

*Electoral Boundaries*

Niagara and Hamilton-Wentworth which in terms of historic social, service and general interest are diverse and represent and reflect very different community ties and concerns. That is what the hon. member for Lincoln said, and I agree with him fully. He was supported in that by the man who ran against him in the last election and who preceded him in this House. He was supported in that by the town of Grimsby which also supported my submission at the hearings in Welland. I might mention that at Welland the constituency of Hamilton Wentworth was represented by three people. It is interesting to note who they are. One is Iain Hendry, Q.C., of the town of Ancaster. He is a former chairman of the school board for Wentworth county. He lives at one end of the constituency, 45 miles away. He was supported in those representations by Mrs. Shirley McLeod of Stoney Creek, a housewife, and by David Stempin, a businessman from East Hamilton.

There you have what makes up the constituency of Hamilton Wentworth—those three people of diverse interests from different parts of the constituency saying one thing, that they belong in Hamilton-Wentworth, that they have no community of interest in Lincoln, that they are not wanted there, and that they are quite happy to remain in Hamilton-Wentworth. The commission not only has seen fit to ignore those representations but has not given us good and sufficient reasons for doing so.

At the hearings in Toronto, of his own volition Mr. Jim Ridge, another past chairman of the Wentworth county school board, a lifelong resident from the rural part of the constituency, went before the hearing and said that he, too, wanted to remain in Hamilton-Wentworth. These people were supported, as I said, not only by Liberals and Conservatives and not only by representatives of civic government and regional municipalities, but by literally hundreds of individual citizens who took the time and the trouble to make individual submissions by way of the Stoney Creek News. We have had no accurate reply or adequate response concerning why those feelings of individual citizens were suddenly thrust aside. I think of a couple of examples. One is the Winona men's club. On February 5 of this year they wrote to me as follows:

Last night, at a meeting of the Winona men's club, we circulated the attached petition concerning the proposed change in federal electoral boundaries in Stoney Creek. All the members present at the meeting who live in the municipality of Stoney Creek signed the petition regardless of political party affiliations. It was unanimously felt that the municipality of Stoney Creek has traditionally been an integral part of the Hamilton-Wentworth region in all respects, and would be completely lost as a small section of the region of Niagara.

Then in a postscript they wrote:

You will note a few ladies names on the first page. These names were obtained last Sunday at the morning service at the Fifty United Church.

I also received a letter from the Reverend and Mrs. R. Matejka on behalf of the Lutheran Church of the Messiah at Stoney Creek. Not only have we the Winona men's club but we have the ladies of the Fifty United Church and the Lutheran Church all together. This is ecumenical; this is the day of liberation! Everybody is of one accord. The commission just puts aside these things and says it has a map and will stick to it. We get stuck with those results. They do not have to live there. It is not their community of interest which has to be represented in parliament. The

[Mr. O'Sullivan.]

people who suffer have voiced their concerns and opinions, and they have the general feeling which I must express on their behalf that their sentiments were not taken into consideration.

I go back to the point I made earlier, that the commission decided not to take into consideration the growth of population as a factor in drawing up the boundaries. That may be convenient. It may be in their terms of reference. Perhaps they have no choice, but if so we must change that because it is an irresponsible way for a commission to draw boundaries when they draw them on the census taken in 1971. These boundaries will come into effect at the next general election which many of us expect will be in 1978. So I asked some of the communities involved to give us their population projections for 1978.

I should like to cite a couple of examples. This year there are 29,281 citizens in Stoney Creek-Saltfleet. By 1978 there will be 40,000 because we have a satellite city being built at this very time in that area. In that part of the city of Hamilton which is to be put into the new riding of Lincoln they are going on the 1971 census which runs roughly at 56,000 people, but the city clerk in Hamilton tells me that they have projected for 1978 a population of 88,884.

The commission in its report says that the riding quotient for Ontario shall be 81,085 people. In that portion of the city of Hamilton alone which they want to put into the riding of Lincoln there will be, in 1978, more than that: there will be 88,884 people. That to me is an abdication of responsibility. They have closed their eyes to the fact that this is one of the most dynamic and fastest growing areas in this province, indeed in this country. They just cannot close their eyes to the cold hard facts that those are not just statistics but that people are involved. That is the point on which I should like to end my remarks.

In making these remarks I want to reiterate that the commission has had a difficult job. I respect the efforts of the commissioners, but I must reject them. Their efforts are unacceptable. I ask them to go back to the drawing board. I ask them to take into consideration something of a general overview. Perhaps to paraphrase Robert Zend, an author and philosopher from the city of Toronto, which may be known to be one of the major suburbs of the city of Hamilton, he said there are too many people and too few human beings. I suggest they should stop worrying and looking upon people as statistics to fit neatly into these things called constituencies.

We have 264 people here who talk about constituencies. The people of Canada do not talk about constituencies; they talk about communities. That is what the commission should be addressing itself to—what is a community? If people as statistics form constituencies that may be legal, it may be technical and it may be very convenient for a commission but it is not taking into account the fact that human beings who individually and collectively form communities are having their lives affected by the decisions taken.

This commission has done its best to date. Its best simply is unacceptable. I ask it to go back to the drawing board, bearing in mind it may have a responsibility to stick to the technical aspects of the act, to worry about statistics and worry about drawing maps and fitting statistics into those maps. But they have a higher responsibility, if the House