

I think are unique. But I have never been able to make any headway, I will acknowledge frankly, in the recognition of the problems of rural ridings and the old distinction between urban and rural constituencies. In this sense the chief electoral officer tends to be what I might call a traditionalist. If there is any formula developed, I am sure he would be interested in an urban-rural formula or ratio.

I insist that this is not sophisticated enough, not practical enough, in the Canadian situation. I think I can show it to a degree, not only by reference to my own constituency but to several others. I have insisted for several years that we have four kinds of constituencies in Canada. I think I might label them as urban, suburban, rural and frontier or hinterland. Naturally, since Port Arthur is a hinterland constituency, it interests me the most. There are a number of others like this, and I should like to put on the record the ten largest constituencies in Canada with their present populations. They are Mackenzie River with 527,490 square miles and a population of 14,895; Saguenay with an area of 374,950 square miles and a population of 81,097; Yukon with 207,076 square miles and a population of only 14,628; Churchill with 170,827 square miles and a population of 54,952; Port Arthur, with an area of 148,482 square miles and a population of 87,977. This is the largest in terms of population for these very large constituencies. Then constituency No. 6 is Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, with an area of 125,710 square miles and a population of 82,433. In my view this is probably the most difficult constituency in Canada. Then there is Skeena with an area of 125,641 square miles and a population of 58,740; Cariboo with an area of 120,544 square miles and a population of 82,173; Meadow Lake, with an area of 96,327 square miles and a population of 37,937; Chapleau, with an area of 83,640 square miles and a population of 71,394.

Now I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members that of those ten largest constituencies in area, perhaps those which have shown rather exceptional growth are Saguenay, because of mineral developments there, Port Arthur, Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, again because of mineral developments. Then Cariboo has grown amazingly in the last ten years, and the Peace River constituency has shown considerable growth. I add that one, and it is No. 11 in size.

The traditionalists argue that rural areas—it seems to me the Prime Minister was being a traditionalist last night—deserve what is in effect better representation. Well, we have so many anomalies. What is the difference

between Port Arthur and Fort William in terms of background? Yet a voter in Fort William has just about twice as much effect as a voter in Port Arthur in terms of the relationship to population. We have a situation where my hon. friend from Timmins is right in the centre of a group of huge constituencies. I kid him about it and say he has a little pocket borough that he can drive around in an hour. It is very small and has a population of about 25,000. Then we have an example of a big suburban constituency such as the one the hon. member for York-Scarborough represents. I think we all know something about the problems he has, and these problems are shared by the hon. member for York Centre and the hon. member for York West. There is the problem of tremendous boom development and an inordinate number of people to look after.

Then we look at the other constituencies in Ontario such as Dufferin-Simcoe and Grey-Bruce, which have a population much below the median. Then we run into this argument that they are rural constituencies. I wanted to put on the record the most compact review of this particular point that I have encountered. It is an article written by J. B. McGeachy on redistribution which appeared in the *Financial Post* of August 20, 1960. The article outlines the arguments advanced in favour of these rural constituencies. The arguments advanced are as follows:

1. The farming or food producing interest has a special value to the community and deserves special protection in parliament.
2. The farmers are lusty yeomen, the salt of the earth, splendid fellows, etc., and heaven forbid this superior racial breed should be permitted to die out.

This is the argument I believe Mr. Frost has used in the past.

3. The farmer is less alert and vigorous mentally, less well educated than the city man, more likely to be taken in, hornswoiggled and otherwise put upon. He needs some protection against his natural dumbness.
4. The city man has the press, boards of trade, chambers of commerce and other agencies to speak for him directly to government. The farmer has none of these.

Then Mr. McGeachy has put in brackets:

(Though the farm associations seem to do very well when it comes to extracting subsidies).

5. Many rural ridings are represented by city men whereas the reverse almost never happens. Thus the Toronto area, e.g., really has more m.p.'s than the 17 elected in the greater Toronto seats.

6. There must be a limit to the size of rural constituencies. A city man who represents only ten square miles can walk around it in a day but a rural m.p. may speak for the inhabitants of thousands of square miles.

But this surely means nothing at all in the motor car age—except, of course, in a few vast