencing at the southerly limit of said unorganized area (the Albany River) at approximate latitude 51°31'10"N and longitude 86°32'53"W; thence northerly in a straight line to latitude 53°00'00"N and longitude 86°33'09"W; thence westerly in a straight line to the easterly limit of the Indian Reserve of Webequie; thence generally northerly, westerly and southerly along the easterly, northerly and westerly limits of said Indian reserve to a point at latitude 53°00'00"N; thence west to longitude 89°00'00"W; thence south to the southerly limit of said unorganized area (the Albany River); thence generally easterly along said limit to the point of commencement;

(g) that part of the Unorganized Area of Thunder Bay lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said unorganized area and a point at approximate latitude 51°08'01"N and longitude 90°10'01"W; thence southerly in a straight line to latitude 50°03'49"N and longitude 90°10'12"W; thence easterly in a straight line to latitude 50°03'45"N and longitude 90°00'00"W; thence south to the Dog River; thence generally southeasterly along said river, Taman Lake and the westerly shoreline of Dog Lake to the northerly limit of Silver Falls Provincial Park; thence westerly, southerly and easterly along the northerly, westerly and southerly limits of said park to the Kaministiquia River; thence generally southerly along said river to the southerly limit of said unorganized area;

(h) the Indian reserves of Fort Hope No. 64, Ginoogaming First Nation, Gull River No. 55, Lake Helen No. 53A, Lake Nipigon, Long Lake No. 58, Marten Falls No. 65, Neskantaga, Pays Plat No. 51, Pic Mobert North, Pic Mobert South, Pic River No. 50, Red Rock No. 53, Rocky Bay No. 1, Sand Point First Nation, Webequie and Whitesand; and

(i) the Indian settlements of Aroland, Lansdowne House and Summer Beaver.

Toronto Centre

(Population: 121,703)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Bloor Street East and the Don River; thence generally southeasterly along said river to the Don Valley Parkway northbound; thence southwesterly along said parkway to the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; thence generally westerly along said expressway to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to Bloor Street East; thence generally easterly along said street to the point of commencement.

Toronto—Danforth

(Population: 105,472)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Taylor Massey Creek and the northeasterly production of Coxwell Boulevard; thence southwesterly along said production and Coxwell Boulevard to Coxwell Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Lake Shore Boulevard East; thence southwesterly in a straight line to the northerly shoreline of Ashbridges Bay at approximate latitude 43°39'43"N and longitude 79°18'55"W; thence generally southeasterly through said bay to its mouth (Lake Ontario); thence southerly in a straight line to the southerly limit of said city at approximate latitude 43°38'54"N and longitude 79°18'51"W; thence generally southwesterly along said limit to the southerly corner of said city (south of the Outer Harbour East Headland [Tommy Thompson Park]); thence northerly in a straight line to the mouth of the Eastern Channel; thence generally northwesterly along said channel, the Inner Harbour, the production of Parliament street and Parliament Street to the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; thence generally northeasterly along said expressway and Don Valley Parkway to the Don River; thence generally northerly and generally easterly along said river and the Don River East Branch to Taylor Massey Creek; thence generally easterly along said creek to the point of commencement.

Toronto—St. Paul's

(Population: 125,438)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Eglinton Avenue East and Bayview Avenue; thence southerly along Bayview Avenue to Moore Avenue; thence westerly along said avenue to the Beltline Trail; thence generally southeasterly along said trail to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence generally southwesterly and westerly along said railway to Ossington Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to Davenport Road; thence easterly along said road to Winona Drive; thence generally northerly along said drive to Vaughan Road; thence northwesterly along said road and its northwesterly production to Eglinton Avenue West; thence easterly along said avenue to Yonge Street; thence northerly along said street to Broadway Avenue; thence easterly along said avenue to Mount Pleasant Road; thence southerly along said road to Eglinton Avenue East; thence easterly along said avenue to the point of commencement.

University—Rosedale

(Population: 123,244)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Beltline Trail; thence generally southerly along said trail to Bayview Avenue at approximate latitude 43°40'51"N and longitude 79°22'06"W; thence generally southerly along said avenue to the Don Valley Parkway ramp (to Bayview Avenue); thence northeasterly along said ramp to the Don River; thence generally southerly along said river to Bloor Street East; thence generally westerly along said street to Yonge Street; thence southerly along said street to Queen Street West; thence westerly along said street to Ossington Avenue; thence northerly along said avenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence easterly and generally northeasterly along said railway to the point of commencement.

Vaughan—Thornhill

(Population: 124,866)

(Map 21)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Markham lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Bayview Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to the southerly limit of said city (Steeles Avenue East); and

(b) that part of the City of Vaughan described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the easterly limit of said city and Major Mackenzie Drive West; thence westerly along said drive to Dufferin Street; thence southerly along said street to Rutherford Road; thence westerly along

said road to Keele Street; thence southerly along said street to the Don River West Branch; thence generally northwesterly along said river to Rutherford Road; thence westerly along said road to Highway 400; thence southerly along said highway to the southerly limit of said city; thence easterly and generally northerly along the southerly and easterly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Vaughan—Woodbridge

(Population: 121,705)

(Map 21)

Consists of that part of the City of Vaughan described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southerly limit of said city and Highway 400; thence northerly along said highway to Teston Road; thence westerly along said road to Pine Valley Drive; thence southerly along said drive to Teston Road; thence westerly along said road to a creek at approximate latitude 43°51'22" N and longitude 79°35'53" W; thence generally southerly along said creek to Major Mackenzie Drive West; thence generally southwesterly along said drive to the westerly limit of said city; thence southeasterly and easterly along the westerly and southerly limits of said city to the point of commencement.

Waterloo

(Population: 121,436)

(Map 8)

Consists of the City of Waterloo.

Wellington—Halton Hills North

(Population: 105,440)

(Maps 3 and 12)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Guelph lying southeasterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said city and College Avenue West; thence northeasterly along said avenue to Hanlon Parkway; thence southeasterly along said parkway to Hanlon's Creek; thence generally northeasterly and northwesterly along said creek to Edinburgh Road South; thence northeasterly along said road to Gordon Street; thence southeasterly along said street to Arkell Road; thence northeasterly along said road to the northeasterly limit of said city (Victoria Road South);

(b) the Town of Erin;

(c) that part of the Town of Halton Hills lying northwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the southwesterly limit of said town (Nassagaweya-Esquesing Townline) and 15 Side Road; thence generally northeasterly along said road to Trafalgar Road; thence northwesterly along said road and Highway 7 to 22 Side Road; thence northeasterly along said road and its intermittent production to the northeasterly limit of said town (Winston Churchill Boulevard); and

(d) the townships of Centre Wellington, Guelph/Eramosa and Puslinch.

Whitby

(Population: 115,257)

(Map 9)

Consists of that part of the Town of Whitby lying southerly of Highway 407.

Willowdale

(Population: 118,218)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Bayview Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence southwesterly along said highway to the Don River West Branch; thence generally northwesterly along said river to Bathurst Street; thence northerly along said street to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

Windsor—Tecumseh

(Population: 131,097)

(Maps 3 and 20)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Windsor lying easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city with the northwesterly production of Langlois Avenue; thence southeasterly along said production and Langlois Avenue to Tecumseh Road East; thence easterly along said road to Pillette Road; thence southeasterly along said road and its intermittent productions to the northerly limit of the Windsor International Airport; thence generally southwesterly along said limit to the Canadian National Railway; thence generally southeasterly along said railway to the southerly limit of said city (Provincial Road);

(b) the Town of Tecumseh; and

(c) that part of the town of Lakeshore lying northerly and westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said town and Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway); thence easterly along said highway to the Puce River; thence generally northerly along said river to Lake St. Clair; thence northerly in a straight line to the northerly limit of said town.

Windsor West

(Population: 130,162)

(Map 20)

Consists of that part of the City of Windsor lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city with the northwesterly production of Langlois Avenue; thence southeasterly along said production and Langlois Avenue to Tecumseh Road East; thence easterly along said road to Pillette Road; thence southeasterly along said road and its intermittent productions to the northerly limit of the Windsor International Airport; thence generally southwesterly along said limit to the Canadian National Railway; thence generally southeasterly along said railway to the southerly limit of said city (Provincial Road).

York Centre

(Population: 108,307)

(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Bathurst Street; thence generally southerly along said street to the Don River West Branch; thence generally southeasterly along said river to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence southwesterly and westerly along said highway to Jane Street; thence northerly along said street to Sheppard Avenue West; thence easterly along said avenue to Black Creek; thence generally northwesterly along said creek to Grandravine Drive; thence generally easterly along said drive to Keele Street; thence northerly along said street to the northerly limit of said city; thence easterly along said limit to the point of commencement.

York—Durham

(Population: 116,560)

(Maps 3 and 4)

Consists of:

(a) the Town of Georgina;

(b) that part of the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Bethesda Road and the easterly limit of said town; thence northwesterly, southwesterly, generally southerly and generally northeasterly along the easterly, northerly, westerly and southerly limits of said town to Highway 48; thence northerly along said highway to Bethesda Road; thence easterly along said road to Ninth Line; thence northerly along Ninth Line to Bethesda Road; thence easterly along said road to the point of commencement;

(c) the townships of Brock, Scugog and Uxbridge; and

(d) the Indian reserves of Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation and Mississaugas of Scugog Island.

York South—Weston—Etobicoke

(Population: 111,369)


(Map 19)

Consists of that part of the City of Toronto described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express) and the GO Transit rail line lying easterly of Connie Street; thence southerly along said rail line to Eglinton Avenue West; thence westerly along said avenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence southeasterly along said railway and the GO Transit rail line to an electric power transmission line lying northerly of Brickworks Lane; thence generally southwesterly along said transmission line to the Humber River; thence generally northerly along said river to Eglinton Avenue West; thence westerly along said avenue to Royal York Road; thence generally northerly along said road and Saint Phillips Road to the Humber River; thence generally northerly along said river to Highway 401 (Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Ontario 401 Express); thence easterly along said highway to the point of commencement.


Province of Ontario




Southern Ontario (part C)




City of Barrie




City of Belleville



Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo




Regional Municipality of Durham (part)




City of Greater Sudbury




City of Guelph




Regional Municipality of Halton




City of Hamilton




City of Ottawa




Regional Municipality of Peel (part)




Cities of St. Catharines and Thorold



City of Thunder Bay



City of Toronto



City of Windsor



Regional Municipality of York (part)



COUNTY OF RENFREW**ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT REPORT ADDENDUM**

TO: Finance and Administration Committee
FROM: Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk
DATE: February 16, 2023
SUBJECT: Addendum to Administration Report

RESOLUTIONS**4. March Meeting of Finance and Administration Committee**

Recommendation: THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend that the March meeting of this committee be rescheduled to Monday, March 20, 2023.

Background

The March 2023 meeting is currently scheduled for Thursday, March 9. Warden Emon and CAO Craig Kelley will be away at an Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus meeting so it is necessary to reschedule this meeting.

COUNTY OF RENFREW**CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT REPORT**

TO: Finance and Administration Committee
FROM: Jeffrey Foss, Director of Corporate Services
DATE: February 16, 2023
SUBJECT: Department Report

INFORMATION**1. KPMG LLP – 2022 Audit**

At our June 2022 Finance & Administration Committee and County Council meetings, the County of Renfrew was made aware that after a relationship of more than 40 years, the accounting firm of Scott Rosien Black & Locke would not be in a position to provide auditing services beyond the 2021 fiscal year. Accordingly, staff issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for audit services for a five-year term and as a result KPMG LLP, through their offices/teams located in Perth/Kingston were appointed in September 2022. Attached as Appendix I is their detailed Audit Planning Report for 2022.

2. Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) 2022 Statement of Remuneration

Attached as Appendix II is a letter dated January 16, 2023 from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) providing details of Council remuneration and expenses paid to Warden Robinson, AMO Board of Directors, County Caucus, EOWC Chair. AMO only reimburses for mileage, and meetings in 2022 were held virtually.

3. Board of Health 2022 Statement of Remuneration

Attached as Appendix III is a letter dated January 30, 2023 from the Renfrew County and District Health Unit (RCDHU) providing an itemized statement of remuneration and expenses paid for 2022 for the members of County Council appointed to the Board of Health.

4. Provincial Offences Administration Workload

The following is a chart comparing charges received, trial notices issued, payments processed, accounts receivable files reviewed and collection notices mailed over the past five months through the Provincial Offences Administration Office.

Month	Charges Received	Trial Notices Issued <small>**Notice of Hearing Audio Court</small>	Early Resolution Notices	Payments Processed	Payfines Payments Processed	Number of Files Reviewed	Licence Suspensions	Collection Notices	To Collection Agency
2022 Sept.	955	18	68	422	472	524	94	87	89
October	925	62	111	422	424	430	45	73	186
Nov.	676	16	92	351	283	355	48	128	323
Dec	527	119	41	317	272	415	168	118	140
2023 Jan.	588	40	72	365	303	480	82	215	173

5. Provincial Offences Administration Backlog

The following chart highlights the ongoing backlog of court matters due to the COVID-19 shutdown:

Month	# of Courts Originally Scheduled	# of Courts Cancelled	# Part I Charges in Backlog	Part III New Charges	# Part III Charges in Backlog	Total Backlog Charges	Number of Court Days Required for Backlog	Months to Clear Backlog at Current Rate
2022 June	7	4	391	87	956	1,434	60	20
July	6	3	389	109	969	1,467	61	20
August	6	2	433	70	1,016	1,519	63	21
Sept.	6	3	399	122	978	1,499	62	21
Oct.	6	2	369	141	994	1,504	62	21
Nov.	6	2	355	150	1,012	1,517	63	21
Dec	6	3	337	114	975	1426	59	20
2023 Jan.	6	2	313	109	907	1329	55	18

6. **Provincial Offences Administration (POA) – Critical Incident Report**

In January, the POA Manager completed and submitted a critical incident/issue report to the Ministry of Attorney General's POA Unit. This reporting process is used whenever there is a major event or issue to be relayed to the province. The report highlighted the impact that ongoing court closures and limited judicial resources are having here in the County of Renfrew. Despite numerous requests to the Regional Senior Justice of the Peace to reallocate satellite court dates back to Pembroke, or provide additional trial dates, no resources have been made available. The concern is a mounting backlog and a defendant's ability to access justice in a timely manner, putting the Courts in a position of receiving more 11B *Charter* challenges which is a person's right to be tried within a reasonable time. Enforcement agencies, prosecutors and legal counsel have also expressed frustration with the very limited court availability and the high volume of court dockets.

7. **Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) – A Call for Provincial Action on Property Assessments**

Property assessments are typically updated every four years and this process was paused during the height of the pandemic to help municipal governments focus on responding to COVID-19. With the Province's latest economic statement remaining silent on the assessment cycle, municipalities are eager to understand the government's intentions regarding the 2024 tax year and beyond. AMO is continuing to call on the government for urgent action as an up-to-date assessment system is the foundation of the municipal tax system that supports strong, vibrant and growing communities. Attached as Appendix IV is a letter from Colin Best, AMO President to the Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy, Minister of Finance regarding reassessment.

RESOLUTIONS

8. **2023 Departmental Budget**

Recommendation: THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommends that the Draft 2023 Budgets for all divisions reporting to this Committee be approved and forwarded to the February 22, 2023 County Council Budget Workshop for approval.

Background

Attached as Appendix V is the detailed 2023 Budgets for all divisions reporting to this Committee which will be overviewed at today's meeting.



Corporation of the County of Renfrew

**Audit Planning Report
for the year ended December 31, 2022**

KPMG LLP

Prepared on January 31, 2023 for the Finance and Administration
Committee meeting on February 16, 2023



KPMG contacts

Key contacts in connection with this engagement



Lori Huber, CPA, CA, LPA

Lead Audit Engagement Partner

613-541-7320

lahuber@kpmg.ca



Caitlyn Cox, CPA, CA

Audit Senior Manager

613-541-7401

caitlyncox@kpmg.ca



Table of contents



Digital use information

This Audit Planning Report is also available as a “hyper-linked” PDF document.

If you are reading in electronic form (e.g. In “Adobe Reader” or “Board Books”), clicking on the home symbol on the top right corner will bring you back to this page.



Click on any item in the table of contents to navigate to that section.

4	Audit quality	5	KPMG Clara	6	Highlights
7	Audit plan	11	Group audit plan	12	Audit risks
16	Key milestones and deliverables	17	Proposed fees	19	Appendices

This report to the Finance and Administration Committee (the “Committee”) is intended solely for the information and use of management, the Committee, and Council, and should not be used for any other purpose or any other party. KPMG shall have no responsibility or liability for loss or damages or claims, if any, to or by any third party as this report to the Committee has not been prepared for, and is not intended for, and should not be used by, any third party or for any other purpose.



Audit Quality: How do we deliver audit quality?

Quality essentially means doing the right thing and remains our highest priority. Our **Global Quality Framework** outlines how we deliver quality and how every partner and staff member contribute to its delivery.

'**Perform quality engagements**' sits at the core along with our commitment to continually monitor and remediate to fulfil on our quality drivers.

Our **quality value drivers** are the cornerstones to our approach underpinned by the **supporting drivers** and give clear direction to encourage the right behaviours in delivering audit quality.

We define '**audit quality**' as being the outcome when:

- audits are **executed consistently**, in line with the requirements and intent of **applicable professional standards** within a strong **system of quality controls**; and
- all of our related activities are undertaken in an environment of the utmost level of **objectivity, independence, ethics and integrity**.



Doing the right thing. Always.






Our audit platform - KPMG Clara

Building upon our sound audit quality foundations, we are making significant investments to drive consistency and quality across our global audit practices. We've committed to an ongoing investment in innovative technologies and tools for engagement teams, such as KPMG Clara, our smart audit platform.

KPMG Clara workflow



Globally consistent execution

A modern, intuitively written, highly applicable audit methodology that allows us to deliver globally consistent engagements.




KPMG Clara for clients



Real-time collaboration and transparency

Allows the client team to see the real-time status of the engagement and who from our KPMG team is leading on a deliverable.




KPMG Clara analytics



Insights-driven efficient operations

Using the latest technologies to analyze data, KPMG Clara allows us to visualise the flow of transactions through the system, identify risks in your financial data and perform more specific audit procedures.



Highlights

Scope of the audit

Our audit of the consolidated financial statements (“financial statements”) of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew (the “County”) as of and for the year ending December 31, 2022 will be performed in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards (CASs).



Significant risks

The presumed fraud risk related to management override of controls.

Rebuttable significant risks

The presumed fraud risk involving improper revenue recognition has been rebutted by us.

Newly effective auditing standards

CAS 315 is effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after December 15, 2021. See Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards.

Upcoming accounting standards

The Asset Retirement Obligations standard will be applicable in fiscal 2023 and is expected to have a significant impact. See Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements for the new standards coming in future years.

Transition to KPMG

We will work closely with the County’s management to ensure a seamless transition of the external audit relationship including audit processes and methodology.

Report highlights

7

An Audit with KPMG


14

Other Areas of Focus





An audit with KPMG



Risk Assessment

What we do

Planning – Planning sets the tone for the whole audit. We will get the planning right so that your audit is focused, efficient and effective. This includes the preparation and presentation of our tailored Audit Planning Report.

Control evaluation – Risk assessment underlies the entire audit process, including the determination of significant accounts and disclosures and relevant assertions. The complexity of the organization, business unit, or process will play an important role in our risk assessment and the determination of the necessary procedures.

Substantive testing – Testing consists of substantive procedures or a combination of tests of operating effectiveness of controls and substantive procedures. We perform tests of the operating effectiveness of controls, if relevant, and substantive procedures to respond to our risk of material misstatement for each relevant assertion.

Completion – Based on the audit procedures performed and the audit evidence obtained, we evaluate before the conclusion of the audit whether the assessments of the risks of material misstatement remain appropriate. This includes the presentation of our tailored Audit Findings Report.



An audit with KPMG (continued)

Our values – what we believe:



Integrity

We do what is right.



Excellence

We never stop learning and improving.



Courage

We think and act boldly.



Together

We respect each other and draw strength from our differences.



For Better

We do what matters.

On your engagement, this means...

- We will demonstrate objectivity and skepticism, holding ourselves to the highest moral and ethical standards - even when under pressure
- We take responsibility and accountability for our day-to-day behavior
- We will keep our promises and provide context if the situation changes
- We will have conversations at the right time, and be honest, fair and consistent in our words, actions and decisions

- We will maintain an unwavering focus on audit quality in line with the requirements and intent of applicable professional standards
- We will bring a continuous improvement mindset, to learn and adapt with you
- We will invite your feedback and act on it to go above and beyond
- We will acknowledge when we don't have the answer, then try and find it


- We will be decisive and deal with challenges head on in the face of difficult circumstances
- We will apply professional skepticism to the work we do and speak up where we have doubts

- We will take time to listen to drive clarity and understanding to solve your biggest challenges
- We will consult with our colleagues and our wider stakeholders, utilizing their diverse skills, experience and specialist expertise to inform our work
- We will bring diverse teams, views and perspectives to the table and ensure everyone's voice is heard
- We will treat everyone with respect and dignity, always

- We will help you think through the long-term implications of your decisions on stakeholders and society
- We will do the small things every day that make a big difference
- We will act in a way that protects and serves the capital markets and the wider public interest
- Together with you, we will support our local communities to create sustainable, positive change



Materiality



We **initially determine materiality** at a level at which we consider that misstatements could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users. Determining materiality is a matter of **professional judgement**, considering both quantitative and qualitative factors, and is affected by our perception of the common financial information needs of users of the financial statements as a group. We do not consider the possible effect of misstatements on specific individual users, whose needs may vary widely.

We **reassess materiality** throughout the audit and revise materiality if we become aware of information that would have caused us to determine a different materiality level initially.

Plan and perform the audit

We **initially determine materiality** to provide a basis for:

- Determining the nature, timing and extent of risk assessment procedures;
- Identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement; and
- Determining the nature, timing, and extent of further audit procedures.

We design our procedures to detect misstatements at a level less than materiality in individual accounts and disclosures, to reduce to an appropriately low level the probability that the aggregate of uncorrected and undetected misstatements exceeds materiality for the financial statements as a whole.

Evaluate the effect of misstatements


We also use materiality to evaluate the effect of:

- Identified misstatements on our audit; and
- Uncorrected misstatements, if any, on the financial statements and in forming our opinion.

Materiality



Group Materiality
\$3,000,000



Prior year total expenses
\$135,000,000

Prior year total revenues
\$145,000,000

Prior year total assets
\$382,000,000



Group audit - scoping

Type of work performed	Total assets	Total revenue
Total full-scope audits	100%	100%
Total consolidated	100%	100%

Component	Component's business activities	Classification	Procedures completed by
County of Renfrew*	Represents the activities of the municipal operation proper.	Individually financially significant	KPMG Canada – Kingston office
Renfrew County Housing Corporation	Administers the social housing units in the County.	In-scope, not significant – subject to a separate financial statement audit.	KPMG Canada – Kingston office

*The Bonnechere Manor Long-Term Care Home and Miramichi Lodge are included as departments of the County and will be audited as part of the audit of the County.

Risk assessment summary

Our planning begins with an assessment of risks of material misstatement in your financial statements.

We draw upon our understanding of the County and its environment (e.g. the industry, the wider economic environment in which the business operates, etc.), our understanding of the County’s components of its system of internal control, including our business process understanding.

	Risk of fraud	Risk of error	PY risk rating
● Management override of controls	✓		Significant
● Cash and investments		✓	Base
● Accounts receivable		✓	Base
● Tangible capital assets		✓	Base
● Long-term liabilities		✓	Base
● Post-employment benefits		✓	Base
● Property taxation		✓	Base
● Government grants		✓	Base
● User charges		✓	Base
● Payroll expenses		✓	Base
● Operating expenses		✓	Base
● Consolidation process		✓	Base
● Financial reporting		✓	Base

Legend:

- PRESUMED RISK OF MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT
- OTHER AREA OF FOCUS



Significant risks



Management Override of Controls

RISK OF



FRAUD

Why is it significant?

**Presumption
of the risk of fraud
resulting from
management
override of
controls**

Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of its ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. Although the level of risk of management override of controls will vary from entity to entity, the risk nevertheless is present in all entities.

Audit approach

As this presumed risk of material misstatement due to fraud is not rebuttable, our audit methodology incorporates the required procedures in professional standards to address this risk. These procedures include:

- assess the design and implementation of controls surrounding the journal entry process
- testing of journal entries and other adjustments,
- performing a retrospective review of estimates
- evaluating the business rationale of significant unusual transactions.



Other areas of focus

Areas	Risk due to error	Audit approach
Cash and investments	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Confirmation with third parties for cash and investment balances. – Review of bank reconciliations and vouch significant reconciling items to supporting documentation. – Review of restrictions and disclosures including presentation considerations. – Perform a substantive analytical procedure over investment income.
Accounts receivable	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Perform substantive tests of details on accounts receivable and other receivables including vouching a selection of receivable balances to supporting documentation. – For accounts receivable at year-end, we will inquire of management as to the collectability of the receivable balance. – Evaluate revenue recognition, revenue restrictions, deferral and presentation considerations.
Tangible capital assets	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Vouch significant additions and disposals to supporting documentation. – Review of repair and maintenance expenses for proper accounting treatment. – Review the existence of the capital assets schedule with capital assets inventory maintained by management. – Review assets under construction to ensure appropriately accounted for. – Perform analytical audit procedures to ensure adequacy of amortization. – Enquire as to the impairment of any tangible capital assets. – Enquire as to land held for resale and ensure the appropriate valuation and financial statement presentation.
Long-term liabilities	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Direct confirmation of all indebtedness including terms with third parties. – Review of debt agreements and covenant compliance with external sources, if any.
Post-employment benefits	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We will obtain the County's actuarial valuation report and will agree the details to the provision and applicable note disclosure related to employee future benefit accruals. – We will perform required accounting estimates procedures per the auditing estimates standards including gaining a detailed understanding of the process used by Management to make the assumptions and develop procedures to test the reasonableness of the assumptions, completeness and accuracy of the data and resulting amount recorded in the County's financial statements.




Other areas of focus (continued)

Areas	Risk due to error	Audit approach
Property taxation	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will complete substantive analytical procedures to address the relevant assertions, including a reconciliation of approved tax rates and property assessments.
Government grants (including related deferred revenue)	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the year-end reconciliation of closing grant balances and obtain supporting documentation for significant reconciling items. Confirm certain balances or review supporting documentation for significant grant funds received by the County during the year to ensure any performance criteria have been met.
User charges	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will verify key changes in the composition of user charges. We will obtain a breakdown of user charges by type and complete substantive analytical procedures tailored to the nature of the accounts by incorporating volume and rate changes. Vouch a sample of user charges to supporting documentation.
Payroll expenses (including related payables)	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test and evaluate design and operating effectiveness over controls related to payroll . Perform substantive analytical procedures over salaries, benefits and staff expenses and related accounts. Recalculate significant accruals and review collective agreements for liabilities related to retroactive pay or any other outstanding amounts.
Operating expenses (including accounts payable and accrued liabilities)	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will perform substantive procedures over operating expenses and accounts payable. Perform a search for unrecorded liabilities and recalculate significant accruals. Vouch a sample of expenses to supporting documentation.
Consolidation process	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review management's consolidation of the reporting entity by cross-checking to audited statutory financial statements for the Housing Corporation. Review eliminating entries as prepared by management for accuracy and completeness. Verify that the related party disclosures are complete and prepared in accordance with PSAS.
Financial reporting	Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review by the engagement partner to ensure the disclosure is consistent with current public sector accounting, disclosure requirements and industry practice.



Key milestones and deliverables





Proposed fees



In determining the fees for our services, we have considered the nature, extent and timing of our planned audit procedures as described above. Our fee analysis has been reviewed with and agreed upon by management based on our most recent competitive proposal dated August 19, 2022.

Description of service	Current period (budget)
Audit of the consolidated financial statements of the County	\$ 39,000
Audit of the financial statements of the Renfrew County Housing Corporation and preparation of the corporate tax return	\$ 14,750
Audit of the Bonnechere Manor Long-Term Care Home Annual Reconciliation Report	\$ 4,500
Audit of the Bonnechere Manor Adult Day Program Annual Reconciliation Report	\$ 2,500
Audit of the Miramichi Lodge Long-Term Care Home Annual Reconciliation Report	\$ 4,500
Review of the Ministry of Community and Social Services: Ontario Works Report	\$ 3,500
Review of the Child Care Service Manager Report	\$ 3,000
Review of the Child Care EarlyON Program Report	\$ 3,000
Audit of the lease costs for 450 O'Brien Road	\$ 2,500



Proposed fees (continued)


Matters that could impact our fee

The proposed fees outlined above are based on the assumptions described in our engagement letter. The following factors could cause a change in our fees:

- Significant changes to the relevant financial reporting framework including any new accounting standards
- Significant new or changed accounting policies or application thereof
- Significant changes to internal control over financial reporting
- Significant unusual and/or complex transactions
- New audit standards or requirements arising as a result of changes in audit standards
- Changes in the timing of our work
- Other significant issues (e.g. cyber security breaches)
- Any accounting advice

Appendices

-  **Other required communications**
-  **Newly effective auditing standards**
-  **Future accounting pronouncements**
-  **Audit and assurance insights**





Appendix 1: Other required communications



Required inquiries


Required inquiries with the Committee, annually, include:

- How do you oversee fraud risk assessments and the establishment of controls to address fraud risks?
- What are your views about fraud risks at the entity?
- Are you aware of, or have you identified, any instances of actual, suspected, or alleged fraud, including misconduct or unethical behavior related to financial reporting or misappropriation of assets? If so, have the instances been appropriately addressed and how have they been addressed?
- Are you aware of or have you received tips or complaints regarding the entity's financial reporting (including those received through the internal whistleblower program, if such program exists) and, if so, what was your response to such tips and complaints?
- What is the Committee's understanding of the entity's relationships and transactions with related parties that are significant to the entity?
- Does any member of the Committee have concerns regarding relationships or transactions with related parties and, if so, what are the substance of those concerns?
- Has the entity entered into any significant unusual transactions?



Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards

CAS 315 (Revised) Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement has been revised, reorganized and modernized in response to challenges and issues with the previous standard. It aims to promote consistency in application, improve scalability, reduce complexity, support a more robust risk assessment and incorporate enhanced guidance material to respond to the evolving environment, including in relation to information technology. Conforming and consequential amendments have been made to other International Standards on Auditing.



Affects both preparers of financial statements and auditors

Applies to audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after 15 December 2021

See here for more information from CPA Canada



We design and perform risk assessment procedures to obtain an understanding of the:

- entity and its environment;
- applicable financial reporting framework; and
- entity's system of internal control.

The audit evidence obtained from this understanding provides a basis for:

- identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error; and
- the design of audit procedures that are responsive to the assessed risks of material misstatement.



Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards (continued)

Key change

Overall, a more robust risk identification and assessment process, including:

- New requirement to take into account how, and the degree to which, 'inherent risk factors' affect the susceptibility of relevant assertions to misstatement
- New concept of significant classes of transactions, account balances and disclosures and relevant assertions to help us to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement
- New requirement to separately assess inherent risk and control risk for each risk of material misstatement
- Revised definition of significant risk for those risks which are close to the upper end of the spectrum of inherent risk

Impact on the audit team

When assessing inherent risk for identified risks of material misstatement, we consider the degree to which inherent risk factors (such as complexity, subjectivity, uncertainty, change, susceptibility to management bias) affect the susceptibility of assertions to misstatement.

We use the concept of the spectrum of inherent risk to assist us in making a judgement, based on the likelihood and magnitude of a possible misstatement, on a range from higher to lower, when assessing risks of material misstatement

The changes may affect our assessments of the risks of material misstatement and the design of our planned audit procedures to respond to identified risks of material misstatement.

If we do not plan to test the operating effectiveness of controls, the risk of material misstatement is the same as the assessment of inherent risk.

Impact on management

If the effect of this consideration is that our assessment of the risks of material misstatement is higher, then our audit approach may increase the number of controls tested and/or the extent of that testing, and/or our substantive procedures will be designed to be responsive to the higher risk.

We may perform different audit procedures and request different information compared to previous audits, as part of a more focused response to the effects identified inherent risk factors have on the assessed risks of material misstatement.



Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards (continued)

Key change	Impact on the audit team	Impact on management
<p>Overall, a more robust risk identification and assessment process, including evaluating whether the audit evidence obtained from risk assessment procedures provides an appropriate basis to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement</p>	<p>When making this evaluation, we consider all audit evidence obtained, whether corroborative or contradictory to management assertions. If we conclude the audit evidence obtained does not provide an appropriate basis, then we perform additional risk assessment procedures until audit evidence has been obtained to provide such a basis.</p>	<p>In certain circumstances, we may perform additional risk assessment procedures, which may include further inquires of management, analytical procedures, inspection and/or observation.</p>
<p>Overall, a more robust risk identification and assessment process, including performing a 'stand back' at the end of the risk assessment process</p>	<p>We evaluate whether our determination that certain material classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures have no identified risks of material misstatement remains appropriate.</p>	<p>In certain circumstances, this evaluation may result in the identification of additional risks of material misstatement, which will require us to perform additional audit work to respond to these risks.</p>



Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards (continued)

Key change

Modernized to recognize the evolving environment, including in relation to IT

Enhanced requirements relating to exercising professional skepticism

Impact on the audit team

New requirement to understand the extent to which the business model integrates the use of IT.

When obtaining an understanding of the IT environment, including IT applications and supporting IT infrastructure, it has been clarified that we also understand the IT processes and personnel involved in those processes relevant to the audit.

Based on the identified controls we plan to evaluate, we are required to identify the:

- IT applications and other aspects of the IT environment relevant to those controls
- related risks arising from the use of IT and the entity's general IT controls that address them.

Examples of risks that may arise from the use of IT include unauthorized access or program changes, inappropriate data changes, risks from the use of external or internal service providers for certain aspects of the entity's IT environment or cybersecurity risks.

New requirement to design and perform risk assessment procedures in a manner that is not biased toward obtaining audit evidence that may be corroborative or toward excluding audit evidence that may be contradictory. Strengthened documentation requirements to demonstrate the exercise of professional scepticism.

Impact on management

We will expand our risk assessment procedures and are likely to engage more extensively with your IT and other relevant personnel when obtaining an understanding of the entity's use of IT, the IT environment and potential risks arising from IT. This might require increased involvement of IT audit professionals.

Changes in the entity's use of IT and/or the IT environment may require increased audit effort to understand those changes and affect our assessment of the risks of material misstatement and audit response.

Risks arising from the use of IT and our evaluation of general IT controls may affect our control risk assessments, and decisions about whether we test the operating effectiveness of controls for the purpose of placing reliance on them or obtain more audit evidence from substantive procedures. They may also affect our strategy for testing information that is produced by, or involves, the entity's IT applications.

We may make changes to the nature, timing and extent of our risk assessment procedures, such as our inquires of management, the activities we observe or the accounting records we inspect.



Appendix 2: Newly effective auditing standards (continued)

Key change

Clarification of which controls need to be identified for the purpose of evaluating the design and implementation of a control

Impact on the audit team

We will evaluate the design and implementation of controls that address risks of material misstatement at the assertion level as follows:

- Controls that address a significant risk.
- Controls over journal entries, including non-standard journal entries.
- Other controls we consider appropriate to evaluate to enable us to identify and assess risks of material misstatement and design our audit procedures

Impact on management

We may identify new or different controls that we plan to evaluate the design and implementation of, and possibly test the operating effectiveness to determine if we can place reliance on them.

We may also identify risks arising from IT relating to the controls we plan to evaluate, which may result in the identification of general IT controls that we also need to evaluate and possibly test whether they are operating effectively. This may require increased involvement of IT audit specialists.



Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements

Asset retirement obligations (“AROs”)

Effective date

December 31, 2023

Summary and implications

- The new standard addresses the recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure of legal obligations associated with retirement of tangible capital assets in productive use. Retirement costs will be recognized as an integral cost of owning and operating tangible capital assets.
- The ARO standard will require the public sector entity to record a liability related to future costs of any legal obligations to be incurred upon retirement of any controlled tangible capital assets (“TCA”).
- As a result of the new standard, the public sector entity will:
 - Consider how the additional liability will impact net debt, as a new liability will be recognized with no corresponding increase in a financial asset.
 - Carefully review legal agreements, senior government directives and legislation in relation to all controlled TCA to determine if any legal obligations exist with respect to asset retirements.

Financial instruments & foreign currency translation

Effective date

December 31, 2023

Summary and implications

- Equity instruments quoted in an active market and free-standing derivatives are to be carried at fair value. All other financial instruments, including bonds, can be carried at cost or fair value depending on the public sector entity's choice and this choice must be made on initial recognition of the financial instrument and is irrevocable.
- Hedge accounting is not permitted.
- A new statement, the Statement of Remeasurement Gains and Losses, will be included in the financial statements. Unrealized gains and losses incurred on fair value accounted financial instruments will be presented in this statement. Realized gains and losses will continue to be presented in the statement of operations.
- PS 3450 *Financial Instruments* was amended subsequent to its initial release to include various federal government narrow-scope amendments.



Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements (continued)

Revenue

Effective date

December 31, 2024

Summary and implications

- The new standard establishes a single framework to categorize revenues to enhance the consistency of revenue recognition and its measurement.
- The standard notes that in the case of revenues arising from an exchange transaction, a public sector entity must ensure the recognition of revenue aligns with the satisfaction of related performance obligations.
- The standard notes that unilateral revenue arises when no performance obligations are present, and recognition occurs when there is authority to record the revenue and an event has happened that gives the public sector entity the right to the revenue.

Effective date

December 31, 2024

Summary and implications

Public Private Partnerships (“P3s”)

- PSAB has introduced Section PS3160, which includes new requirements for the recognition, measurement and classification of infrastructure procured through a public private partnership. The standard may be applied retroactively or prospectively.
- The standard notes that recognition of infrastructure by the public sector entity would occur when it controls the purpose and use of the infrastructure, when it controls access and the price, if any, charged for use, and it controls any significant interest accumulated in the infrastructure when the P3 ends.
- The public sector entity recognizes a liability when it needs to pay cash or non-cash consideration to the private sector partner for the infrastructure.

Effective date

December 31, 2024

Summary and implications

Purchased intangibles

- The guideline allows public sector entities to recognize intangibles purchased through an exchange transaction. The definition of an asset, the general recognition criteria and GAAP hierarchy are used to account for purchased intangibles.
- Narrow scope amendments were made to *PS 1000 Financial statement concepts* to remove the prohibition to recognize purchased intangibles and to *PS 1201 Financial statement presentation* to remove the requirement to disclose purchased intangibles not recognized.
- The guideline can be applied retroactively or prospectively.



Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements (continued)

Asset retirement obligations: key audit risks

1

Do you have **completeness** of ARO's on your financial statements, particularly in terms of assets identified as in-scope?

2

Have you determined **measurement** of ARO's based on reliable data and costing models?

3

Have you correctly applied an appropriate **transition method**?

4

Do you have adequate **documentation** of your process and audit working papers enabling auditability?



Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements (continued)

Asset retirement obligations: implementation project

Project planning

- Project team is cross-functional and includes Finance and non-Finance personnel.
- Sufficient personnel resources are available for the implementation project.
- Where required, external experts have been engaged.
- The project plan identifies who is responsible for each project task.
- Project timelines are reasonable.
- Auditor involvement has been scheduled at each significant project milestone.
- Asset retirement obligations policy has been drafted.
- Recurring project updates are provided to the Audit Committee or other governance body to engage them in the implementation process.

Scoping

- The tangible capital assets listing reconciles to the audited financial statements.
- Agreements (e.g. leases, statutory rights of way, etc.) have been reviewed for potential legal obligations.
- Productive and non-productive assets have been included in the scoping analysis.
- Assets with similar characteristics and risks have been grouped together in the scoping analysis.
- All relevant legal acts, regulations, guidelines, etc. have been identified.
- Relevant internal stakeholders have been interviewed to obtain information about potential retirement obligations.

Measurement

- Cost information is relevant and reliable.
- Only costs directly attributable to legally required retirement activities have been included in the liability.
- If applicable, the discount rate is consistent with the risks and timelines inherent in the cash flows.
- If discounting is applied, it is based on reliable information to inform the timing of future cash flows.
- Asset retirement obligations have been linked to specific tangible capital assets.
- The useful life of the tangible capital asset remain appropriate and are consistent with estimated asset retirement date.
- The transition method selected is appropriate based on the measurement information available.
- Calculations are mathematically accurate.

Financial reporting

- Financial statements have been mocked up to include asset retirement obligations.
- Note disclosures, including significant accounting policies, have been drafted.
- Documentation prepared during the project has been reviewed to ensure it is accurate and complete.
- Plans have been implemented for the annual post-implementation review and update of the asset retirement obligation liability.



Appendix 3: Future accounting pronouncements (continued)

Asset retirement obligations: implementation milestones

PHASE 1

Step 1:

Development of a PS3280 compliant policy. Include a definition for in-scope assets, productive and non-productive assets, and document known sources of legal obligations (such as regulations and contracts) as well as key roles and responsibilities for retirement obligation identification, measurement and reporting.

Step 2:

Identification of TCA/sites inventory. Develop an inventory of potential in-scope assets or sites based on existing TCA listings, and inventories used for PS3260 contaminated sites. Reconcile the listing of TCA items to the audited financial statements. Assess in-scope assets against PS3280 recognition criteria.

Milestone – KPMG Audit Team review of PS3280 policy, asset listings, and in-scope assets

PHASE 2

Step 3:

Measure the estimated liability. Assess available information, and consider the need for additional environmental assessment of any sites. Document key assumptions and variables, and selection of transition method. Determine if discounting will be applied for any assets. Consider impacts on useful life assumptions for in-scope assets. Document measurement methodology and range of estimate for in-scope assets.

Milestone – KPMG Audit Team review of measurement methodology and range of estimates

Step 4:

Reporting. Prepare a library of documentation and assumptions supporting each retirement obligation for audit purposes, and comprehensive documentation of the process followed for implementation. Prepare template financial statements and related note disclosure for 2023 year end.

Milestone – KPMG Audit Team review of working papers and template financial statements



Appendix 4: Audit and assurance insights

Our latest thinking on the issues that matter most to Audit Committees, board of directors and management.

KPMG Audit & Assurance Insights

Curated research and insights for Audit Committees and boards.

Board Leadership Centre

Leading insights to help board members maximize boardroom opportunities.

Current Developments

Series of quarterly publications for Canadian businesses including Spotlight on IFRS, Canadian Securities & Auditing Matters and US Outlook reports.

Audit Committee Guide – Canadian Edition

A practical guide providing insight into current challenges and leading practices shaping Audit Committee effectiveness in Canada

KPMG Learning Academy

Technical accounting and finance courses designed to arm you with leading-edge skills needed in today's disruptive environment.

Accelerate

The key issues driving the audit committee agenda in 2023.

IFRS Breaking News

A monthly Canadian newsletter that provides the latest insights on international financial reporting standards and IASB activities.

KPMG Climate Change Financial Reporting Resource Centre

Our climate change resource centre provides insights to help you identify the potential financial statement impacts to your business.

Momentum

A quarterly newsletter providing curated insights for management, boards and Audit Committees.

Uncertain Times Financial Reporting Resource Centre

Uncertain times resource center provides insights to support clients facing challenges relating to COVID-19, natural disasters and geopolitical events.

Environmental, social and governance (ESG)

Building a sustainable, resilient and purpose-led organization

Other Insights



[kpmg.ca](https://www.kpmg.ca)

© 2023 KPMG LLP, an Ontario limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organization.

KPMG member firms around the world have 227,000 professionals, in 145 countries.





January 16, 2023

County of Renfrew
9 International Drive
Pembroke, ON K8A 6W5

Attention: Director of Finance/Treasurer

Re: Remuneration and expenses of council appointees (elected officials)
to the AMO, ROMA, MEPCO, LAS, ONE Investment Board of Directors for year ended December
31, 2022.

Dear: Jeffrey Foss

Please find attached a statement of remuneration and expense of council appointees (elected officials) to the AMO, ROMA, MEPCO, LAS, and ONE Investment Board of Directors for the year ended December 31, 2022. This statement is prepared in accordance with section 284 (1) of The Municipal Act (S.O. 2001, c25).

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions or concerns regarding this statement.

Yours truly,

Suma Mullangi, CPA, CA
Accounting Manager
Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Tel: 416-971-9856 #314
Fax: 416-971-6191
Smullangi@amo.on.ca

Enclosure

200 University Ave. Suite 801	www.amo.on.ca	Tel 416.971.9856	Toll Free in Ontario
Toronto, ON, M5H 3C6	amo@amo.on.ca	Fax 416.971.6191	877.426.6527



REMUNERATION AND EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR 2022

Name	Position	Period Served on Board	Elected Officials	Municipality	Official Title	Total Amount Paid	Honorarium	Expenses Only
A. Councillors								
1. Debbie Robinson	AMO Director - County Caucus, EOWC Chair	Jan - Nov 2022	Y	Renfrew, County of	Warden	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

B. Other Appointees

CERTIFIED CORRECT

Suma Mullangi

Name (Please PRINT)

Signature

Accounting Manager

(416) 971-9856 x 314

Title

Telephone No.

Association of Municipalities of Ontario:

200 University Avenue, Suite 801, Toronto, Ontario, M5H 3C6

Name of Board

Address



Renfrew County and District Health Unit

"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"

January 30, 2023

County of Renfrew
9 International Drive
Pembroke, ON K8A 6W5

Attention: Mr. Craig Kelley, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk

RE: 2022 Statement of Remuneration – Board of Health

Please find below an itemized statement of remuneration and expenses paid for the year 2022, pursuant to the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25 Statement 284. (3):

Name	Honoraria	Mileage (kms)
Councillor Michael Donohue	\$ 2,975.00	\$ 104.76
Warden Peter Emon	\$ 1,925.00	-
Councillor Jennifer Murphy	\$ 1,750.00	-
Councillor James Brose	\$ 4,550.00	\$ 33.48
Councillor Neil Nicholson	\$ 175.00	

Kind regards,

Heather G. Daly, CPA, CMA
Chief Executive Officer
Renfrew County and District Health Unit

HD/mz

cc: Jeff Foss, Director, Corporate Services

Sent via email to: minister.fin@ontario.ca

January 13, 2023

The Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy
Minister of Finance
Frost Building South, 7th Floor
7 Queen's Park Crescent
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1Y7

RE: Reassessment

Dear Minister Bethlenfalvy:

Through recent correspondence and engagement with the Ministry of Finance, AMO has expressed very strong support for a timely return to the assessment cycle. We recognize how important it was to pause reassessment during the height of the pandemic. We made sure our members understood it too.

The province's latest economic statement was silent on the assessment cycle, leaving the sector eager to understand the government's intentions regarding the 2024 tax year and beyond. We also understand that there is a very narrow window for opportunity left for the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) to move forward in time for the 2024 taxation year.

A well-functioning, up-to-date assessment system is the foundation of the municipal tax system that supports strong, vibrant, and growing communities. Ontario's property tax system works well and provides municipalities with a stable and predictable source of revenue. Just as important, it provides stability and predictability for property taxpayers.

With the ROMA conference now just over a week away, our members will be looking to the government for direction on returning to the assessment cycle. We'd encourage the government to heed the sector's call to clarify its intentions. We will continue to work closely with MPAC and with the Ministry of Finance to ensure that the public, media, and municipal councils understand the benefits and the importance of moving forward with the reassessment at this time, and the value to municipalities and taxpayers of a modern, up-to-date, and reliable assessment system.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you again to discuss this important matter.

Yours truly,



Colin Best
AMO President
Halton Regional Councillor

cc: The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Parliamentary Assistant Byers, Ministry of Finance
Al Spacek, Chair, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation

**COUNTY OF RENFREW
2023 BUDGET
GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

	<u>Budget Enhancement</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5%</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5% target pressure</u>	<u>2023 Budget - Baseline</u>	<u>2022 Budget</u>	<u>Variance \$</u>	<u>Unchanged Service Variance %</u>	<u>2.5% target Variance %</u>	<u>2021 Actual</u>	<u>2020 Actual</u>	<u>2019 Actual</u>
MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	12,000	543,329	(64,500)	607,829	529,954	77,875	14.7%	2.5%	429,232	417,279	499,919
GENERAL - ADMINISTRATION	150,000	933,509	(56,266)	989,775	943,406	46,369	4.9%	-1.0%	923,421	756,963	745,237
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	130,800	486,587	(40,000)	526,587	474,759	51,828	10.9%	2.5%	407,027	400,443	391,499
HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT	0	259,687	(30,000)	289,687	254,064	35,623	14.0%	2.2%	91,808	569,859	196,074
PUBLICITY/PUBLIC RELATIONS SERVICE	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	9,525	5,148	14,518
AGRICULTURE & REFORESTATION	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	14,854	14,165	14,580
PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ADMINISTRATION	5,200	(493,550)	(30,468)	(463,081)	(497,332)	34,251	-6.9%	-0.8%	(546,849)	(560,264)	(540,040)
MPAC	0	1,540,414	0	1,540,414	1,541,700	(1,286)	-0.1%	-0.1%	1,546,566	1,555,448	1,549,942
FINANCIAL EXPENSE	0	21,540,054	0	21,540,054	20,087,400	1,452,654	7.2%	7.2%	18,261,200	13,081,700	10,291,749
Finance & Administration Committee	298,000	24,845,031	(221,234)	25,066,265	23,368,951	1,697,314	7.3%	6.3%	21,136,784	16,240,741	13,163,478
COUNTY LEVY (2.5% target + 2.16% CVA=4.66%)	511,852	52,893,896	(3,062,296)	55,956,192	50,540,380	5,415,812	10.7%	4.7%	48,945,594	47,253,904	45,655,946
OTHER REVENUE	0	4,308,770	0	4,308,770	4,193,826	114,944	2.7%	2.7%	4,354,617	7,416,807	5,655,411
Total Revenues	511,852	57,202,666	(3,062,296)	60,264,962	54,734,206	5,530,756	10.1%	4.5%	53,300,211	54,670,711	51,311,357

**COUNTY OF RENFREW
2023 BUDGET
GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

	<u>Budget Enhancement</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5%</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5% target pressure</u>	<u>2023 Budget - Baseline</u>	<u>2022 Budget</u>	<u>Variance \$</u>	<u>Unchanged Service Variance %</u>	<u>2.5% target Variance %</u>	<u>2021 Actual</u>	<u>2020 Actual</u>	<u>2019 Actual</u>
MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	12,000	543,329	(64,500)	607,829	529,954	77,875	14.7%	2.5%	429,232	417,279	499,919
Ad Hoc Per Diem Payments		29,160		29,160	29,340	(180)	-0.6%	-0.6%	32,562	20,655	26,244
AMO Board of Directors		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	972	6,899	14,402
Computer Expense		5,000		5,000	5,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	2,497	9,399	5,480
Council Benefits - EHC/Dental		78,223		78,223	60,000	18,223	30.4%	30.4%	62,126	53,514	47,594
Council Conventions		16,000	(14,000)	30,000	30,000	0	0.0%	-46.7%	15,421	13,714	36,958
Council CPP, Employer Health Tax		25,872		25,872	20,000	5,872	29.4%	29.4%	19,619	17,779	18,287
Council Group Insurance		7,677		7,677	6,600	1,077	16.3%	16.3%	5,916	5,304	4,896
Council Hospitality		9,500	(10,500)	20,000	20,000	0	0.0%	-52.5%	4,821	6,239	23,411
Council Liability Insurance		10,200		10,200	10,001	199	2.0%	2.0%	9,092	8,338	8,147
Council Mileage		25,000	(10,000)	35,000	12,400	22,600	182.3%	101.6%	4,273	13,560	42,146
FCM Board of Directors		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	6,461	3,441	13,289
Legal - Integrity Commissioner		2,000		2,000	2,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	346	1,018	8,846
Office Expenses		5,000		5,000	5,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	2,151	6,393	6,010
Public Relations	12,000	0		0	0	0					
Recoveries - County		(65,000)		(65,000)	(63,400)	(1,600)	2.5%	2.5%	(66,789)	(65,961)	(71,327)
Recoveries - Outside		0		0	0	0			(396)	(1,281)	(17,429)
Salary - Council		273,745		273,745	251,771	21,974	8.7%	8.7%	242,505	237,293	236,732
Salary & Ad Hoc - Warden		80,952		80,952	81,242	(290)	-0.4%	-0.4%	85,150	73,980	73,206
Advocacy / Delegations		10,000	(20,000)	30,000	30,000	0	0.0%	-66.7%	486	744	14,576
Warden Banquet		0	(10,000)	10,000	0	10,000			0		0
Warden Expenses		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	2,019	6,251	8,451
GENERAL - ADMINISTRATION	150,000	933,509	(56,266)	989,775	943,406	46,369	4.9%	-1.0%	923,421	756,963	745,237
Bank Charges - Moneris		2,300		2,300	2,000	300	15.0%	15.0%	2,138	1,551	1,437
Computer Expense		45,000		45,000	45,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	46,696	31,180	35,130
Conferences & Conventions		5,000		5,000	4,000	1,000	25.0%	25.0%	1,883	2,312	2,769
Depreciation		1,600		1,600	1,700	(100)	-5.9%	-5.9%	1,641	1,646	2,308
Employee Benefits		362,189	(8,921)	371,110	357,207	13,903	3.9%	1.4%	333,519	266,334	220,838
General Legal & Audit		25,600		25,600	28,000	(2,400)	-8.6%	-8.6%	23,425	25,738	28,525
Membership Fees		36,000		36,000	31,000	5,000	16.1%	16.1%	35,223	33,176	28,673
COVID		0		0	0	0			29,374	19,514	
Office Expense		26,000		26,000	26,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	17,640	18,952	24,021
Professional Development - Department Staff		5,000		5,000	5,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	2,401	1,828	8,212
Professional Development - Mgt Team		0		0	0	0			0		19,073
Recovery - Other Departments		(860,349)		(860,349)	(897,849)	37,500	-4.2%	-4.2%	(811,117)	(680,793)	(624,284)
Recovery - Provincial		0		0	0	0			(47,144)	(208,362)	
Recovery - Provincial One time		0		0	0	0			(29,374)	(19,514)	
Recovery - Outside		0		0	0	0			(149)	(7)	(55)
Recruitment		1,000		1,000	0	1,000			0	2,465	1,217
Salaries		1,208,669	(47,345)	1,256,014	1,266,548	(10,534)	-0.8%	-4.6%	1,249,190	1,023,350	942,625
Special Projects - Plans	150,000	30,000		30,000	30,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	14,560	0	15,293
Special Projects - EOWC		20,100		20,100	19,500	600	3.1%	3.1%	17,500	18,603	12,153
Special Projects - Service Delivery Review		0		0	0	0			31,889	210,417	
Surplus Adjustment - Capital		0		0	0	0			0		0
Surplus Adjustment - Trf From Reserves		0		0	0	0			(1,641)		0
Surplus Adjustment - Depreciation		(1,600)		(1,600)	(1,700)	100	-5.9%	-5.9%	0	(1,646)	(2,308)
Telephone		5,000		5,000	5,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,382	6,097	2,978
Travel		22,000		22,000	22,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	1,385	4,122	24,732

**COUNTY OF RENFREW
2023 BUDGET
GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

	<u>Budget Enhancement</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5%</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5% target pressure</u>	<u>2023 Budget - Baseline</u>	<u>2022 Budget</u>	<u>Variance \$</u>	<u>Unchanged Service Variance %</u>	<u>2.5% target Variance %</u>	<u>2021 Actual</u>	<u>2020 Actual</u>	<u>2019 Actual</u>
<u>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</u>	<u>130,800</u>	<u>486,587</u>	<u>(40,000)</u>	<u>526,587</u>	<u>474,759</u>	<u>51,828</u>	<u>10.9%</u>	<u>2.5%</u>	<u>407,027</u>	<u>400,443</u>	<u>391,499</u>
Annual Software Maintenance Fees	1,500	109,900	(20,000)	129,900	100,150	29,750	29.7%	9.7%	73,995	72,067	69,385
Benefits	28,000	152,039		152,039	128,032	24,007	18.8%	18.8%	125,928	122,960	118,207
Communication Fees		29,000	(15,000)	44,000	50,896	(6,896)	-13.5%	-43.0%	26,435	23,337	20,862
Computer Technology Supplies	3,000	7,000	(5,000)	12,000	4,500	7,500	166.7%	55.6%	3,688	2,234	1,754
Corporate Software		2,000		2,000	2,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	4,452	5,466
COVID		0		0					0	4,370	
Depreciation		38,000		38,000	38,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	37,638	36,971	30,976
Office Expense		1,100		1,100	1,100	0	0.0%	0.0%	1,947	1,602	1,356
Professional Development	1,500	5,500		5,500	5,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,451	779	453
Purchased Services		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	9,362	0	0
Recoveries - County		(338,847)		(338,847)	(334,828)	(4,019)	1.2%	1.2%	(337,981)	(325,509)	(319,266)
Recoveries - Outside		0		0	0	0			0	0	(1,050)
Recoveries - Prov-Strategy		0		0	(35,000)	35,000	-100.0%	-100.0%	(25,716)		
Recoveries - Provincial One Time		0		0	0	0			0	(4,370)	
Special Project		0		0	35,000	(35,000)	-100.0%	-100.0%	25,716		
Salaries	96,000	493,595		493,595	492,109	1,486	0.3%	0.3%	489,849	485,575	476,619
Surplus Adjustment - Capital		17,000		17,000	17,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	34,479	60,540	39,018
Surplus Adjustment - Depreciation		(38,000)		(38,000)	(38,000)	0	0.0%	0.0%	(37,638)	(36,971)	(30,976)
Surplus Adjustment - Trf From Reserves		(17,000)		(17,000)	(17,000)	0	0.0%	0.0%	(34,479)	(60,540)	(39,018)
Telephone Costs	800	5,300		5,300	5,300	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,380	4,593	5,552
Travel		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,973	8,353	12,161
<u>HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>259,687</u>	<u>(30,000)</u>	<u>289,687</u>	<u>254,064</u>	<u>35,623</u>	<u>14.0%</u>	<u>2.2%</u>	<u>91,808</u>	<u>569,859</u>	<u>196,074</u>
Benefits		185,580		185,580	171,925	13,655	7.9%	7.9%	143,643	97,791	115,908
Conference & Convention		4,000		4,000	4,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0		1,514
COVID		0		0	0				15,299	3,905	
Depreciation		500		500	500	0	0.0%	0.0%	461	462	461
Expenses Recoverable From Others		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	2,276	9,183	29,950
Legal Fees		14,500		14,500	14,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	(131,602)	375,452	4,357
Membership Fees		6,000		6,000	6,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,146	1,924	3,666
Office Expense		25,000	(5,000)	30,000	30,000	0	0.0%	-16.7%	34,325	33,827	25,118
Professional Development		12,000		12,000	12,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	6,476	1,983	5,531
Purchased Services		75,000	(10,000)	85,000	111,200	(26,200)	-23.6%	-32.6%	111,918	109,958	90,368
Recovery - County Departments		(618,088)		(618,088)	(604,187)	(13,901)	2.3%	2.3%	(597,066)	(525,623)	(513,221)
Recovery - Municipal		(95,000)	(10,000)	(85,000)	(116,000)	31,000	-26.7%	-18.1%	(4,133)	(17,013)	(57,924)
Recovery - Provincial One Time		0		0	0	0			(82,116)	(16,620)	
Recovery - Outside Agencies		0		0	0	0			(32)		
Recruitment		1,000		1,000	1,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	3,710	6,010	535
Salaries		629,695		629,695	598,626	31,069	5.2%	5.2%	583,266	484,972	472,861
Surplus Adjustment - Capital		0		0	0	0			0		0
Surplus Adjustment - Depreciation		(500)		(500)	(500)	0	0.0%	0.0%	(461)	(462)	(461)
Travel		10,000	(5,000)	15,000	15,000	0	0.0%	-33.3%	1,698	4,110	17,411

**COUNTY OF RENFREW
2023 BUDGET
GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

	<u>Budget Enhancement</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5%</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5% target pressure</u>	<u>2023 Budget - Baseline</u>	<u>2022 Budget</u>	<u>Variance \$</u>	<u>Unchanged Service Variance %</u>	<u>2.5% target Variance %</u>	<u>2021 Actual</u>	<u>2020 Actual</u>	<u>2019 Actual</u>
PUBLICITY/PUBLIC RELATIONS SERVICE	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	9,525	5,148	14,518
Publicity/Public Relations Service		15,000		15,000	15,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	9,525	5,148	14,518
Recoveries		0		0	0	0					
AGRICULTURE & REFORESTATION	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	14,854	14,165	14,580
Reforestation - Grants in Lieu		15,000		15,000	15,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	13,334	12,645	13,060
Forest Fire Protection		5,000		5,000	5,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	1,520	1,520	1,520
PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ADMINISTRATION	5,200	(493,550)	(30,468)	(463,081)	(497,332)	34,251	-6.9%	-0.8%	(546,849)	(560,264)	(540,040)
Adjudication		60,850	(20,000)	80,850	80,850	0	0.0%	-24.7%	66,698	28,200	66,852
Admin Charges		57,258		57,258	54,610	2,648	4.8%	4.8%	52,749	49,492	38,810
Bank Charges (Visa/MasterCard)		31,000		31,000	28,000	3,000	10.7%	10.7%	30,456	22,918	24,596
Benefits	15,000	116,320		116,320	102,468	13,852	13.5%	13.5%	87,642	74,413	65,160
Certificates of Offence		10,000		10,000	10,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	5,714	9,373	4,139
City of Pembroke - Share of Net Revenue		66,633	(3,543)	70,177	71,437	(1,260)	-1.8%	-6.7%	45,980	80,477	77,572
Collection Costs		35,000		35,000	40,000	(5,000)	-12.5%	-12.5%	25,398	28,911	36,544
Computer & Technology		16,500		16,500	16,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	15,665	16,854	17,087
Conventions		2,300		2,300	2,300	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	499
COVID		0		0	0	0			69	3,308	
Court Transcripts		1,000		1,000	3,000	(2,000)	-66.7%	-66.7%	0	281	232
Depreciation		3,600		3,600	6,500	(2,900)	-44.6%	-44.6%	6,000	6,417	6,399
ICON Charges		20,000		20,000	25,350	(5,350)	-21.1%	-21.1%	16,846	15,555	19,502
Interpreter Fees		1,500		1,500	3,000	(1,500)	-50.0%	-50.0%	601	486	2,698
IT Charges		18,140		18,140	18,066	74	0.4%	0.4%	18,047	17,704	17,364
Lease Costs (County)		105,060		105,060	102,000	3,060	3.0%	3.0%	102,000	104,274	102,517
Legal Costs		2,000		2,000	1,000	1,000	100.0%	100.0%	1,018	1,272	21,296
Miscellaneous		1,500		1,500	1,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	154	396
Monitoring / Enforcement Fees		7,776		7,776	7,776	0	0.0%	0.0%	7,776	7,776	7,776
Office Equipment / Furniture		2,100		2,100	2,100	0	0.0%	0.0%	1,714	1,800	1,623
Office Supplies		6,500		6,500	6,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	6,531	2,957	6,181
Part III Prosecution		0		0	0	0			13,827	3,690	9,171
Postage		6,800		6,800	6,800	0	0.0%	0.0%	4,191	4,732	5,577
Purchase of Service - Notice of Fines		5,000		5,000	4,000	1,000	25.0%	25.0%	5,696	1,050	3,544
Purchase of Service - Prosecution	(74,800)	74,800		74,800	74,800	0	0.0%	0.0%	33,705	25,434	32,608
Recoveries - Other		0		0	0	0			(1,581)	(390)	(3,033)
Recoveries - Prov / One Time		0		0	0	0			(226,746)	(462,459)	
Revenues - Fees and Charges		(1,510,000)		(1,510,000)	(1,510,000)	0	0.0%	0.0%	(1,190,550)	(889,509)	(1,372,307)
Salaries	65,000	354,913		354,913	330,186	24,727	7.5%	7.5%	316,354	279,161	258,877
Satellite Courtroom Costs		0	(4,925)	4,925	4,925	0	0.0%		0	485	3,469
Staff Training/Development		2,000		2,000	2,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	504	0	190
Surplus Adjustment - Capital		11,000		11,000	0	11,000		#DIV/0!	0	0	0
Surplus Adjustment - From Reserves		(11,000)		(11,000)	0	(11,000)		#DIV/0!	0	0	
Surplus Adjustment - Depreciation		(3,600)		(3,600)	(6,500)	2,900	-44.6%	-44.6%	(6,000)	(6,417)	(6,399)
Telephone		8,000		8,000	8,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	12,449	10,833	6,002
Travel		2,500	(2,000)	4,500	4,500	0	0.0%	-44.4%	398	504	4,836
Witness Fees		1,000		1,000	1,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	182

**COUNTY OF RENFREW
2023 BUDGET
GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

	<u>Budget Enhancement</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5%</u>	<u>2023 Budget - 2.5% target pressure</u>	<u>2023 Budget - Baseline</u>	<u>2022 Budget</u>	<u>Variance \$</u>	<u>Unchanged Service Variance %</u>	<u>2.5% target Variance %</u>	<u>2021 Actual</u>	<u>2020 Actual</u>	<u>2019 Actual</u>
MPAC	<u>0</u>	<u>1,540,414</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,540,414</u>	<u>1,541,700</u>	<u>(1,286)</u>	<u>-0.1%</u>	<u>-0.1%</u>	<u>1,546,566</u>	<u>1,555,448</u>	<u>1,549,942</u>
Property Assessment		1,540,414		1,540,414	1,541,700	(1,286)	-0.1%	-0.1%	1,546,566	1,555,448	1,549,942
FINANCIAL EXPENSE	<u>0</u>	<u>21,540,054</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>21,540,054</u>	<u>20,087,400</u>	<u>1,452,654</u>	<u>7.2%</u>	<u>7.2%</u>	<u>18,261,200</u>	<u>13,081,700</u>	<u>10,291,749</u>
Capping Costs (ends 2020)		0		0	0	0			0	0	0
Assessment Review		0		0	22,000	(22,000)	-100.0%		0	0	
County Share - Taxes Written Off		300,000		300,000	300,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	360,101	222,479	198,042
Provision for Unallocated Funds		300,000		300,000	300,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	300,000	850
Insurance Increase - 2021		0		0	0	0			0	0	
OW Sick Leave Liability		0		0	0	0			0	0	0
EOWC Cell Project		0		0	0	0			0	0	905,996
Claybank Debt Interest (2028)		65,008		65,008	76,253	(11,245)	-14.7%	-14.7%	84,870	95,635	105,729
Surplus Adj-Principal-Claybank Bridge (2028)		373,559		373,559	362,314	11,245	3.1%	3.1%	351,407	340,829	330,569
Madawaska Debt Interest (2030)		81,809		81,809	90,811	(9,002)	-9.9%	-9.9%	53,067	0	
Surplus Adj-Principal-Madawaska Bridge (2030)		439,515		439,515	430,513	9,002	2.1%	2.1%	211,939	0	
Surplus Adjustment - Trf to Gas Tax Reserve		2,914,661		2,914,661	2,793,217	121,444	4.3%	4.3%	2,793,217	6,024,817	2,126,252
Surplus Adjustment - Trf to TCA Renewal Reserve		7,360,198	0	7,360,198	6,227,007	1,133,191	18.2%	18.2%	5,262,450	5,722,940	5,226,854
Surplus Adjustment - Trf to PW Capital Reserve		9,238,831	0	9,238,831	8,800,744	438,087	5.0%	5.0%	8,586,092	0	
Surplus Adjustment - SDIP Saving - Trf to TCA Resv		466,473		466,473	466,473	0	0.0%	0.0%	169,149	0	
Cannabis/Modernization Reserve		0		0	0	0			13,908	0	881,321
Sched 2 Reserve		0		0	0	0			0	0	0
Reserve (BM Solar)		0		0	0	0			0	0	123,767
Surplus Adj. Unfinanced Cap (Centennial Lake Bridge 2022)		0		0	218,068	(218,068)	-100.0%		375,000	375,000	375,000
Vacant Building Rebates (ends 2018)		0		0	0	0			0	0	17,369
COUNTY LEVY (2.5% target + 2.16% CVA=4.66%)	<u>511,852</u>	<u>52,893,896</u>	<u>(3,062,296)</u>	<u>55,956,192</u>	<u>50,540,380</u>	<u>5,415,812</u>	<u>10.7%</u>	<u>4.66%</u>	<u>48,945,594</u>	<u>47,253,904</u>	<u>45,655,946</u>
PIL ADJUSTMENTS	<u>0</u>	<u>(150,000)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(150,000)</u>	<u>(150,000)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>(109,521)</u>	<u>(74,225)</u>	<u>(132,079)</u>
WATERPOWER GENERATING STATION	<u>0</u>	<u>394,109</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>394,109</u>	<u>394,109</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>394,109</u>	<u>394,109</u>	<u>394,109</u>
RAILWAY/HYDRO RIGHTS-OF-WAY	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>(5,000)</u>	<u>-100.0%</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
SUPPLEMENTARY REVENUE	<u>0</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>569,916</u>	<u>452,233</u>	<u>426,201</u>
OTHER REVENUE	<u>0</u>	<u>3,564,661</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,564,661</u>	<u>3,444,717</u>	<u>119,944</u>	<u>3.5%</u>	<u>3.5%</u>	<u>3,500,113</u>	<u>6,644,690</u>	<u>4,967,180</u>
Interest Revenue		650,000		650,000	650,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	654,664	734,673	935,664
Provincial - One Time		0		0	0	0			13,908		881,321
Other Revenue		0		0	0	0			35	50	30
Gain / (Loss) Sale of Assets		0		0	0	0			37,854	(115,430)	(6,865)
BM Repayment of Loan (ends 2019)		0		0	0	0			0	0	123,767
CCBF (Gas Tax) Funding		2,914,661		2,914,661	2,793,217	121,444	4.3%	4.3%	2,793,217	6,024,817	2,126,252
Surplus Adjustment - From Reserve		0		0	0	0			0	0	905,996
Licenses		0		0	1,500	(1,500)	-100.0%		435	580	1,015
											299
TOTAL REVENUES	<u>511,852</u>	<u>57,202,666</u>	<u>(3,062,296)</u>	<u>60,264,962</u>	<u>54,734,206</u>	<u>5,530,756</u>	<u>10.1%</u>	<u>4.5%</u>	<u>53,300,211</u>	<u>54,670,711</u>	<u>51,311,357</u>

County of Renfrew
Schedule of Reserves
2023 BUDGET

	Audited Balance 31-Dec-21	2022 Budget Reserve Changes	Known Adjustments In 2022	Estimated Balance 31-Dec-22	Prop-Pembroke	Property-RCP	Property - Base	Prop- Arnprior	IT	POA	Trails	PW	xxx	Transfers To	Transfers From	SDIP	Net Change	Estimated Balance 31-Dec-22	
Child Care Mitigation	1,534,682			1,534,682													0	1,534,682	s
Ec Dev RED	35,000			35,000													0	35,000	
Trail Algonquin Trail	54,125			54,125													0	54,125	
General Building Reserve	3,528,757	(641,734)	400,000 f	3,287,023	(253,000)	(985,630)	114,134	83,375				(317,000)					(1,358,121)	1,928,902	c
General Development Reserve	8,780			8,780													0	8,780	c
General Federal Gas Tax Reserve	0	(2,685,199)	2,685,199 a	0								(2,914,661)		2,914,661			0	0	
General Insurance	150,000			150,000													0	150,000	
General Reforestation Reserve	235,894	(8,100)		227,794											(24,100)		(24,100)	203,694	c s
General OPP Bldg	808,540	66,169		874,709										62,625	(41,000)		21,625	896,334	c
General Sick leave	69,458			69,458													0	69,458	
General TCA Renewal Reserve	17,526,393	(3,217,371)	3,306,073 b	17,615,095				(17,000)	(11,000)			(14,410,409)		7,360,198		466,473	(6,611,738)	11,003,357	c
General Working Capital	19,378,284	(2,051,000)		17,327,284	(40,000)						(2,225,538)						(2,265,538)	15,061,746	c
General WSIB Sched 2	621,547			621,547													0	621,547	
General Cannabis Reserve	149,979			149,979													0	149,979	
General Ontario Winter Games	200,000			200,000													0	200,000	
Housing Non Profit Capital	116,222			116,222													0	116,222	s
Housing Severance	146,992			146,992													0	146,992	s
Paramedic Infrastructure	2,229,761	(794,000)	1,605,000 c	3,040,761										1,200,000	(2,445,000)		(1,245,000)	1,795,761	c s
Paramedic Community Paramedic	738,884			738,884													0	738,884	s
Paramedic Severance	1,378,862			1,378,862													0	1,378,862	s
Paramedic WSIB Sched 2	0			0													0	0	s
Public Works Capital	0			0								(9,238,831)		9,238,831			0	0	c
Public Works Winter Control	250,000			250,000													0	250,000	
Social Service Fiscal Pressure	339,942			339,942													0	339,942	s
County Of Renfrew	49,502,102	(9,331,235)	7,996,272	48,167,139	(293,000)	(985,630)	114,134	83,375	(17,000)	(11,000)	(2,225,538)	(26,880,901)	0	20,776,315	(2,510,100)	466,473	(11,482,872)	36,684,267	
BM WSIB Sched 2	545,768	49,024		594,792										49,024			49,024	643,816	s
BM Butterfly	149,318	(25,000)		124,318													0	124,318	c s
BM Unallocated	3,248,734	(361,800)	65,000 d	2,951,934											(626,500)		(626,500)	2,325,434	c s
BM LTC CMI Stabilization	248,242			248,242													0	248,242	s
BM Equip	100,000			100,000													0	100,000	c s
Bonnechere Manor	4,292,062	(337,776)	65,000	4,019,286	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49,024	(626,500)	0	(577,476)	3,441,810	
ML Butterfly	159,419	(159,419)		0													0	0	c s
ML WSIB Sched 2	228,442			228,442													0	228,442	s
ML Unallocated	947,809	(426,341)	227,600 e	749,068											(703,600)		(703,600)	45,468	c s
ML LTC CMI Stabilization	0	100,614		100,614													0	100,614	s
ML Equip	38,782			38,782													0	38,782	c s
ML Sick leave	186,402			186,402													0	186,402	s
Miramichi Lodge	1,560,854	(485,146)	227,600	1,303,308	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(703,600)	0	(703,600)	599,708	
Opeongo Capital	0			0													0	0	c s
RCHC Capital	3,870,674	(1,482,665)	236,000 g	2,624,009											(1,204,200)		(1,204,200)	1,419,809	c s
RCHC AHP Reserve	0			0													0	0	s
RCHC AHP Admin Reserve	0			0													0	0	s
RCHC Home Ownership	0			0													0	0	s
RCHC Working Capital	50,000			50,000													0	50,000	c s
RCHC WSIB Sched 2	148,483			148,483													0	148,483	s
Renfrew County Housing Corp	4,069,157	(1,482,665)	236,000	2,822,492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1,204,200)	0	(1,204,200)	1,618,292	
Total Surplus Adjustment	59,424,175	(11,636,822)	8,524,872	56,312,225	(293,000)	(985,630)	114,134	83,375	(17,000)	(11,000)	(2,225,538)	(26,880,901)	0	20,825,339	(5,044,400)	466,473	(13,968,148)	42,344,077	
Capital Reserves Only	52,281,145	(9,101,261)	5,839,673	49,019,557	(293,000)	(985,630)	114,134	83,375	(17,000)	(11,000)	(2,225,538)	(23,966,240)	0	17,861,654	(5,044,400)	466,473	(14,017,172)	35,002,385	

c = capital reserve
s = shared provic

County of Renfrew
2023 Budget

						Road 70	Sources of Financing							
						Bridge 70								
						Culvert 70	Revised							
Department	Primary Category	Detail	Detail	Location/Other	or Risk	10 Year Plan	Budget \$	Taxation/Other	Pembroke Share	Provincial Grant	Gas Tax Res Reserve	Reserves	Debt	Total
BM	Buildings	D2030 - Sanitary Waste		Municipal sanitary Lift station	Low	10,000	10,000					10,000		10,000
BM	Buildings	E2010 - Fixed Furnishings		kitchen cabinets 2 x servery 2 x cabinets in staff	Low	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
BM	Buildings	D4010 - Sprinklers		sprinklers	Low	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
BM	Buildings	E1042 - Laundry Room Equipment		3 washers new dryer 2016	Low	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
BM	Buildings	D5033 - Telephone Systems		new NEC system, partial cf	Low	180,000	160,000					160,000		160,000
BM	Buildings	Butterfly project		2021 & 2022 carryover			25,000					25,000		25,000
BM	Buildings	d3055-fin tube radiation	heaters in all rooms	2022 carryover			20,000					20,000		20,000
BM	Equipment	portable phones		2022 carryover			20,000					20,000		20,000
BM	Equipment	Wireless access points x 19					16,500					16,500		16,500
BM	Buildings	B30 - Roofing		washed river stone over single EPDM roof memt	Low	290,000	290,000					290,000		290,000
BM Total						565,000	626,500	0	0	0	0	626,500	0	626,500
IT	Equipment	server-virtual replacement		CAB			17,000					17,000		17,000
IT Total						0	17,000	0	0	0	0	17,000	0	17,000
ML	Buildings	C3020 - Floor Finishes		Ceramic flooring (ceramic repair 1st Floor)	Low	10,000	10,000					10,000		10,000
ML	Buildings	D3034 - Study - Air Conditioning Units		Eng. Study / tender			25,000					25,000		25,000
ML	Buildings	D1011 - Passage Elevators - Hydraulic		68 special purpose lifts from 160 kg - 455 kg ten	Medium	26,000	26,000					26,000		26,000
ML	Buildings	D5092 - Emergency Power & Generation Systems		500 Kw Emergency Generator - New Tranfer Sw	Low	35,000	35,000					35,000		35,000
ML	Buildings	C3020 - Floor Finishes		carpet rolled - Final phase of resident floor repla	Low	40,000	40,000					40,000		40,000
ML	Building	D-Services - Mechanical		carryover 2022 - Make-Up AHU			27,600					27,600		27,600
ML	Buildings	D3045 - Exhaust Ventilation Systems		VAV boxes - 43 VAVs Resident Areas Phase Tw	Medium	90,000	90,000					90,000		90,000
ML	Buildings	D3043 - Hydronic Distribution Systems		Hydronic valve controllers upgrade Phase Four	Low	160,000	160,000					160,000		160,000
ML	Buildings	hotwater boilers		carryover 2022 - \$200K, deferred to 2026			0					0		0
ML	Buildings	Butterfly Dementia care unit renovations		deferred re COVID and contractor issues, partial cf			161,000					60,000		60,000
ML	Buildings	D5032 - Intercommunications And Paging		Nurse call - Austco systsem - Phase #1- 2022 & i	Low	200,000	200,000					200,000		200,000
ML	Land Improvement	G2030 - Pedestrian Paving		concrete sidewalk and patio	Low	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
ML Total						777,000	703,600	0	0	0	0	703,600	0	703,600
POA	Equipment	AV Equipment for Hybrid Court	Original Equipment was Temp Pandemic		Low		11,000					11,000		11,000
POA Total						0	11,000	0	0	0	0	11,000	0	11,000
Paramedic	Equipment	es_0713-pc.workgroup	tuffbook laptop				6,000					6,000		6,000
Paramedic	Equipment	es_0768-pc.workgroup	tuffbook laptop				6,000					6,000		6,000
Paramedic	Equipment	es_0714-pc.workgroup	tuffbook laptop				6,000					6,000		6,000
Paramedic	Equipment	es_1063-pc.workgroup	tuffbook laptop				6,000					6,000		6,000
Paramedic	Equipment	es_0754-pc.workgroup	tuffbook laptop				6,000					6,000		6,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	ATV-18-8054008	POLARIS 4X4 SIDE BY SIDE			30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	ERV-18-F286261	TRUCK GMC SIERRA		H	120,000	150,000					150,000		150,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	ERV-18-R375167	TRUCK CHEV TAHOE		H	120,000	120,000					120,000		120,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	ERV-18-R375824	TRUCK CHEV TAHOE		H	120,000	120,000					120,000		120,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	ERV-18-R376195	TRUCK CHEV TAHOE		M	120,000	120,000					120,000		120,000
Paramedic	Vehicles		Ford Expedition	new replacements			120,000					120,000		120,000
Paramedic	Vehicles		FORD F250	new replacements			150,000					150,000		150,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-17-9774496	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE II	carryover \$235,000			235,000					235,000		235,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-18-9774473	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	carryover \$235,000			235,000					235,000		235,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-18-9774474	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	carryover \$235,000			235,000					235,000		235,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-18-9774495	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III (+stretc	carryover \$300,000			300,000					300,000		300,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-18-9774497	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III (+stretc	carryover \$300,000			300,000					300,000		300,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-19-N044507	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III (+stretc	carryover \$300,000			300,000					300,000		300,000
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-19-N053032	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	supply issues - not delivered until 2024	H	235,000								0
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-19-N053279	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	supply issues - not delivered until 2024	M	235,000								0
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-19-N054530	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	supply issues - not delivered until 2024	L	235,000								0
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-19-N053540	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	supply issues - not delivered until 2024	L	235,000								0
Paramedic	Vehicles	AMBU-18-9774498	AMBULANCE DEMERS TYPE III	supply issues - not delivered until 2024	L	235,000								0
Paramedic Total						1,685,000	2,445,000	0	0	0	0	2,445,000	0	2,445,000
Prop-ArnBase	Land Improvement	parking lot		Paramedic base Amprior		10,000	10,000					10,000		10,000
Prop-ArnBase Total						10,000	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000
Prop-BBBBase	Land Improvement	crack sealing	under threeshold	Paramedic base Barry's Bay		5,000	0					0		0
Prop-BBBBase Total						5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prop-CAB	Buildings	door opener	funded CF	CAB			59,000			59,000				59,000
Prop-CAB	Buildings	consulting on new PS base	6% of \$3M base	CAB			180,000					180,000		180,000
Prop-CAB	Buildings	generator transfer switch		CAB		33,000	33,000					33,000		33,000
Prop-CAB	Furniture	office conference furniture		CAB		27,500	0					0		0
Prop-CAB	Vehicles	LDT	LDTR-12-S287312	TRUCK PICKUP DODGE RAM 1500 4X2	Low	40,000	40,000					40,000		40,000
Prop-CAB Total						100,500	312,000	0	0	59,000	0	253,000	0	312,000
Prop-DeepBase	Buildings	lighting	under threeshold	Paramedic base Deep river		5,500	0					0		0
Prop-DeepBase	Land Improvement	crack sealing	under threeshold	Paramedic base Deep river		5,000	0					0		0
Prop-DeepBase Total						10,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prop-OPP	Equipment	HVAC		OPP - Renfrew		11,000	11,000					11,000		11,000

County of Renfrew
2023 Budget

Department	Primary Category	Detail	Detail	Location/Other	Road 70		Sources of Financing								
					Bridge 70	Revised	Pembroke			Provincial		Gas Tax Res		Total	
					Culvert 70	10 Year Plan	Taxation/Other	Share	Grant	Reserve	Reserves	Debt			
Prop-OPP	Land Improvement	parking lot remediation		OPP - Renfrew		16,500	30,000						30,000		30,000
Prop-OPP Total							27,500	41,000	0	0	0	0	41,000	0	41,000
Prop-PetBase	Buildings	floor sealing		Paramedic base Petawawa		17,600	17,600						17,600		17,600
Prop-PetBase	Land Improvement	crack sealing		Paramedic base Petawawa		20,000	20,000						20,000		20,000
Prop-PetBase Total							37,600	37,600	0	0	0	0	37,600	0	37,600
Prop-RCP	Buildings	roofing		RCP		341,000	341,000						341,000		341,000
Prop-RCP	Buildings	PS storage building	carry over of \$200K	RCP		200,000	425,000						425,000		425,000
Prop-RCP	Equipment	rooftop HVAC units x 2	carry over of \$150K	RCP		220,000	220,000						220,000		220,000
Prop-RCP	Land Improvement	parking lot	carry over of \$50k	RCP		50,000	50,000						50,000		50,000
Prop-RCP	Land Improvement	crack sealing		RCP		13,200	13,200						13,200		13,200
Prop-RCP Total							824,200	1,049,200	0	0	0	0	1,049,200	0	1,049,200
PW	Bridge	B007		Butler Bridge	Butler Road	72	1,700,000	20,000					20,000		20,000
PW	Bridge	B044		Douglas Bridge	5	66	1,800,000	1,800,000					1,800,000		1,800,000
PW	Bridge	B064		Pilgrim Road Bridge	2022 budget carry over \$139K	64	380,000	380,000					380,000		380,000
PW	Bridge	B102		Brennans Creek Bridge	512	62	825,000	10,000					10,000		10,000
PW	Bridge	B108		Tramore Bridge	Tramore Road	72	400,000	20,000					20,000		20,000
PW	Bridge	B156		Burnt Bridge	Burnt Bridge Road	62	530,000	53,000					53,000		53,000
PW	Bridge	B232		Cochrane Creek Bridge	Cement Bridge Road	38	500,000	50,000					50,000		50,000
PW	Bridge	B257		Harrington Creek Bridge	2022 budget carry over \$800K	24	800,000	800,000					800,000		800,000
PW	Bridge	B310		Ski Hill Bridge	58	67	1,200,000	1,200,000					1,200,000		1,200,000
PW	Bridge	B103		O'Grady Bridge	O'Grady Settlement Road	52	26,500	26,500					26,500		26,500
PW	Bridge	B145		Combermere Bridge	62	64	280,000	280,000					280,000		280,000
PW	Bridge	B181		Peter Black Bridge	24	61	180,000	180,000					180,000		180,000
PW	Bridge			General Bridge Repairs			200,000	100,000					100,000		100,000
PW	Buildings	Calabogie		Gas/Diesel Tanks & Pumps	Fuel Inventory & Dispensing System	Low	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Calabogie		Property, General Yard & Signs	Site Condition Assessment	Low	15,000	0					0		0
PW	Buildings	Cobden		Gas/Diesel Tanks & Pumps	Proper enclosure around oil tank	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Cobden		Property, General Yard & Signs	Site Condition Assessment	Medium	15,000	0					0		0
PW	Buildings	Cobden		Waste Oil Tank, Catch, & Structure	Proper enclosure around oil tank	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Cobden		Furnace			32,000	32,000					32,000		32,000
PW	Buildings	Goshen		Gas/Diesel Tanks & Pumps	Fuel Inventory & Dispensing System	Low	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Goshen		Property, General Yard & Signs	Site Condition Assessment	Low	15,000	0					0		0
PW	Buildings	Goshen		Waste Oil Tank, Catch, & Structure	Proper enclosure around oil tank	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Southwest		Gas/Diesel Tanks & Pumps	Fuel Inventory & Dispensing System	Low	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	Southwest		Property, General Yard & Signs	Site Condition Assessment	Low	15,000	0					0		0
PW	Buildings	Southwest		Toilets, Sinks, Piping, etc	Architectural Review & design for Washroom	Low	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
PW	Buildings	Southwest		Waste Oil Tank, Catch, & Structure	Proper enclosure around oil tank	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	White Water		Gas/Diesel Tanks & Pumps	Fuel Inventory & Dispensing System	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Buildings	White Water		Property, General Yard & Signs	Site Condition Assessment	Medium	15,000	0					0		0
PW	Buildings	White Water		Toilets, Sinks, Piping, etc	Architectural Review & design for Washroom	Low	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
PW	Buildings	White Water		Waste Oil Tank, Catch, & Structure	Proper enclosure around oil tank	Medium	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Culverts	C001		Berlanquet Creek Culvert	5	65	400,000	40,000					40,000		40,000
PW	Culverts	C025		Borne Road Culvert	Borne Road	28.5	800,000	800,000					800,000		800,000
PW	Culverts	C115		Dunlop Crescent Dual Culvert	Dunlop Crescent	37	415,000	415,000					415,000		415,000
PW	Culverts	C134		Campbell Drive Culvert	Campbell Drive	39	600,000	0					0		0
PW	Culverts	C137		Hanson Creek Culverts	carryover 82K	53.79	600,000	600,000					600,000		600,000
PW	Culverts	C191		Dicks Road Culvert	Dicks Road	18	200,000	200,000					200,000		200,000
PW	Culverts	C197		Etmanskie Swamp Culvert	carryover \$1M	43.74	1,300,000	1,300,000					1,300,000		1,300,000
PW	Culverts	C204		Bellows Creek Culvert	12	40.5	540,000	600,000					600,000		600,000
PW	Culverts	C325		Neilson Creek Culvert	Clear Lake Road	18	450,000	450,000					450,000		450,000
PW	Culverts	C040		Snake River Culvert	8	67	25,000	25,000					25,000		25,000
PW	Culverts	C051		Harris Creek Culvert	Proven Line	21	20,000	20,000					20,000		20,000
PW	Culverts	C062		John Watson Culvert 2	John Watson Road	25	45,000	45,000					45,000		45,000
PW	Culverts	C130		Lochiel Creek Culvert North	63	25.5	40,000	40,000					40,000		40,000
PW	Culverts	C136		Robertson Twin Pipes	Robertson Line	43	61,000	61,000					61,000		61,000
PW	Culverts	C201		Broomes Creek Culvert	7	16	200,000	200,000					200,000		200,000
PW	Culverts	C215		Elm Creek Culverts	Snake River Line	21	36,000	36,000					36,000		36,000
PW	Culverts	C221		Kenny's Culvert	Pleasant Valley Road	48.14	20,000	20,000					20,000		20,000
PW	Culverts	C229		Burnt Bridge	Burnt Bridge Road	42.64	30,500	0					0		0
PW	Culverts	C250		Pleasant Valley Culvert	Grants Settlement Road	64.1	80,000	0					0		0
PW	Culverts	C268		St. Columbkille's Culvert	58	59	90,000	90,000					90,000		90,000
PW	Equipment		U-body water tank				36,000	36,000					36,000		36,000
PW	Equipment		Roller 3'				55,000	55,000					55,000		55,000
PW	Equipment		Forestry Mulcher Attachment				50,000	50,000					50,000		50,000
PW	Equipment		Forestry Mulcher Attachment				50,000	50,000					50,000		50,000
PW	Equipment		Offset Roller				81,000	81,000					81,000		81,000

County of Renfrew
2023 Budget

Department	Primary Category	Detail	Detail	Location/Other	Road 70	Revised	Budget \$	Sources of Financing						
					Bridge 70			Taxation/Other	Pembroke Share	Provincial Grant	Gas Tax Res Reserve	Reserves	Debt	Total
					Culvert 70 or Risk									
RCHC	Buildings	150 Elizabeth Street North	B2030 - Exterior Doors	Fire Exit Door	carryover	35,000	35,000					35,000	35,000	
RCHC	Buildings	425 Nelson Street	fire system consultant		does not qualify	50,000	0					0	0	
RCHC	Buildings	75 Stafford Street	D4010 - Sprinklers	Partial sprinkler system.		50,000	50,000					50,000	50,000	
RCHC	Buildings	k Cres, 596-598 Frank Dench St	Electrical	does not meet current electrical code		50,000	50,000					50,000	50,000	
RCHC	Buildings	26 Spruce Family steps				50,000	50,000					50,000	50,000	
RCHC	Buildings	New install bathroom fans	Do 50 in 2023		does not qualify	50,000	0					0	0	
RCHC	Buildings	Extension to garage at Lorne				50,000	50,000					50,000	50,000	
RCHC	Buildings	75 Stafford Street	C1070 - Plumbing fixture Refurbishment		carryover	75,000	75,000					75,000	75,000	
RCHC	Buildings	ey, 220/350 Arith Blvd - (14) Dupl	Roofing	Asphalt shingle roofing.	carryover	75,000	75,000					75,000	75,000	
RCHC	Buildings	0-1144 Lea St - (2) Townhome Bl	B30 - Roofing	Asphalt shingles.		90,000	90,000					90,000	90,000	
RCHC	Buildings	260 Elizabeth Street North	A20 - Basement Construction	Structural issues		100,000	100,000					100,000	100,000	
RCHC	Buildings	0-1144 Lea St - (2) Townhome Bl	B2020 - Exterior Windows	All, based on sample units		125,000	125,000					125,000	125,000	
RCHC	Buildings	41 Vimy Building shift				150,000	150,000					150,000	150,000	
RCHC	Buildings	1030-1106 Lea St - (4) Townhon B30 - Roofing		Asphalt shingles.		200,000	200,000					200,000	200,000	
RCHC	Buildings	demolition and rebuild - 202 cecil			OHPI		546,000			546,000			546,000	
RCHC	Buildings	lee & douglas new build		RCHC contribution	COCHI		2,350,000			2,350,000			2,350,000	
RCHC	Vehicles	TRAC-09-LAWNPO2	Tractor 510 MacKay/515 River Rd		Low	8,600	8,600					8,600	8,600	
RCHC	Vehicles	TRAC-06-LAWNPO5	Lawn tractor 425 Nelson		Low	8,600	8,600					8,600	8,600	
RCHC	Vehicles	LTDR-15-N107755	VAN MTCE NISSAN		Low	46,000	46,000					46,000	46,000	
RCHC Total						1,316,440	4,100,200	0	0	2,896,000	0	1,204,200	0	4,100,200
Grand Total						47,841,929	43,337,164	0	0	5,567,973	2,914,661	30,364,340	4490190	43,337,164



BUSINESS CASE - STAFFING REPORT

NEW 2023-IT-01

Date: February 16, 2023

Department: Corporate Services,
Information Technology

Report Prepared by: Chris Ryn, IT Manager

PROPOSAL	To change the Administrative Assistant II position (Group 3) to a Help Desk position (Group 4), no change in the 1,820 hours.		
POSITIONS Non-Union X	Administrative Assistant II (1,820) to Help Desk 1,820.		
SUMMARY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Discussion 	With the retirement of the Information Technology Administrative Assistant II in 2022 and the final results of the Perry Group Consulting, Digital Strategy review, there was an opportunity to review the existing position within the Information Technology Division. It was determined that a Help Desk position, with more IT related duties, rather than administrative duties would be better suited to assist the division, as well as staff and Elected Officials. The Helpdesk position would help manage help desk tickets, be the first point of contact to help solve the client's issues to improve customer service and provide a faster turnaround of customer requests, provide solutions and advice on technical issues and escalate help desk calls to the next level that require specialized IT Technician support. The Information Technology Division averages approximately 8,213 help desk tickets/requests annually.		
RECOMMENDATION	THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend the approval of a position change from Administrative Assistant II (Group 3) to Help Desk (Group 4), no change in the 1,820 hours within the Information Technology Division, Corporate Services Department; AND FURTHER THAT this be brought forward to the February 22, 2023 County Council Budget Workshop for approval.		
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS		<u>HRS</u>	<u>Salary/Benefits</u>
	Administrative Assistant II	(1,820)	(\$67,000)
	Help Desk	<u>1,820</u>	<u>\$77,000</u>
	Total IT Budget Change	0	\$10,000



BUSINESS CASE - STAFFING REPORT

NEW 2023-IT-02

Date: **February 16, 2023**

Department: **Corporate Services,
Information Technology**

Report Prepared by: **Chris Ryn, IT Manager**

PROPOSAL	The creation of a new Business Analyst position, Group 8, an increase of 1,820 hours.												
POSITIONS Non-Union X	Increase in Business Analyst position, Group 8, 1,820 hours.												
SUMMARY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Discussion 	In 2021-2022, County Council approved the use of funding under the Municipal Modernization Program Intake 2 and 3 for a Digital Strategy Review to be completed by Perry Group Consulting. They explored our use of digital business tools including strengths and areas needing improvement from both internal business processes and citizen facing service aspects. The report determined that the County of Renfrew had no dedicated solutions or business analysts in Information Technology. There are many projects ahead which are in the business solutions domain that will require business analysis and application development skills to support systems configuration during the projects and for support after solutions are implemented. This individual will help the County of Renfrew define requirements, analyze current systems and determine specifications for new systems/solutions and improvements to business processes, as well as support by working with the departments and vendors during this process. This position may also assist the lower-tier municipalities depending on project timing and capacity.												
RECOMMENDATION	THAT the Finance and Administration Committee recommend the approval of an increase of 1,820 hours for the creation of a new Business Analyst position (Group 8) within the Information Technology Division, Corporate Services Department; AND FURTHER THAT this be brought forward to the February 22, 2023 County Council Budget Workshop for Approval.												
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;"></th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>HRS</u></th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Salary/Benefits</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Business Analyst</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,820</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$114,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Computer Supplies etc.</td> <td style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">_____</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">\$6,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total IT Budget Enhancement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,820</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$120,800</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>HRS</u>	<u>Salary/Benefits</u>	Business Analyst	1,820	\$114,000	Computer Supplies etc.	_____	\$6,800	Total IT Budget Enhancement	1,820	\$120,800
	<u>HRS</u>	<u>Salary/Benefits</u>											
Business Analyst	1,820	\$114,000											
Computer Supplies etc.	_____	\$6,800											
Total IT Budget Enhancement	1,820	\$120,800											



BUSINESS CASE - STAFFING REPORT

NEW 2023-POA-01

Date: **February 16, 2023**

Department: **Provincial Offences,
Corporate Services**

Report Prepared by: **Ashley Wilton, POA Manager**

PROPOSAL	Increase of 1,300 Prosecutor hours, Group 8, to change the Prosecutor position from a purchased service to an employee of the County of Renfrew.
POSITIONS Non-Union X	Increase in Prosecutor hours, Group 8, 1,300 hours.
SUMMARY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Discussion 	<p>In February 2018, staff provided the Finance & Administration Committee with a letter dated January 22, 2018 from the Ministry of the Attorney General (MAG) advising that Bill 177 – Stronger, Fairer Ontario Act (Budget Measures), 2017 was passed by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on December 14, 2017. This Bill enables the Attorney General to enter into agreements with municipalities to transfer responsibility for certain prosecutions currently prosecuted by the Ministry’s Criminal Law Division under Part III of the Provincial Offences Act. The target date for all municipalities to download Part III matters was the end of 2019 and MAG was to meet in June 2018 to further discuss how to proceed with the Memorandum of Understanding. No further updates were received until May 2019, when staff attended another Municipal Court Managers’ Association Annual Conference and the Ministry of the Attorney General (MAG) advised that the download of Part III Prosecutions was still under review and they could not provide a timeline as to when the download would occur.</p> <p>The Ministry will continue to prosecute certain Part III POA cases, including those in which a criminal charge is also laid, charges involving Ontario’s sex offender registry and Young Persons, and a review of POA fatalities will be conducted on a case-by-case basis to determine if the Crown Attorney or municipality will prosecute. The Ministry is continuing to plan for a phased approach to the transfer of this Part III work and the timing of individual transfers will be informed by local site readiness and capacity to assume this important responsibility. An amending legal agreement will be required to affect the transfer, consisting of an amending Memorandum of Understanding and amending Local Side Agreement, which specifically address the transfer of the Part III prosecution only.</p>

	<p>Part I offences represent less than 30% of all court matters before a Justice in Renfrew County courtrooms. Prior to a Part I court appearance there is also an informal meeting with the Prosecutor. These meetings result in a resolution before the court, payment of fine or a trial. With the transfer to Part III responsibilities, the workload for our Prosecutor will increase substantially as these matters tend to be more serious in nature and can have extensive disclosure provided by enforcement agencies i.e. video evidence, witness statements and collision reports. With the transfer of Part III responsibilities in 2023 and with the recent appointment of our purchased service/contract prosecutor to a Justice of the Peace, it would be beneficial to hire our own prosecutor, rather than purchase these services from a lawyer.</p>												
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>THAT the Finance and Administration recommend the approval of an increase of 1,300 hours for the Prosecutor position (Group 8) to be changed from a Purchased Service to an employee of the County of Renfrew, within the Provincial Offences Administration Division, Corporate Services Department; AND FURTHER THAT this be brought forward to the February 22, 2023 County Council Budget Workshop for approval.</p>												
<p>FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</p>	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>HRS</u></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Salary/Benefits</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prosecutor</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1,300</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$80,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prosecutor Purchased Service</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u> </u></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>(\$74,800)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total POA Budget Enhancement</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1,300</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 5,200</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>HRS</u>	<u>Salary/Benefits</u>	Prosecutor	1,300	\$80,000	Prosecutor Purchased Service	<u> </u>	<u>(\$74,800)</u>	Total POA Budget Enhancement	1,300	\$ 5,200
	<u>HRS</u>	<u>Salary/Benefits</u>											
Prosecutor	1,300	\$80,000											
Prosecutor Purchased Service	<u> </u>	<u>(\$74,800)</u>											
Total POA Budget Enhancement	1,300	\$ 5,200											