

Electoral Boundaries Commission

quite apparent that the changed circumstances have changed his view. His confrere, who spoke about rural tyranny, had nothing much to support that point of view. I do not know whether it was rural tyranny when the farmers of the country supplied grain to Britain under a fixed price agreement initiated by a Liberal government which did not bring them the returns they could have obtained by selling in the world market as did the Americans. On the other hand, industry in this country had cost-plus contracts for defence needs while the farmers provided grain at a fixed price. It has been argued that they lost millions of dollars by doing so; in fact, some say as high as \$600 million. If that is rural tyranny perhaps we should have more of it to help to build up this country and to support the efforts that Canada makes to keep the world free.

I suppose it was rural tyranny that produced the great abundance of wheat which has lifted our economy at the present time. I say that our farmers have played their part in building the country since confederation, will continue to do so and deserve a proper voice in the government of the country. All arguments in favour of representation by population fall flat because, in the case of certain provinces there is a floor so far as representation is concerned below which the number of their members cannot fall.

In view of the great extent of Canada I think a tolerance of 20 per cent by way of variation is completely unreasonable and cannot be argued to be sufficient. I do not think that a larger voice for rural Canada as opposed to representation by population produces tyranny at all. It has not produced it in this house or in government measures in any way, shape or form in the history of the country. When one considers the obligations of those who represent rural areas and the problems they meet in consulting with their constituents, I think the figure of 33½ per cent which we have put forward is very reasonable.

I represent a strictly urban community. The only complaint I have had from these people is that they would like to know when the boundaries are going to be changed so that people whose interests are centered in the city of Regina can vote for a representative or representatives of the city of Regina. I have not tried to find out what the 20 per cent figure might do to my constituency and the whole area of the city of Regina. I have not tried in any way to get prior information, for the sake of argument, with regard to what might have been developed on certain bases, but I do submit that the tolerance of

20 per cent ties the hands of this non-political commission.

I fully agree that the commission should be non-political. I think it is time we had such a commission, but such a figure does not give the commission enough leeway with regard to the situation in Regina where we have a population of 120,000. The city is not large enough for two members and if the figure of 20 per cent is used and Regina is carved up to meet that tolerance the result will be that areas will be taken in that have no relationship at all to the city, and no great interest in the problems that the residents of the city want their representative to deal with.

That is the only representation that has been made to me. The people who live in the burgeoning areas outside the old city boundaries all vote in the constituency of Moose Jaw-Lake Centre, I believe, and they all complain that their voice is therefore not heard so far as the affairs of the city are concerned. It is also passing strange in my opinion that in 1952 the legislature of Saskatchewan, composed wholly of Liberal and C.C.F. members, adopted a resolution unanimously with regard to the situation in Saskatchewan, which was forwarded to a Liberal government in Ottawa and, in the words of the then prime minister, was given attention; but at the present time they have not raised their voices at all. I can only think the reason is that they would like to have fewer than 17 Conservative members from Saskatchewan and they think the only way they can accomplish this is by remaining silent and letting the over-all number of members be reduced.

Mr. Prittie: Would the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. More: I will answer if I have time when I finish. I do not intend to be interrupted now. This is a passing strange situation. I do not speak politically because I do not know whether I would be returned if all of the city of Regina were in one constituency, but I believe that these people have a reasonable claim when they wish to be represented by someone who knows what their interests are.

As I say, it is passing strange that the matter has not been raised in the Saskatchewan legislature. We were only going to lose three seats in 1952 and now we are going to lose four, but nobody in the Saskatchewan legislature is paying any attention whatsoever. There is no move on the part of the federal Liberal government to consider this factor. I think it is evident that the figure has been placed at 20 per cent because both the C.C.F. and the present government believe that their

[Mr. More.]