




Redistribution
Federal Electoral Districts

Redécoupage
Circonscriptions fédérales



Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of **New Brunswick**

Published pursuant to the *Electoral
Boundaries Readjustment Act*

ISBN 978-0-660-46415-2

Cat. No.: SE3-123/5-1-2022E-PDF

© Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick, 2023

All rights reserved

Table of Contents

Foreword	5
Report (November 28, 2022)	6
Acknowledgments	7
Introduction and Overview	8
Establishment and Membership	8
Statutory and Constitutional Obligations	8
The Proposal	9
Territorial Divisions.....	9
Alternative Provincial Boundary Changes	10
Not Within the Commission's Mandate	11
Summary of Changes Made to the Proposal	12
Additional Reasons for Final Names and Boundaries Following Public Consultation	14
Names of the Electoral Districts	14
Boundaries of the Electoral Districts	15
Acadie—Bathurst.....	15
Beauséjour.....	16
Fredericton—Oromocto	20
Fundy Royal.....	20
Madawaska—Restigouche	21
Miramichi—Grand Lake	22
Moncton—Dieppe	23
Saint John—Kennebecasis.....	25
Saint John—St. Croix.....	28
Tobique—Mactaquac.....	30
Conclusion	32
Appendix – Maps, Boundaries and Names of Electoral Districts	33
Province of New Brunswick.....	42

Cities of Dieppe and Moncton and Town of Riverview..... 43

City of Saint John 44

Addendum to the Report Disposition of Objection (April 14, 2023) 45

Overview 46

The Commission’s Reasons 47

Conclusion..... 50

Foreword

The Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick was initially completed following public consultations and submitted on November 28, 2022.

It was tabled in the House of Commons and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on November 30, 2022. One objection to the Report was filed with the Standing Committee.

In accordance with subsection 22(3) of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, the report of the Standing Committee, the objection, the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Standing Committee, and the Report of the Commission were referred back to the Commission for consideration of the matter of the objection.

The initial version of the Report is included in this final Report in its entirety.

The new section titled “Addendum to the Report – Disposition of Objection” provides the Commission’s consideration and disposition of the objection. In the end, the objection was dismissed. Therefore, the Commission’s Report of November 28, 2022 is unaltered.



Report

(November 28, 2022)

Acknowledgments

We would like to recognize the work of three individuals, each of whom were an integral part of our team: the secretary of the Commission, Ms. Christine Simard; our geography specialist, Mr. Andrew Digney; and our public tour manager, Ms. Monique Drapeau-Miles. We sincerely thank them for their dedicated and timely work and for their commitment to the smooth and efficient functioning of the Commission. We most certainly valued their assistance.

We also wish to thank Elections Canada, who provided the Commission with unwavering administrative and technical support, while at the same time fully respecting the independence of the Commission.

Introduction and Overview

Establishment and Membership

The Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick (the Commission) submits its report for presentation to the House of Commons pursuant to section 20 of the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-3 (the *Act*).

The Commission was established on November 1, 2021, to readjust the boundaries of New Brunswick's federal electoral districts using the data from the 2021 Census.

The Commission is an independent body and makes all final decisions as to where these boundaries will lie. The chair of the Commission, appointed by the Chief Justice of New Brunswick, is the Honourable Madam Justice Lucie A. LaVigne, of the Court of Appeal of New Brunswick. The other members of the Commission, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons, are the Honourable Thomas Riordon, a retired justice of the Court of King's Bench of New Brunswick, deputy chair of the Commission; and Dr. Condé Grondin, a retired professor of political science from the University of New Brunswick.

Statutory and Constitutional Obligations

The 2021 Census established the population of New Brunswick at 775,610. New Brunswick's representation in the House of Commons is 10 members, corresponding to 10 electoral districts (also called ridings), which therefore amounts to a provincial average, or electoral quota, of 77,561 residents per electoral district.

When drawing the electoral boundaries, the Commission was mindful of its statutory obligation to establish electoral districts with populations as close to the provincial average as reasonably possible. However, population parity is not the sole consideration. As required by section 15 of the *Act*, the Commission also considered the communities of interest and identity, historical pattern and geographical size of each district when determining whether deviation from the electoral quota was either necessary or desirable to achieve fair and effective representation. Each of these factors can, just like the population, influence the ability of a member of Parliament to effectively represent his or her constituents. In proposing a new electoral map for the province, the Commission was also guided by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the jurisprudence.

Before drafting its proposed redistribution plan, the Commission welcomed public input. Many of the suggestions received were incorporated into the initial proposal. The redistribution proposal altered the boundaries of all the electoral districts as well as the names of 5 of the 10 districts. Although the Commission was of the view that its proposal would provide effective representation for New Brunswickers in Parliament, it also acknowledged that it was not set in stone.

The Proposal

The Commission submitted its proposal dated June 2, 2022, outlining the proposed names and boundaries of the 10 electoral districts in New Brunswick, with supporting reasons (the Proposal). It was published online and in the *Canada Gazette*. An insert was placed in newspapers throughout the province. It contained the proposed names of the ridings and the maps illustrating their proposed boundaries, outlined the process for submitting written submissions and making public presentations, and specified the locations and dates of the public hearings.

A more detailed consideration of the process that guided the Proposal, including a more thorough explanation of section 15 of the *Act*, the *Charter* and the jurisprudence, as well as the reasons for the recommendations, can be found in the Proposal. Readers are referred to the published document for these details as they will not be repeated here, although they remain very relevant and are to be considered to form part of this report.

The Commission scheduled one in-person public hearing in each electoral district. Hearings were held in the following municipalities between September 7 and September 28, 2022: Woodstock, Saint-Quentin, Newcastle (a neighbourhood in the city of Miramichi), Shediac, Moncton, Rothesay, Saint Andrews and Fredericton. The hearings scheduled for Saint-Léolin and Sussex were cancelled as there were no expressions of interest to make a representation at these hearings. A virtual public hearing was held on September 29, 2022.

In reaction to its Proposal, the Commission heard 37 presenters, most of whom also provided written submissions. It also received at least another 20 written submissions from individuals and groups who did not wish to make oral presentations. The Commission considered all these submissions, plus those received during the advance public consultation, before making the final decisions contained in this report.

The proposed changes that attracted the most feedback, some positive and some negative, were the division of the city of Saint John into two electoral districts, the transfer of the community of McAdam from New Brunswick Southwest to the proposed district of Tobique—Mactaquac and the transfer of the remainder of the town of Riverview from the current riding of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe to Fundy Royal. The dividing line between the ridings of Beauséjour and Miramichi—Grand Lake also generated a lot of discussion and received many different suggestions for change, even though the Commission had not suggested any change to this boundary. These matters will be discussed further in the sections on the individual ridings.

The information and views provided by the public enriched the Commission's understanding of this province's diversity. The need to balance various competing interests inevitably led to not all requests being accommodated.

Territorial Divisions

The Commission endeavoured to draw electoral districts in a manner that respects the integrity of the boundaries of municipalities and First Nations reserves. However, it found it necessary to divide the cities of Saint John and Dieppe in order to respect the objectives of effective representation and greater electoral fairness.

Local governance reform is continuing in this province. The new entities list and maps depicting the future state of the local governance structure for New Brunswick are known. However, maps are not for legal use. Maps with final boundaries will become legal only on January 1, 2023.

The general rule is that commissions use the territorial divisions in existence on January 1 of the year that a commission was established. Therefore, in its Proposal, the Commission used the boundaries and names of entities as they existed on January 1, 2021, except for Fredericton, whose limits were drawn using the expected new limits, as requested by the City of Fredericton during the advance public consultation. However, the Commission reserved the right to readjust other boundaries to take into account some or all local governance reform should it conclude that there was a need to do so before submitting its report.

Throughout the public consultation, both in writing and orally, participants continued to refer to the names and boundaries of the current entities. There was very little mention of the new entities. Notwithstanding the reform, the identity of the communities does not change, and the addresses of its residents stay the same. Therefore, unless otherwise stated, the Commission will continue to employ the territorial divisions used in its Proposal, which was the basis of public consultation and input.

In this report, the Commission has made exceptions for the cities of Moncton, Fredericton and Saint John, and the towns of Oromocto, Quispamsis and Rothesay. It has adjusted the boundaries of these municipalities to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, as a result of local governance reform. These adjustments account for the difference between the population numbers indicated in the Proposal and those specified in this report, for the various impacted ridings, where no other changes were made. The changes in population are not very significant. All are within 155 people of the original count except for the riding of Moncton—Dieppe, which has an increase in population of 628, and Fundy Royal, which has a decrease in population of 707. The names of these entities have not changed.

Reconfiguring the federal electoral districts to realign them with the limits of some of the other new entities would have required more significant changes to the Proposal, as is evidenced by examining the new entities of Five Rivers, Maple Hills, Valley Waters and Butternut Valley, all of which cut across at least two federal ridings. The Commission was not convinced that other changes should be made to the electoral map at this time. The federal electoral districts will be revised again in 10 years. At that time, further consideration should be given to the names and boundaries of the new entities as the public will probably have become accustomed to them.

Alternative Provincial Boundary Changes

Although the Commission received many suggestions for how a specific district could be configured differently, many participants agreed with the Proposal. Only one member of Parliament, the Member for Saint John—Rothesay, disagreed with what the Commission had proposed for his riding and asked that the current riding be maintained.

Most participants who suggested changes to the Proposal targeted chiefly one riding. However, four participants suggested complete provincial boundary changes. One suggestion was received from the Kent Regional Services Commission (Kent RSC) (alluded to in the Proposal), one was submitted by a Saint John resident, one was presented by a Fredericton resident and a written submission suggested an electoral map for the whole country (the author did not identify as a New Brunswicker).

These changes to provincial boundaries resulted in ridings with smaller deviations from the quota than outlined in the Proposal; in fact, all the deviations were within 12%. However, redistribution is more than a purely mathematical exercise. These changes would have involved drastic and sweeping changes to the boundaries of many ridings, basically requiring the Commission to scrap its Proposal and start all over from scratch.

Rather than making fundamental and radical changes to New Brunswick's electoral map, the Commission opted for an approach of generally maintaining established electoral districts and making incremental changes where necessary to achieve fair and effective representation. As far as reasonably possible, the Commission aimed to maintain some continuity between old and new boundaries so that citizens could continue to identify with their riding and their elected representative.

Effective representation can be achieved by various configurations. The Commission's proposal for most ridings was generally well accepted except for these provincial changes. In such circumstances, unless an option proposed by others represented an obvious improvement over the Proposal, substantially changing the redistribution plan suggested in the Proposal, which formed the basis of extensive public consultation and input, could undermine confidence in the electoral boundaries readjustment process. The Commission is of the view that this would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the *Act*. Public consultation and feedback are integral and essential to the process, and the *Act* does not provide for a second round of public consultation.

After reviewing the four alternative provincial boundary changes, the Commission remains unconvinced that any of these proposed options would improve the overall redistribution. The Commission believes that its Proposal, with some minor adjustments, offers the best solution for the province.

Not Within the Commission's Mandate

A few matters that are beyond the Commission's mandate were the subject of written submissions or comments from presenters during the hearings. Two individuals advocated for a system of proportional representation. Two others argued that the *Act* should be changed to (1) remove all limits on the number of people allowed in each electoral district and (2) prevent members of Parliament from making both a submission during the public consultation process and objections after the report is presented to the House of Commons.

The Chair of the New Brunswick Coalition of Persons with Disabilities made a presentation during the virtual public hearing, advocating for an inclusive society. She offered different suggestions, which, she submitted, would make voting and being involved in the electoral process easier for people with disabilities, such as improving public transit, making sure that polling stations are

accessible and keeping separate data on registered people with disabilities to facilitate them accordingly in upcoming elections, especially if boundaries change.

These matters are for Parliament or Elections Canada to consider rather than the Commission. However, they form part of the record of the Commission and are accordingly available for review and discussion by others who may wish to pursue them.

Summary of Changes Made to the Proposal

The Commission reaffirms the proposed names of all the electoral districts, except for the proposed electoral district of Fundy Royal—Riverview, which reverts to Fundy Royal.

The Commission reaffirms the boundaries of all the electoral districts as proposed, subject only to the following:

- The community of Four Falls is transferred from the proposed electoral district of Madawaska—Restigouche to the reconfigured electoral district of Tobique—Mactaquac.
- The community of McAdam is transferred from the proposed electoral district of Tobique—Mactaquac to the electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix.
- Adjustments have been made to the boundaries of the cities of Moncton, Fredericton and Saint John, and the towns of Oromocto, Quispamsis and Rothesay to reflect territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, as a result of local governance reform.

The names, populations and variances from the electoral quota of 77,561 for all the electoral districts are shown in the table below.

Electoral District	Population 2021	Variance (%)
Acadie—Bathurst	79,581	2.60
Beauséjour	88,591	14.22
Fredericton—Oromocto	85,389	10.09
Fundy Royal	73,554	-5.17
Madawaska—Restigouche	70,597	-8.98
Miramichi—Grand Lake	59,725	-23.00
Moncton—Dieppe	91,961	18.57
Saint John—Kennebecasis	81,932	5.64
Saint John—St. Croix	80,192	3.39
Tobique—Mactaquac	64,088	-17.37

This redistribution plan maintains the status quo concerning the linguistic profile of the electoral districts. New Brunswick has three predominantly French-speaking electoral districts (Acadie—Bathurst, Beauséjour and Madawaska—Restigouche), one bilingual district (Moncton—Dieppe) and six mainly English-speaking districts (Fredericton—Oromocto, Fundy Royal, Miramichi—Grand Lake, Saint John—Kennebecasis, Saint John—St. Croix and Tobique—Mactaquac).

The next section of this report provides additional reasons for the final names and boundaries. The Appendix contains legal descriptions and maps of the electoral districts.

Additional Reasons for Final Names and Boundaries Following Public Consultation

Names of the Electoral Districts

In its Proposal, the Commission considered it appropriate to change the names of 5 of the 10 districts. Only three submissions opposing proposed name changes were received; two of those were from current members of Parliament.

The Member of Parliament for Fundy Royal objected to the proposed name of Fundy Royal—Riverview. Although approximately 50% of the population of the town of Riverview was already in this riding, given that the Commission was transferring to it the remainder of Riverview, it thought that the proposed name was more suitable. In his letter, the Member argued that no change was necessary since Riverview is in Albert County and “Royal” encapsulates the counties of Kings, Queens and Albert (named for Prince Albert, the consort of Queen Victoria). He submitted that the current name achieved a fine balance of fair representation of all communities in the riding. Considering the Member’s arguments and the fact that the Commission had sought to retain the current riding names wherever appropriate, it is now satisfied that no name change is necessary for this riding.

There was also opposition to the proposal that the electoral district of New Brunswick Southwest should be renamed Saint John—St. Croix. The Commission heard a presentation in Saint Andrews from the Member of Parliament for New Brunswick Southwest and received a written comment from another concerned citizen. Both argued that the current name should be maintained. The Member stated that he thought that Saint John—St. Croix was a lovely name and, when arguing for the inclusion of the community of McAdam in this district, noted that McAdam was a starting point for the St. Croix River. However, he submitted that the proposed name was not an entirely accurate geographical description because many of the communities do not lie next to the St. Croix River and the name does not capture all the communities included in this riding. He also noted that the changes required to reflect the new name would result in needless expenditures. Nevertheless, the Commission remains convinced that the name Saint John—St. Croix better reflects the new electoral district’s culture, history and geography.

The Commission reaffirms the proposed names of all the electoral districts, except for the proposed electoral district of Fundy Royal—Riverview, which reverts to Fundy Royal.

Boundaries of the Electoral Districts

This section deals with the boundaries of the electoral districts. For each district, it provides an overview of what the Commission had recommended, the suggestions received from the public, the Commission's final decision and the reasons therefor. These reasons are in addition to the reasons detailed in the Proposal since the Commission has adopted, as final, several of the boundaries suggested in its Proposal.

Acadie—Bathurst

During the advance public consultation, two writers, including the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Tracadie-Sheila, asked that the small part of Tracadie that was situated in the current riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake be transferred to Acadie—Bathurst where the rest of that municipality is located. The Commission accepted this request and incorporated this change into its Proposal. Several participants applauded this move. It is the only change that the Commission proposed for this district.

At the public hearing held in Fredericton, two presenters suggested that the Francophone communities of Alnwick and Neguac, which are in the proposed district of Miramichi—Grand Lake, should be assigned to Acadie—Bathurst, grounded mostly on community of identity based on language, but also community of interest. No such suggestion or request was received from these communities or from anyone identifying as a resident of these communities.

Neguac is included in the Acadian Peninsula Regional Service Commission, while Alnwick is included in the Greater Miramichi Regional Service Commission. During the virtual public hearing, the Mayor of Miramichi told the Commission that the Village of Neguac had asked to be part of the Greater Miramichi Regional Service Commission, but its request had been denied. He noted that Miramichi and Neguac were included in the provincial electoral district of Miramichi Bay—Neguac. He was of the view that the people from Alnwick and Neguac were happy being in the riding that encompassed Miramichi and added that the City of Miramichi would be disappointed if those communities were to be removed from the proposed electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake. The Commission heard the same thing in Miramichi from the executive assistant to the member of Parliament for Miramichi—Grand Lake. He stated that this area was serviced by the Miramichi hub, and he believed that these communities were happy to be in this riding.

If these communities were to be assigned to Acadie—Bathurst, it would decrease the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake by approximately 5,300 people. That adjustment would bring the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake to approximately 30% below the electoral quota. The arguments put forward did not convince the Commission that the communities of Alnwick and Neguac should be removed from the proposed district of Miramichi—Grand Lake and assigned to Acadie—Bathurst.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Acadie—Bathurst as proposed.

Beauséjour

Several suggestions received touched on the neighbouring electoral districts of Miramichi—Grand Lake and Beauséjour, and significantly impacted both ridings. Therefore, this section will deal with both districts. Additional comments concerning Miramichi—Grand Lake can be found in the section dealing with that riding.

In its Proposal, the Commission suggested that the current electoral district of Beauséjour be adjusted slightly so that the entire city of Moncton would be included in the proposed district of Moncton—Dieppe. No other changes were proposed for this riding. For Miramichi—Grand Lake, the Commission suggested adding population by extending the riding south toward the Grand Lake area. The Commission did not suggest any transfer of communities between Beauséjour and Miramichi—Grand Lake.

Transferring Communities from Miramichi—Grand Lake to Beauséjour

At the hearing in Shediac, the Commission heard from the Chair of the Kent RSC, who is also the Mayor of Rogersville. She repeated the request the Kent RSC had made during the advance public consultation, asking that all communities that are part of the Kent RSC be included in the electoral district of Beauséjour. Several of these communities are in the riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake, including Rogersville, Carleton, Huskisson, Acadieville, Harcourt, Weldford and part of Hardwicke. These communities have been in the same riding as the city of Miramichi for at least 10 years, and some have been there for more than 20 or 30 years.

In support of its position, the Kent RSC invoked communities of interest and identity, asserting that the communities included in its commission worked well together on common projects and that it would be easier if it had to deal with only one member of Parliament. It also stated that most of the communities that would be transferred are predominantly Francophone and would be joining the riding of Beauséjour, where a majority of the population is Francophone. Other than Rogersville, the only other community that communicated with the Commission was Carleton, and it specified that it did not want to be transferred to Beauséjour, as requested by the Kent RSC.

There are 12 regional service commissions in New Brunswick and only 10 electoral districts. The population included in each commission varies greatly, from less than 22,000 to more than 177,000. Only three regional service commissions will have all its communities within one riding. While some commissions are divided into two or even four ridings, most are spread out in three ridings. The only other regional service commission that asked the Commission to consider including all its communities in one riding was the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission. The Commission accepted that request. In that instance, only one community was involved (namely, McAdam), that community had asked to be transferred and the impact on the populations of both affected ridings was acceptable.

The Kent RSC further suggested that the southern part of the Beauséjour riding, including the communities of Sackville, Dorchester, Port Elgin and surrounding areas, be removed from Beauséjour and assigned to a new riding to be called Albert—Tantramar. It also suggested far-reaching changes to several of the other ridings. It acknowledged that this would result in a major restructuring of the electoral map of the province, including the disappearance of Miramichi—

Grand Lake, Fundy Royal, Tobique—Mactaquac and New Brunswick Southwest, and the creation of Central New Brunswick, Albert—Tantramar, Western Valley—Charlotte and Kings—York.

In Fredericton, the President of the Association francophone des municipalités du Nouveau-Brunswick (AFMNB) was heard. He commended the Commission for its Proposal, except for the part dealing with the communities from the Kent RSC. He stated that the AFMNB supported the request from the Kent RSC to transfer communities from Miramichi—Grand Lake to Beauséjour so that all communities included in that commission would be in the electoral district of Beauséjour. The Société de l'Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick made a presentation in Moncton and applauded the Commission for the totality of its Proposal. However, it asked the Commission to reconsider the request from the Kent RSC, to see whether it would be possible to include all its communities in Beauséjour, while acknowledging the pitfalls that moving the boundary between Beauséjour and Miramichi—Grand Lake could have.

In its presentation, the AFMNB did not suggest any other changes to Beauséjour, Miramichi—Grand Lake or the rest of the province. If the changes requested by the Kent RSC were accepted without any other adjustment, the population of the electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake would be at least 33% below the provincial electoral quota, well below the allowable variance of plus or minus 25%.

The AFMNB suggested that the situation of Miramichi—Grand Lake should be tolerated on the basis of “extraordinary circumstances,” as provided for in section 15(2) of the *Act*.

The term “extraordinary circumstances” is not defined in the *Act*. However, in New Brunswick, the Commission knows of no instances where a commission suggested in its final report an electoral district that had a variance of more than or less than 25% of the electoral quota. In 2012, in its final report, the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick stated:

[...] research indicates that the allowance of a variance exceeding 25% of the electoral quota on the basis of “extraordinary circumstances” under the Act has been applied sparingly throughout the country over decades. In essence, the use of that special provision appears to have been reserved, at least at the federal level, for extreme cases where the vastness of the territory or geographical character of a given area simply makes it impossible for it to be joined with any other electoral district despite its very low population base. Such is the case, for example, for the electoral district of Labrador in Newfoundland and Labrador, which has a population of 27,000 and a variance of -62%. The territory covers some 270,000 square kilometres, compared to New Brunswick's 74,000 square kilometres. The electoral district of Kenora in northern Ontario has a variance of -47% and also covers an area larger than the entire Province of New Brunswick. The Commission is therefore under a legal obligation to effect a redistribution that increases voter parity and ensures that no district is beyond the 25% variance. [p. 14]

The Commission shares this view.

While the *Act* directs the Commission to look beyond the principle of representation by population, and while the Commission accepts that vast sparsely populated northern regions of New Brunswick will have smaller populations than other New Brunswick electoral districts, it continues to be of the view expressed in its Proposal that there is no justification to make use of the extraordinary circumstances rule for any riding in New Brunswick.

To allow the electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake to exist on the basis of extraordinary circumstances, with such a highly negative variance, could bring about its disappearance as a riding.

Although the Commission reconsidered the request of the Kent RSC, it was unable to adopt it because of the effect it would have on the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake and on many other districts.

Transferring Communities from Beauséjour to Miramichi—Grand Lake

Other than the scenario explained above, which entailed the transfer of communities from Miramichi—Grand Lake to Beauséjour, another completely opposite scenario emerged. At least six participants, including the Mayor of Miramichi and a former member of Parliament, spoke to Miramichi—Grand Lake's low population and suggested that the most logical expansion to acquire population would be to extend part of its eastern boundary across part or all of Kent County, which is situated in Beauséjour.

This change would mean transferring from Beauséjour to Miramichi (a riding that could be called Northumberland—Kent, Miramichi—Kent or Miramichi—Beauséjour, depending on whom you listen to and how far south you go) the communities of Saint-Louis, Saint-Charles, Saint-Louis de Kent, Richibucto, Rexton and Indian Island 28. Some participants would go further and also transfer to Miramichi—Grand Lake the communities of Saint-Paul, Sainte-Marie, Wellington, Bouctouche and Saint-Antoine. At least one presenter would transfer all of Kent County, noting that this would respect the Kent RSC's wish to keep its boundaries whole in one riding.

The proponents invoked geographical proximity and community of interest, but also the principle of relative population, or voter parity, noting that Miramichi—Grand Lake has a population that is 23% below the provincial electoral quota, while the population of Beauséjour is 14.22% above it. Some contended that the wide discrepancy in population in the riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake, compared to others, compromised the concept of representation by population.

The possibility of better representation for the minority linguistic community in Miramichi—Grand Lake was also raised. As per the linguistic data, 54.4% of the population of the proposed district of Beauséjour indicate French as the language most often spoken at home, while 58.4% indicate French as their mother tongue. Therefore, this is a predominantly French-speaking electoral district. In contrast, in the proposed riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake, only 15.1% of the population indicate French as the language most often spoken at home, and 18.6% indicate French as their mother tongue. If the northern part of Kent County were to be transferred, these percentages for Miramichi—Grand Lake would increase to approximately 20.9% and 24.4%, respectively. If all of Kent County were to be transferred to Miramichi—Grand Lake, the percentages would further increase to approximately 31% and 34.4%, respectively.

These figures, at first glance, seem to support the position of those who submit that the transfer of part or all of Kent County to Miramichi—Grand Lake could increase the Francophone population to a point where it would reach a significant number, or critical mass, thereby giving the minority linguistic community better representation.

A similar conclusion reached by the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for New Brunswick in 2003 was rejected by the Federal Court in *Raïche v. Canada (Attorney General) (FC)*, [2005] 1 F.C.R. 93, [2004] F.C.J. No. 839. At issue in *Raïche* was the boundary between Miramichi (then a majority-Anglophone district, but with an influential Francophone minority of 33%) and Acadie—Bathurst (then an 85% majority-Francophone district). The commission had previously moved some Acadians from Acadie—Bathurst to the Miramichi district in order to move closer to population parity and the 10% variation target that the commission had set.

Opponents of the revised map claimed that by moving Francophone residents into Miramichi, the commission had failed to comply with its statutory obligations under the *Act* to respect communities of interest and identity. The commission explained that it considered the Francophone minority in the new riding of Miramichi to be sufficiently large that its voice would be heard and its interests represented.

The Court found that the commission had acted unreasonably. Among its reasons, it concluded there was no evidence that the minority would be adequately represented in the Miramichi riding even if it reached a critical mass. It stated:

[...] the Court believes that forming communities of interest and increasing a community's political power depend on a large number of factors, and they do not occur simply because a community achieves a critical mass. Adding other members of the community to the electoral district, in the hope that effective representation will follow, is something of a gamble. That position is not consistent with the spirit of the Readjustment Act. [para. 81]

As a result, a new commission was established, and the Francophone communities were returned to the electoral district of Acadie—Bathurst.

There are also several suggestions for Dieppe, which the Commission reviews in the section dealing with Moncton—Dieppe. They range from including the entire city in Beauséjour, once most of Kent County has been transferred to Miramichi—Grand Lake, to removing it from Beauséjour and using it to configure new ridings.

One presenter heard in Fredericton suggested that all the predominantly Francophone communities presently in the Miramichi—Grand Lake district should be transferred to Acadie—Bathurst or Beauséjour and that all predominantly Anglophone communities and First Nations from Kent County, currently included in Beauséjour, should be transferred to Miramichi—Grand Lake. Oromocto would be added to Miramichi—Grand Lake to increase its population.

None of the communities in Beauséjour have asked to be transferred to another riding. Defining electoral boundaries is not simply a numbers game or a question of language. The Commission is expected to use its knowledge and experience in applying the principles contained in the *Act* to the establishment of boundaries.

The next commission, 10 years from now, may have to reconsider the status quo in light of population trends, but, for now, the Commission believes that Beauséjour should retain its proposed boundaries. The Commission was able to add communities to increase the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake without violating the principle of community of interest or community of identity or making changes that would result in a major reconfiguration of New Brunswick's electoral map.

The Commission remains of the view that the proposed boundaries respect the spirit and intent of the *Act*, while achieving effective representation for the populations of the neighbouring ridings of Beauséjour and Miramichi—Grand Lake.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Beauséjour as proposed, subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Moncton.

Fredericton—Oromocto

During the advance public consultation, the Commission received a request from the City of Fredericton, asking that there be one electoral district comprised of the entirety of the city of Fredericton (as per its expected new territorial limits), the town of Oromocto, the village of New Maryland, St. Mary's First Nation and Oromocto First Nation. The Commission agreed to proceed as requested and recommended that the new riding be named Fredericton—Oromocto.

The Commission's proposal for this electoral district was well received. The only different suggestions received concerned Oromocto. A couple of writers suggested that it should be removed from this riding and assigned to Miramichi—Grand Lake or Gagetown—Kennebecasis (with Rothesay and Quispamsis) and that Hanwell should join Fredericton instead of Oromocto. At the public hearing in Fredericton, the City of Fredericton, through its Deputy Mayor, reiterated its request, arguing that Oromocto was better aligned with this riding than Hanwell. It also stated it agreed with the Commission that this electoral district should be renamed Fredericton—Oromocto, given the new geography of the district.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Fredericton—Oromocto as proposed, subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Fredericton and Oromocto.

Fundy Royal

Approximately 50% of the population of Riverview was already in the current riding of Fundy Royal. The Commission proposed that the rest of the town be added to this riding. It also proposed that Quispamsis be assigned to Saint John—Kennebecasis and Waterborough to Miramichi—Grand Lake.

Other than the comments received from the four participants who suggested complete provincial boundary changes, the only negative comments received concerning this district were from the Mayor of Riverview and four of its residents, who asked that Riverview, in whole or in part, remain part of the riding of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe. The Commission deals with these suggestions when discussing the electoral district of Moncton—Dieppe.

As previously noted, the Member of Parliament for Fundy Royal wrote to express his objection to the proposed change of name. However, he did not object to the new configuration proposed for his riding.

The Commission adopts the proposed electoral district of Fundy Royal—Riverview (now renamed Fundy Royal), subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Moncton, Saint John, Rothesay and Quispamsis.

Madawaska—Restigouche

As a result of suggestions received during the advance public consultation, the Commission proposed the addition of the parish of Grand Falls, the town of Grand Falls, the parish of Drummond, the village of Drummond and the rural community of Saint-André to this electoral district. These communities are situated in the northern part of the current electoral district of Tobique—Mactaquac.

In a letter addressed to the Commission before the publication of its Proposal, the municipalities of Grand Falls, Drummond and Saint-André asked that their communities be included in the Madawaska—Restigouche riding. The Mayor of Grand Falls participated in the public hearing in Saint-Quentin as designated spokesperson for the three municipalities to express support for the Proposal.

The Commission apprised the mayor of a request received from a resident of Tobique—Mactaquac (a former member of the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly), during the public hearing in Woodstock, asking that the community of Four Falls remain in Tobique—Mactaquac. There are approximately 500 people who reside in this area, which is situated at the southern tip of the proposed Madawaska—Restigouche district. With this minor adjustment, the population of Madawaska—Restigouche would decrease from 71,099 to 70,597, and the variance would increase from -8.33% to -8.98%. Four Falls was described as a largely Anglophone community. It will be part of the new municipal entity to be called Grand Falls and is included in the Northwest Regional Service Commission. However, participants at the Woodstock hearing told the Commission that most of its residents shop, work and have their primary linkages with Aroostook and Perth-Andover. Based on communities of interest and identity, they argued that Four Falls would be better aligned with Tobique—Mactaquac. The Mayor of Grand Falls was of the view that this request should be accepted. The Commission agrees.

The Commission also heard from a spokesperson for the Madawaska—Restigouche Federal Liberal Association. Although she stated that the association welcomed the addition of the communities proposed by the Commission, she expressed concern regarding the resulting increase in the geographical size of this proposed electoral district. She submitted that the added travel times and distances would make it more challenging for a member of Parliament to adequately represent all constituents.

The proposed changes will see the size of this riding increase from approximately 11,900 square kilometres to approximately 13,200 square kilometres. It is the third largest in terms of geographical size, after Miramichi—Grand Lake, which covers a land area of approximately

18,900 square kilometres, and Tobique—Mactaquac, which covers approximately 15,300 square kilometres.

At the beginning of the redistribution process, the population of this electoral district was 22.40% below the provincial quota—therefore, a variance that was very close to the allowable limit of plus or minus 25%. Notwithstanding the additions made to the riding, its population will still be 8.98% below the provincial electoral quota.

The Commission recognizes that it is more difficult to represent large, rural districts than small, urban districts. This warrants lower population numbers in the three vast, rural districts that are sparsely populated. However, the Commission is satisfied that, despite their size, effective representation can occur within these electoral districts. The Internet, social media and changing methods of electronic communication have made personal contact easier, more frequent and more cost-effective. Hopefully, technological advancement will continue to ease the communications challenges being experienced in these ridings.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Madawaska—Restigouche as proposed, subject only to the exclusion of the community of Four Falls, which will revert to Tobique—Mactaquac.

Miramichi—Grand Lake

The Commission proposed to transfer to Acadie—Bathurst that small part of Tracadie that was in the riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake. It also proposed to add population to this electoral district by extending it south toward the Grand Lake area to include Sheffield and those parts of Maugerville and Canning, which were in the current electoral district of Fredericton, and Waterborough, which was in the current electoral district of Fundy Royal.

All who attended the Miramichi public hearing supported the Proposal, except for a former member of Parliament, who suggested that the Commission should transfer part of Kent County to this riding and transfer the communities from the Grand Lake area elsewhere. His comments, as well as the other suggestions for change received for this district, were reviewed when discussing the district of Beauséjour. The Commission will now review the positive support received for the proposed district of Miramichi—Grand Lake.

The Member of Parliament for Miramichi—Grand Lake had provided a written submission during the advance public consultation, wherein he had encouraged the Commission to keep the current boundaries intact as far as possible. He suggested that, if additions were necessary, the Commission should consider adding to it other specific communities, some included in the current riding of Tobique—Mactaquac. After the publication of the Proposal, he wrote back, stating that he supported it and thought that the proposed electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake would receive widespread acceptance from the residents of his riding.

The Commission heard from the President of the Miramichi—Grand Lake Conservative Electoral District Association. He described himself as a person who had been born in Miramichi and lived there all his life. He had also provided written comments during the advance public consultation. Although the Proposal was somewhat different from what he had suggested, he attended the public hearing in Miramichi and affirmed that, having read the Proposal and the reasons given for the suggested changes, he was happy to accept what was being proposed for this riding.

The Chair of the local service district of Carleton, who was present in Miramichi, had sent a letter to inform the Commission that Carleton supported the Proposal. Carleton had been included in this riding for many years, and it did not want to be transferred to Beauséjour, as requested by the Kent RSC.

The executive assistant to the current member of Parliament appeared at the hearing in Miramichi on his own behalf and endorsed the Proposal. He was of the view that, despite its size, the proposed district could be effectively represented by a member of Parliament and its constituents could be well served. He stated that constituents were using technology more and more every day to carry out their affairs, including communicating with their member of Parliament. He believed that the people from Kent County were more likely to gravitate to Dieppe and Moncton for their services and needs than to Miramichi. He added that good connections had been established from the Harcourt area down to the Grand Lake area.

The Commission is of the view that it has found an appropriate way to increase the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake and keep the deviation within the allowable variance. It remains convinced that the southern communities are an appropriate fit and thinks that this boundary change is the most reasonable way to adjust the population of Miramichi—Grand Lake at this time. It is also of some significance that no objections to the Proposal were made by the residents of the southern communities.

The Commission has not been persuaded that changes should be made to the proposed electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake. It therefore adopts the electoral district of Miramichi—Grand Lake as proposed, subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Fredericton and Oromocto.

Moncton—Dieppe

The population of the electoral district of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe was outside the allowable limits of plus or minus 25% when the Commission began its deliberations. Therefore, adjustments were required. In its Proposal, the Commission recommended transferring the remainder of Riverview to the proposed district of Fundy Royal—Riverview. The rest of the riding, remaining relatively unchanged, would comprise Moncton and part of Dieppe.

During his presentation in Moncton, the Mayor of Riverview asked that the Commission maintain the existing boundaries of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe. Given that the population of the current district is more than 30% over the provincial electoral quota, the Commission is unable to accommodate this request. In the alternative, the Town of Riverview requested that some portion of it be kept in the riding so that the three communities would be represented by a unified voice. The mayor argued that, when it came to federal issues, Riverview was more closely aligned with Moncton and Dieppe than with the communities in Fundy Royal. He expressed concern that the issues important to Riverview may not receive proper attention because they were very different from the issues that concerned the other communities in Fundy Royal. Although Riverview is a predominantly English-speaking community, he stated that the Town had been working tirelessly with Moncton and Dieppe to create an inclusive, diverse and equitable community and region. Riverview was now worried about the negative implications of being segregated from Moncton and Dieppe based on linguistic data. The mayor thought that the broader impact of the decision

may have been overlooked by the Commission and stated that the decision should not be based solely on population numbers and linguistics.

The Commission also received written comments from four other individuals, residents of Riverview, asking that all of Riverview be included in the electoral district of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe.

The Greater Moncton Roméo LeBlanc International Airport was included in the electoral district of Beauséjour before the redistribution, and, as per the Proposal, it is to remain in the proposed district of Beauséjour. However, at least three presenters, including the City of Moncton and the Town of Riverview, asked that the airport be included in the same riding as Moncton.

In correspondence received from the City of Moncton during the advance public consultation, the City had stated that its preferred option was a riding that coincided with Moncton's current municipal boundaries. At the hearing in Moncton, the Mayor of Moncton reaffirmed the City's preference and asked that the city's boundaries be adjusted to reflect the territorial limits expected to come into effect on January 1, 2023, as a result of local governance reform. This adjustment would result in an increase of population of 628 for this riding.

In its Proposal, the Commission stated that transferring the remaining portions of both Dieppe and Riverview to other ridings would require major changes to several other ridings. Among the writers who suggested redrawing the provincial boundaries (none identified as a resident of this riding), each put forward a different scenario for this electoral district.

- In order to keep Moncton by itself, one presenter recommended the creation of one riding called Dieppe—Westmorland, which would comprise Dieppe and a part of Westmorland. Riverview and the Grand Lake area would be part of the electoral district of Fundy Royal.
- Another presenter suggested that Moncton remain by itself and that all of Dieppe be included in the riding of Beauséjour, after most of Kent County had been transferred from Beauséjour to the riding of Miramichi. Riverview would join a riding to be called Albert—Petitcodiac—Kings.
- One writer suggested that the Commission should divide Moncton into two parts but keep Dieppe together. Dieppe would join east Moncton, while west Moncton and Riverview would join Fundy Royal.
- Another presenter suggested that the Commission should divide both Dieppe and Moncton. Part of Dieppe would join most of Moncton and be called Moncton—Dieppe, while a small part of north and west Moncton would be included in a riding that would contain Albert County (including Riverview) and part of Westmorland County and be called Albert—Tantramar.

The Commission heard presenters in Shediac, Moncton and Fredericton who wholeheartedly supported the proposed reconfiguration of this riding. Among them were the Société de l'Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick, the Association francophone des municipalités du Nouveau-Brunswick and the Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe Federal Liberal Association.

New Brunswick is Canada's only officially bilingual province, and Moncton is Canada's only officially bilingual city. Dieppe is the largest predominantly Francophone city in Canada outside Quebec. The language data from the 2021 Census reveal that there has been a decrease in the percentage of Francophones in Moncton. Only 20.4% of the population of Moncton give French as the language spoken most often at home, while 27.2% indicate French as their mother tongue. These percentages increase to 24.6% and 31.3%, respectively, when considering the population of the proposed riding of Moncton—Dieppe.

There is a substantial Francophone institutional network located within the Moncton urban area. As the percentage of Francophones in Moncton continues to decline, it becomes more difficult for the Francophones to attract the attention of their member of Parliament regarding the fate of their institutions and the role of Parliament and the federal government in the future of these crucial institutions for the preservation and vitality of the Francophone community.

When a French-speaking community represents an important percentage of an existing electoral district, its representation should not be significantly diluted or diminished by the redistribution process. The linguistic profile of this riding as a bilingual riding (the only one in New Brunswick) is maintained in the proposed district of Moncton—Dieppe.

In its Proposal, the Commission concluded that the factors found in section 15 of the *Act*, especially the community of interest factor, as well as fair representation for New Brunswick's linguistic minority, militated in favour of keeping part of Dieppe in the same riding as Moncton. The reasons detailed in the Proposal for keeping Moncton and part of Dieppe together in the proposed district of Moncton—Dieppe remain applicable.

However, the Commission is of the view that the City of Moncton's request to readjust its municipal boundaries as per local governance reform is reasonable. With this adjustment, the electoral district of Moncton—Dieppe would have a population count of 91,961 and be 18.57% above the provincial quota—therefore, still within the 25% range of deviation permitted by the *Act*.

The Commission was not satisfied that the transfer of the Greater Moncton Roméo LeBlanc International Airport from Beauséjour to Moncton—Dieppe would result in more effective representation for New Brunswickers. The population count for this area is negligible. The Commission was not convinced that a change was warranted.

With Riverview constituting roughly 28% of the population of the electoral district of Fundy Royal, the Commission is satisfied that the Town of Riverview should be able to convince its member of Parliament to advocate for issues important to Riverview.

After further analysis, the Commission adopts the electoral district of Moncton—Dieppe as proposed, subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Moncton.

Saint John—Kennebecasis

The Commission recommended the addition of Quispamsis to the current riding of Saint John—Rothesay and the transfer of that part of Saint John that lies west of the Saint John River and Saint John Harbour to the proposed riding of Saint John—St. Croix.

Although this section examines the proposed riding of Saint John—Kennebecasis, it would be difficult to do so without also dealing with the neighbouring proposed riding of Saint John—St. Croix. Many of the comments received opposed the division of the city of Saint John between these two ridings. Additional comments concerning Saint John—St. Croix can be found in the section dealing with that riding.

At the hearing in Rothesay, the Member of Parliament for the current riding of Saint John—Rothesay argued that the city of Saint John should not be divided between two electoral districts. He stated that he had grown up in west Saint John and lived in Saint John all his life, except for four years, when he lived in Charlotte County. He had also worked in Charlotte County for 15 years. He did not agree with the mixed urban-rural district of Saint John—St. Croix as he believed the issues for west Saint John were very different from those for Charlotte County. He opined that the first thing the Commission should have done was start by not breaking up the three major cities in this province and then work around that. He argued that Saint John was growing and thriving and needed one member of Parliament to focus on it. He asked that the existing boundaries remain the same, with Saint John kept intact in the current riding of Saint John—Rothesay, and that a new riding be created from the outlying communities of Grand Bay-Westfield, the Kingston Peninsula, the parish of Rothesay and Quispamsis.

No one from the City of Saint John appeared at a public hearing, nor did the Commission receive any written submission advising it of the City's position concerning the Commission's recommendation to divide Saint John between two ridings. However, the mayor's special advisor made a presentation in Rothesay. He specified that he was a political appointee rather than staff. He informed us that he was appearing before the Commission as a result of a resolution passed by the City of Saint John that read as follows: "Resolved that the matter be referred to the Mayor's Special Advisor to further consult with regional stakeholders to create a proposal to be presented to the Federal Boundary Commission so that our region would have two Federal Members of Parliament." He asserted that the region already had two members of Parliament—namely, the members for Saint John—Rothesay and Fundy Royal. He concluded his presentation by asking the Commission to keep Saint John as a whole, in one electoral district. However, there is no indication that the City of Saint John had passed a resolution to that effect.

At least a dozen other individuals expressed concerns, either in writing or during the public hearings, about the division of Saint John between two electoral districts. Some stated that having one member of Parliament focusing on Saint John would be better than two members of Parliament representing different parts of the city. Some argued that there should not be any mixed urban-rural ridings. Others added that the proposed changes could dilute the representation of the population of west Saint John.

Those who recommended that Saint John should remain in one electoral district and proceeded to suggest provincial boundary changes had different suggestions for how the population in the southern part of New Brunswick could be balanced.

- One suggested that Grand Bay-Westfield, Musquash, part of Simonds and Saint John be kept together. The current riding of New Brunswick Southwest would no longer exist. In its stead, there would be a riding called Kings—York, which would include Rothesay and Quispamsis, while Charlotte County would be included in a riding named Charlotte—Western Valley, which would start in Denmark and end in Grand Manan.

- The second suggested that Saint John and Simonds be kept together, while Quispamsis, Rothesay and Grand Bay-Westfield be kept together in the riding of New Brunswick Southwest.
- The third suggested that the current riding of Saint John—Rothesay be maintained and a new riding, to be called Charlotte—Kings, be created, which would include Quispamsis and Grand Bay-Westfield.
- The fourth suggested that Saint John and Grand Bay-Westfield be kept together, a riding called Gagetown—Kennebecasis (which would include Oromocto, Quispamsis and Rothesay) be created and a part of Tobique—Mactaquac be joined to Charlotte County in a riding to be called Carleton—Mactaquac—Charlotte.

A presenter at the Rothesay public hearing suggested that the Commission should keep Saint John, Rothesay and Quispamsis together and call the riding Saint John—Kennebecasis. This option would bring the population of this riding to over 100,000 and push its deviation, at more than 29% above the provincial electoral quota. The Commission is unable to support a variance for this riding that is outside the statutorily permitted plus or minus 25% range. As previously noted, the Commission is of the view that there is no justification to make use of the extraordinary circumstances rule for any riding in New Brunswick. This certainly applies to the three contiguous southern electoral districts that border the Bay of Fundy, where there are historical ties, an obvious and long-shared community of interest, a significant community of identity based on the English language and a relatively compact geography. In such circumstances, the dividing lines can more easily be moved in order to balance populations between the ridings, while respecting the spirit and intent of the *Act*.

Not all comments received were negative. A few individuals asked that the Commission proceed with the changes recommended in the Proposal. It was noted that this would effect a desirable and fair distribution of the population between the two ridings, allow Charlotte County to be part of a riding with approximately enough population and keep Quispamsis and Rothesay together with Saint John. Some thought that having two members of Parliament would result in increased advocacy for Saint John.

The Commission received a letter from the Mayor of Quispamsis, stating that the Town of Quispamsis was on record as supporting the Commission's proposal to move Quispamsis from the Fundy Royal riding to the proposed riding of Saint John—Kennebecasis as the Town was of the view that it shared more commonalities with the communities of the latter.

In its written submission, the Town of Grand Bay-Westfield, which is currently in the riding of New Brunswick Southwest but would be part of the proposed district of Saint John—St. Croix, applauded the Commission's endeavours to achieve equitable and fair federal representation for all New Brunswickers. It believed that Grand Bay-Westfield was better aligned with the Greater Saint John region as a whole.

The Member of Parliament for New Brunswick Southwest made a presentation in Rothesay in addition to the one he made during the public hearing held in his riding in Saint Andrews. He informed the Commission that he did not dispute the reconfiguration of the two ridings and that, if the Proposal were maintained, he looked forward to representing west Saint John. He submitted that dividing middle-sized cities was not unusual in this country and it could be advantageous to

have multiple lawmakers representing a municipality. However, he added that a member of Parliament must first represent individuals—namely, his or her constituents. Reviewing and rejecting the four alternative provincial boundary changes suggested to the Commission, which he posited would lead to some unwieldy and unfair ridings, he expressed great concern about the significant impact on his riding if west Saint John were now removed from it.

There was no specific request to align Saint John with its expected new territorial limits. However, since the Commission took into consideration local governance reform for the other two urban ridings, it is appropriate to also adjust this riding to reflect the territorial limits for Saint John, Rothesay and Quispamsis that will be effective on January 1, 2023.

The population of the current riding of Saint John—Rothesay is 5.72% above the provincial electoral quota, while the population of New Brunswick Southwest is 12.61% below the provincial quota. The Proposal results in populations for both Saint John—Kennebecasis and Saint John—St. Croix that are above the provincial quota. Furthermore, the final redistribution results in the three southern ridings having deviations that are within 6% of the provincial average: Fundy Royal will stand at 5.17% below the provincial electoral quota, while Saint John—St. Croix and Saint John—Kennebecasis will stand at 3.39% and 5.64%, respectively, above the quota.

The proposed changes have the added benefit of resulting in a more manageable geographical size for the riding of Saint John—St. Croix, acknowledging that Charlotte County has residents living on at least three islands, a situation that presents unique travel and representation challenges.

Both the urban and the rural populations of Saint John—St. Croix are significant. Therefore, the elected representative will have to attend to the interests of both, and the Commission is satisfied that neither the urban nor the rural voices will be lost.

Having regard to its particular facts, the statutory criteria, the population numbers and the available alternatives for creating an electoral map for the province, the Commission remains of the view that the changes proposed for these two ridings provide effective representation for the population of Saint John and, overall, better representation for New Brunswickers. Redistribution is directed at ensuring fair federal representation for all citizens, not at creating preferred electoral districts for some.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Saint John—Kennebecasis as proposed, subject to adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Saint John, Rothesay and Quispamsis.

Saint John—St. Croix

The Commission proposed to transfer from the current riding of New Brunswick Southwest to the proposed district of Tobique—Mactaquac the villages of Harvey and McAdam; the parishes of Dumfries, Kingsclear, McAdam, Manners Sutton and Prince William; most of the rural community of Hanwell; and the Kingsclear Indian Reserve No. 6. It also proposed the addition of the parish of Burton and that part of the city of Saint John that lies west of the Saint John River and Saint John Harbour.

The transfer of west Saint John to this riding was dealt with in the previous section. The other proposed boundary changes were well accepted, except that the community of McAdam asked to be kept in the riding to be renamed Saint John—St. Croix instead of relocated to Tobique—Mactaquac along with the other communities from York County. The present section will explain why the Commission accepted this request.

At the public hearing in Woodstock, the participants were apprised of the request received from McAdam. They told the Commission that although it was no surprise that McAdam would want to be assigned to the proposed district of Saint John—St. Croix, they would prefer that the communities of McAdam and Harvey remain together in the proposed district of Tobique—Mactaquac. They noted that McAdam was in York County rather than Charlotte County. While community of interest was argued, it was acknowledged that the matter could be argued both ways.

Leaders from Charlotte County wrote to the Commission, and some appeared before it in Saint Andrews or during the virtual public hearing, to argue that the community of McAdam should be part of Saint John—St. Croix. They included the Member of Parliament for New Brunswick Southwest, the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Saint Croix, the Mayor of McAdam (who is also the Chair of the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission), the Mayor of Saint Andrews, the Deputy Mayor of McAdam and a former principal of the McAdam Elementary School.

The different participants made similar arguments, including the following:

- Economically and culturally, the interests of McAdam are twinned with communities near the St. Croix River (St. Stephen, Saint Andrews, Blacks Harbour, St. George, Grand Manan, Campobello). McAdam is the starting point for the St. Croix River; therefore, it would be appropriate that it be included in a riding that contains St. Croix in its name.
- McAdam is included in the provincial riding of Saint Croix. The Member of the Legislative Assembly for Saint Croix asked that McAdam be included in Saint John—St. Croix, the federal riding where all other communities from her provincial riding are situated.
- Although McAdam is in York County, its local economy is closely linked to the communities in Charlotte County. Residents of McAdam travel regularly to Charlotte County, most often St. Stephen, for their goods and services. Both the Member of Parliament and the Member of the Legislative Assembly have offices in St. Stephen, which is a 50-minute drive from McAdam. The *Saint Croix Courier* (a local newspaper) covers stories from across Charlotte County and McAdam. The historic McAdam Railway Station is linked to other tourist attractions found in Charlotte County.
- Although the Port of Saint John is located in the city of Saint John, the primary rail network (with direct access to the port) runs through McAdam, and significant economic ties are growing among McAdam, Charlotte County and the Port of Saint John because of the railway industry.
- McAdam is the only community that is part of the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission, which is not included in the proposed electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix.

- The Village of McAdam passed a resolution on August 2, 2022, asking that McAdam be included in the proposed electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix.
- The Town of Saint Andrews asked that McAdam be kept in the same riding as it.

The community of McAdam has a population of approximately 1,200. Therefore, with the addition of McAdam, the population for Saint John—St. Croix would increase from 1.81% to 3.39% above the electoral quota.

The Commission is satisfied that the community of McAdam (including the village and the parish) has more in common with the communities in Charlotte County than it does with those in Tobique—Mactaquac and considers it appropriate that the community of McAdam be located in the electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix as proposed, subject to the addition of the community of McAdam and the adjustments made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Saint John, Fredericton, and Oromocto.

Tobique—Mactaquac

The Commission proposed to transfer, from Tobique—Mactaquac to Madawaska—Restigouche, the parish of Grand Falls, the town of Grand Falls, the parish of Drummond, the village of Drummond and the rural community of Saint-André. It also proposed to transfer to Fredericton—Oromocto all parts that were within the proposed new limits of Fredericton. To increase the population of Tobique—Mactaquac, the Commission proposed to extend the southwesterly boundary of the district to include the villages of Harvey and McAdam; the parishes of Dumfries, Kingsclear, McAdam, Manners Sutton and Prince William; most of the rural community of Hanwell; and the Kingsclear Indian Reserve No. 6, all of which are in the current district of New Brunswick Southwest.

At the public hearing in Woodstock, several leaders from the area were heard, including the Member of Parliament for Tobique—Mactaquac, the Mayor of Canterbury, the President of the Tobique—Mactaquac Conservative Electoral District Association and two former members of the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly.

They generally agreed with the Proposal. The only request for change heard at the hearing concerned the community of Four Falls. In the section discussing the riding of Madawaska—Restigouche, the Commission explained why it accepted to keep Four Falls in Tobique—Mactaquac, as requested. The only other change to the Proposal is the removal of the community of McAdam, which was explained when discussing the proposed district of Saint John—St. Croix.

The community of McAdam has a population of approximately 1,200 and the community of Four Falls approximately 500. As per the Proposal, the electoral district of Tobique—Mactaquac had a population of 64,664 and was 16.63% below the provincial quota. These changes will result in a net decrease in the population of Tobique—Mactaquac. With all adjustments made, Tobique—Mactaquac will have a population of 64,088 and a variance of -17.37%.

The Commission adopts the electoral district of Tobique—Mactaquac as proposed, subject to the following changes: the community of Four Falls will be located in the reconfigured riding of Tobique—Mactaquac; the community of McAdam will be situated in the new riding of Saint John—St. Croix; and adjustments will be made to the boundaries of this riding to reflect the territorial limits that will be effective on January 1, 2023, for Fredericton.


Conclusion

This report is largely the result of the efforts of those New Brunswickers who participated in the public hearings or who contributed written submissions to the Commission before and after the publication of its Proposal. The Commission wishes to pay tribute to these citizens and elected officials who made the effort and took the time to provide advice. This advice made the Commission more aware of perceived problems and local issues. It was a democratic process that measurably aided the Commission in its deliberations. The Commission is satisfied that it has balanced its statutory obligations with the views of the people of New Brunswick in striving for the goal of effective representation for all citizens of the province.


Dated at Edmundston, New Brunswick, this 28th day of November, 2022.



The Honourable Madam Justice Lucie A. LaVigne, Chair



The Honourable Thomas Riordon, Deputy Chair



Dr. Condé Grondin, Member

Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick

Appendix – Maps, Boundaries and Names of Electoral Districts

There shall be in the Province of New Brunswick ten (10) electoral districts, named and described as follows, each of which shall return one member.

The following definitions apply to all the descriptions contained in this publication:

(a) reference to a "county" or "parish" signifies a "county" or "parish" as named and described in the *Territorial Divisions Act*, Chapter T-3 of the *Revised Statutes of New Brunswick*, 1973;

(b) reference to a municipality such as a "city," "town" or "village" signifies a "city," "town" or "village" as named and described in the *Municipalities Order – Municipalities Act*, New Brunswick Regulation 85-6;

(c) reference to an "Indian reserve" signifies a "reserve" as defined in the *Indian Act*, Chapter I-5 of the *Revised Statutes of Canada*, 1985;

(d) 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 bounded on the first day of January, 2021, unless otherwise stated;

(e) specific exceptions are used for the limits that will be in effect as of the first day of January, 2023, for the cities of Fredericton, Moncton and Saint John and the towns of Oromocto, Rothesay and Quispamsis and the limits for those areas are described in the *Local Governance Act*, New Brunswick Regulation 2022-50, filed on August 3, 2022;

(f) all counties, parishes, cities, towns, villages, rural communities and Indian reserves lying within the perimeter of the electoral district are included unless otherwise described;

(g) all First Nation territories lying within the perimeter of the electoral district are included unless otherwise described;

(h) reference to "highway," "drive," "road," "boulevard," "avenue," "river," "brook" and "creek" signifies their centre line unless otherwise described;

(i) all offshore islands are included in the landward district unless otherwise described;

(j) the translation of the term "street" follows Treasury Board standards, while the translation of all other public thoroughfare designations is based on commonly used terms but has no official recognition; and

(k) all coordinates are in reference to the North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83).

The population figure of each electoral district is derived from the 2021 decennial census.

Acadie—Bathurst

(Population: 79,581)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

- (a) the County of Gloucester;
- (b) that part of the County of Restigouche comprising:
 - (i) that part of the Village of Belledune lying within said county;
 - (ii) that part of said county lying northerly and easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southernmost intersection of the easterly limit of said county and the boundary of the Jacquet River Gorge Protected Natural Area; thence generally westerly and generally northeasterly along the boundary of said protected natural area to the southerly limit of the Village of Belledune; and
- (c) that part of the County of Northumberland comprising that part of the Regional Municipality of Tracadie lying within said county.

Beauséjour

(Population: 88,591)

(Maps 1 and 2)

Consists of:

- (a) that part of the County of Kent comprising:
 - (i) the towns of Bouctouche and Richibucto;
 - (ii) the villages of Rexton, Saint-Antoine and Saint-Louis de Kent;
 - (iii) the parishes of Dundas, Richibucto, Saint-Charles, Saint-Louis, Saint Mary, Saint-Paul and Wellington;
 - (iv) the Rural Community of Cocagne;
 - (v) Buctouche Indian Reserve No. 16 and Indian Island Indian Reserve No. 28; and
- (b) the County of Westmorland, excepting:
 - (i) the City of Moncton;
 - (ii) that part of the City of Dieppe described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Dieppe Boulevard; thence southerly along said boulevard to Champlain Street; thence westerly along said street to Pascal Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Gauvin Road; thence westerly along said road to Thomas Street; thence generally southerly along said street and Centrale Street to

Melanson Road; thence westerly along said road and its production to the westerly limit of said city; thence northwesterly and easterly along the limits of said city to the point of commencement;

- (iii) the villages of Petitcodiac and Salisbury;
- (iv) the Parish of Salisbury;
- (v) that part of the Parish of Moncton lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said parish and Highway 126; thence generally southeasterly along said highway to Homestead Road; thence northeasterly along said road to the westerly limit of the City of Moncton;
- (vi) Soegao Indian Reserve No. 35.

Fredericton—Oromocto

(Population: 85,389)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

- (a) the City of Fredericton;
- (b) the Town of Oromocto;
- (c) the Village of New Maryland;
- (d) that part of the Rural Community of Hanwell lying easterly of Highway 8 and northeasterly of Highway 2 (Trans-Canada Highway); and
- (e) Devon Indian Reserve No. 30, Oromocto Indian Reserve No. 26 and St. Mary's Indian Reserve No. 24.

Fundy Royal

(Population: 73,554)

(Maps 1 and 2)

Consists of:

- (a) the County of Albert;
- (b) the County of Kings, excepting:
 - (i) the towns of Grand Bay-Westfield, Quispamsis and Rothesay;
 - (ii) the parishes of Greenwich, Kars, Springfield and Studholm;

- (iii) that part of the Parish of Westfield lying northerly and westerly of the Saint John River;
- (c) that part of the County of Queens comprising the Parish of Brunswick;
- (d) that part of the County of Saint John excepting:
 - (i) the City of Saint John;
 - (ii) that part of the Town of Rothesay lying within said county;
 - (iii) the Parish of Musquash;
 - (iv) that part of the Parish of Simonds lying southwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Old Black River Road and the easterly limit of the City of Saint John (that is to say, the Mispec River); thence generally southeasterly and easterly along said road to West Beach Road; thence southerly along said road to latitude 45°13'44"N; thence southerly in a straight line to a point in the Bay of Fundy lying at approximate latitude 45°12'31"N and longitude 65°50'39"W;
 - (v) The Brothers Indian Reserve No. 18; and
- (e) that part of the County of Westmorland comprising:
 - (i) the villages of Petitcodiac and Salisbury;
 - (ii) the Parish of Salisbury;
 - (iii) that part of the Parish of Moncton lying westerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said parish and Highway 126; thence generally southeasterly along said highway to Homestead Road; thence northeasterly along said road to the westerly limit of the City of Moncton; thence generally southeasterly, generally southwesterly and southerly along said limit to the Petitcodiac River;
 - (iv) Soegao Indian Reserve No. 35.

Madawaska—Restigouche

(Population: 70,597)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

- (a) the County of Madawaska;
- (b) the County of Restigouche, excepting:
 - (i) that part of the Village of Belledune lying within said county;
 - (ii) that part of said county lying northerly and easterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the southernmost intersection of the easterly limit of said county and the boundary of the Jacquet River Gorge Protected Natural Area; thence generally westerly

and generally northeasterly along the boundary of said protected natural area to the southerly limit of the Village of Belledune;

(c) that part of the County of Victoria comprising:

- (i) that part of the Town of Grand Falls lying within said county;
- (ii) the Village of Drummond;
- (iii) the Parish of Drummond;
- (iv) that part of the Parish of Grand Falls lying northerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said parish and Highway 375; thence generally easterly along said highway to Highway 130; thence southerly along said highway to Limestone Siding Road; thence generally easterly and northeasterly along said road to West River Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Brooks Bridge Road; thence easterly along said road to the easterly limit of said parish; and

(d) that part of the County of Northumberland comprising:

- (i) that part of Mount Carleton Provincial Park lying within said county;
- (ii) Nepisiguit Protected Natural Area.

Miramichi—Grand Lake

(Population: 59,725)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

(a) the County of Northumberland, excepting:

- (i) that part of Mount Carleton Provincial Park lying within said county;
- (ii) Nepisiguit Protected Natural Area;
- (iii) that part of the Regional Municipality of Tracadie lying within said county;

(b) that part of the County of Kent comprising:

- (i) the parishes of Acadieville, Carleton, Harcourt, Huskisson and Weldford;
- (ii) that part of the Village of Rogersville lying within said county;
- (iii) Richibucto Indian Reserve No. 15;

(c) that part of the County of Queens comprising:

- (i) the Village of Chipman;
- (ii) that part of the Village of Minto lying within said county;
- (iii) the parishes of Canning, Chipman and Waterborough;

(d) that part of the County of Sunbury comprising:

- (i) that part of the Village of Minto lying within said county;
- (ii) the parishes of Maugerville, Northfield and Sheffield; and

(e) that part of the County of York comprising that part of the Rural Community of Upper Miramichi lying within said county.

Moncton—Dieppe

(Population: 91,961)
(Map 2)

Consists of:

(a) the City of Moncton;

(b) that part of the City of Dieppe described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the northerly limit of said city and Dieppe Boulevard; thence southerly along said boulevard to Champlain Street; thence westerly along said street to Pascal Avenue; thence southerly along said avenue to Gauvin Road; thence westerly along said road to Thomas Street; thence generally southerly along said street and Centrale Street to Melanson Road; thence westerly along said road and its production to the westerly limit of said city; thence northwesterly and easterly along the limits of said city to the point of commencement; and

(c) the Metepenagiag urban reserves No. 3 and No. 8.

Saint John—Kennebecasis

(Population: 81,932)
(Maps 1 and 3)

Consists of:

(a) that part of the City of Saint John lying easterly of the Saint John River and Saint John Harbour;

(b) the towns of Quispamsis and Rothesay;

(c) that part of the Parish of Simonds lying southwesterly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of Old Black River Road and the easterly limit of the City of Saint John (that is to say, the Mispec River); thence generally southeasterly and easterly along said road to West Beach Road; thence southerly along said road to latitude 45°13'44"N; thence southerly in a straight line to a point in the Bay of Fundy at approximate latitude 45°12'31"N and longitude 65°50'39"W; and

(d) The Brothers Indian Reserve No. 18.

Saint John—St. Croix

(Population: 80,192)

(Maps 1 and 3)

Consists of:

(a) the County of Charlotte;

(b) that part of the County of Kings comprising:

- (i) the Town of Grand Bay-Westfield;
- (ii) the parishes of Greenwich, Kars, Springfield and Studholm;
- (iii) that part of the Parish of Westfield lying northerly and westerly of the Saint John River;

(c) that part of the County of Queens comprising:

- (i) the villages of Cambridge-Narrows and Gagetown;
- (ii) the parishes of Cambridge, Gagetown, Hampstead, Johnston, Petersville and Wickham;

(d) that part of the County of Saint John comprising:

- (i) that part of the City of Saint John lying west of the Saint John River and Saint John Harbour;
- (ii) the Parish of Musquash;

(e) that part of the County of Sunbury comprising:

- (i) the villages of Fredericton Junction and Tracy;
- (ii) the parishes of Blissville and Gladstone;
- (iii) the Parish of Burton, excepting that part of the Town of Oromocto lying within;
- (iv) the Parish of Lincoln, excepting that part of the City of Fredericton and that part of the Town of Oromocto lying within; and

(f) that part of the County of York comprising:

- (i) the Village of McAdam;
- (ii) the parishes of McAdam and New Maryland.

Tobique—Mactaquac

(Population: 64,088)

(Map 1)

Consists of:

(a) the County of Carleton;

(b) that part of the County of Victoria comprising:

- (i) the villages of Aroostook, Perth-Andover and Plaster Rock;
- (ii) the parishes of Andover, Denmark, Gordon, Lorne and Perth;
- (iii) that part of the Parish of Grand Falls lying southerly of a line described as follows: commencing at the intersection of the westerly limit of said parish and Highway 375; thence generally easterly along said highway to Highway 130; thence southerly along said highway to Limestone Siding Road; thence generally easterly and northeasterly along said road to West River Road; thence northeasterly along said road to Brooks Bridge Road; thence easterly along said road to the easterly limit of said parish;
- (iv) Tobique Indian Reserve No. 20; and


(c) the County of York, excepting:

- (i) that part of the City of Fredericton lying within said county;
- (ii) the villages of McAdam and New Maryland;
- (iii) the parishes of McAdam and New Maryland;
- (iv) that part of the Rural Community of Hanwell lying easterly of Highway 8 and northeasterly of Highway 2 (Trans-Canada Highway);
- (v) that part of the Rural Community of Upper Miramichi lying within said county;
- (vi) Devon Indian Reserve No. 30 and St. Mary's Indian Reserve No. 24.


Province of New Brunswick



Cities of Dieppe and Moncton and Town of Riverview



City of Saint John





Addendum to the Report

Disposition of Objection

(April 14, 2023)

Overview

The Report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick (the Report) was tabled in the House of Commons and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on November 30, 2022. By the end of the 30-day period, the clerk of the Committee had received one objection. The objection is outlined in the Twenty-Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, 44th Parliament, 1st Session, which was transmitted to the Commission by the Chief Electoral Officer on March 23, 2023. The prescribed period for the consideration and disposition of the objection by the Commission is 30 days, ending on April 22, 2023.

The objection pertains solely to the name of a reconfigured electoral district which the Commission named Saint John—St. Croix as a replacement for the name of an existing district known as New Brunswick Southwest. Mr. John Williamson, Member of Parliament for New Brunswick Southwest, objected to the name chosen by the Commission and proposed that the reconfigured district continue to be called New Brunswick Southwest. The Standing Committee supported the objection and recommended that the Commission consider it favourably.

The Commission appreciates the input and has re-examined its Report in light of Mr. Williamson's objection as well as the minutes of proceedings, evidence and report of the Standing Committee. The Commission recognizes the valuable information elected representatives contribute to the redistribution process, and appreciates the effort and thoroughness demonstrated in the submissions received. The Commission is an independent body and is therefore not bound by the representations.

The Commission met on March 27, 2023, and carefully considered the objection submitted to it as well as the Standing Committee's recommendation but dismissed the request for a name change. The following reasons explain the Commission's decision.

The Commission's Reasons

The Commission readjusted the electoral boundaries of the current electoral district of New Brunswick Southwest. In its Proposal, the Commission proposed to transfer several communities from the current electoral district of New Brunswick Southwest to the proposed district of Tobique—Mactaquac, and to add to the riding the parish of Burton and that part of the City of Saint John that lies west of the Saint John River and Saint John Harbour. Approximately 19,000 people who reside in the City of Saint John are now part of the reconfigured district. They represent approximately 24% of the population of Saint John—St. Croix. The Commission suggested that the new electoral district be renamed Saint John—St. Croix for the reasons stated in the Proposal, which are still relevant.

The Commission published its Proposal on June 16, 2022. It then consulted the public. There was very little indication that the community objected to the new name being proposed. During the consultation, the Commission received only two comments concerning the suggested new name of Saint John—St. Croix. One was a one-line written comment from a citizen who asked: “Why change a district identity if it didn’t really change that much?” The only other comment came from Mr. Williamson.

In its Report dated November 28, 2022, the Commission adopted the name and the boundaries of the electoral district of Saint John—St. Croix as proposed, except that the community of McAdam remained in the riding instead of being transferred to Tobique—Mactaquac as originally proposed. The fact that McAdam is a starting point for the St. Croix River further justifies keeping the name Saint John—St. Croix. Having considered the arguments advanced by Mr. Williamson during the public hearings, the Commission remained convinced that Saint John—St. Croix was the better name.

Before the Standing Committee, Mr. Williamson acknowledged that the names St. Croix and Saint John were historically significant. He explained that the St. Croix River is the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and Saint John is the name of our country’s first incorporated city. However, Mr. Williamson does not believe the new name adequately reflects the whole of the new riding as certain communities do not lie near the St. Croix River, nor are they part of the City of Saint John. He stated that the name New Brunswick Southwest is a more appropriate name because in his view, it continues to properly reflect the new riding much more precisely.

He noted that the citizens living in the current riding of New Brunswick Southwest have a historical connection to the name, as the riding has borne that name almost continuously since 1997.

Mr. Williamson worries that some people will mispronounce the name Saint John—St. Croix, in that they will pronounce it “Saint John—St. Croix” instead of “Saint John—St. Croy,” which he argues is the correct pronunciation. He claims that if it is pronounced “Saint John—St. Croix,” this will create confusion about its geographic location in Canada. We agree that some will pronounce the name “Saint John—St. Croix,” while others will pronounce it “Saint John—St. Croy.” However, we do not share Mr. Williamson’s concern.

Mr. Williamson indicated to the Standing Committee that he had spoken with a number of mayors and councillors about the riding’s name and that broad agreement existed that New Brunswick Southwest should continue to be used. Some leaders of the community of Saint John—St. Croix, including two mayors and two councillors, were present at the public hearings. The Commission specifically asked one councillor, present in Saint Andrews, if he had any comments on the proposed name of Saint John—St. Croix. He indicated that he did not see an issue with the name at that point. During the public hearings, no one other than Mr. Williamson objected to the new name proposed by the Commission for the reconfigured district.

When choosing a name, various factors are considered, such as culture, geography, history and other identifying characteristics of the electoral district. New Brunswick Southwest is a name representative of geographical location only. Furthermore, the reconfigured district of Saint John—St. Croix is not entirely situated in the southwestern quadrant of New Brunswick. Some municipalities are in the southeastern quadrant. And technically, most—if not all—of the electoral district of Fredericton—Oromocto, as well as parts of Tobique—Mactaquac and Miramichi—Grand Lake, are also situated in the southwestern quadrant of the province.

Even if it does not capture all the communities included in the riding, or if sections of the riding are beyond the usually understood area comprising the prominent characteristics for which it is named, the name of a district can still be a good choice. A riding comprising two unique geographical names united by a dash is normally a good choice, as are names of important historical places and natural features.

The St. Croix River is a prominent natural feature of the electoral district and forms part of its western boundary. The new name also reflects the fact that part of the City of Saint John was added to the reconfigured district. Mr. Williamson stated that, while there were a few communities in this district with a population of approximately 6,000, most communities have fewer than 2,000 people. With the new electoral boundaries, the riding of Saint John—St. Croix now has a population of 80,192 people, approximately 19,000 of whom reside in the City of Saint John.

Since New Brunswick is an officially bilingual province, the fact that the new name does not require translation is a bonus. The name of Saint John—St. Croix, as well as the names of all other federal ridings in New Brunswick, remain the same in both official languages without the need for translation. The use of Cardinal points requires translation between official languages. Therefore, whenever it is necessary to use the name in both official languages, such as a map, sign or logo, the name becomes “New Brunswick Southwest/Nouveau-Brunswick-Sud-Ouest.” It is a cumbersome name. As far as we can tell, having federal riding names that do not require translation has been the norm in New Brunswick since Confederation. New Brunswick Southwest/Nouveau-Brunswick-Sud-Ouest is the exception.

The name New Brunswick Southwest came into existence not as a result of a name given by a commission, as required by the *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*, but through legislation. It was changed by legislation in 1997 from Charlotte to New Brunswick Southwest and again by legislation in 2004 when the new name of St. Croix—Belleisle, chosen by the commission, was changed back to New Brunswick Southwest.

Most arguments made by Mr. Williamson before the Standing Committee were also made by him before the Commission during the public hearings. The Commission considered them before issuing its Report.

However, there was no evidence before us that anyone from the community, other than Mr. Williamson and the other citizen previously mentioned, objected to the new name. In the circumstances, it may well be unfair to now change the name from Saint John—St. Croix to New Brunswick Southwest without any opportunity for public consultation and input from the community.


The Commission continues to view Saint John—St. Croix as the preferable identifier for this reconfigured district.

Conclusion


The objection is dismissed. The name of Saint John—St. Croix will remain for this electoral district. The Commission's Report dated November 28, 2022, is unaltered. This completes the work of the Commission.

We wish to express our pride in having been able to contribute, to the best of our abilities, to a process that is so crucial for a sound democratic system.


Dated at Edmundston, New Brunswick, this 14th day of April, 2023.



The Honourable Madam Justice Lucie A. LaVigne, Chair



The Honourable Thomas Riordon, Deputy Chair



Dr. Condé Grondin, Member

Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of New Brunswick