

*Redistribution*

which was added at that time. If that situation had existed in 1931 no such redistribution would have taken place.

On the other hand, the proposed constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare has a population of 45,595, as compared with 41,572, or an increase of 4,000 and a percentage increase of 9.6 per cent. The constituency of Queens-Lunenburg has a population of 45,800 as compared with 42,286, an increase of 3,519 or a percentage increase of 8.3 per cent. You get a spread there between the largest and smallest constituencies, that is the constituency of Digby-Annapolis-Kings which in the redistribution of 1931 was the largest constituency, as it is today, and the constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare, which was the smallest then as it is today. I believe the spread was only 7,875 then, whereas the spread now between those same constituencies is 20,915, or virtually 21,000. When one quotes those figures, Mr. Chairman, one can see why redistribution takes place. It is for the reason that places do not stand still and you get variations in population that we have redistribution. Otherwise, there would be no point in having it at all; and what has the redistribution of 1933 to do with the problems of today?

There was one reference made this morning by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough to which I should like to reply very briefly. I could not clearly hear the statements which were made from where I was sitting, but I caught part of them and I understood there was some reference to the fact that the committee did not agree on Annapolis-Kings being kept independent and unchanged, but that we had agreed on Digby-Annapolis-Kings remaining apparently the same as it was in 1931. Then the hon. member went on to say that I suggested that Queens-Shelburne be added to Lunenburg.

I have a long standing friendship with and a great regard for the present member for Digby-Yarmouth, but notwithstanding that I do not think I would be quite so foolish or shall I say stupid—a word which has apparently come into good usage—that I would have agreed to allow that member to reduce his constituency by adding Digby to Annapolis-Kings and to accept no additional territory at all. In other words, the constituency of Yarmouth would have been smaller after redistribution than it was before. Certainly that was not ever discussed by the committee. I think even to suggest such a thing shows how fallacious that argument is, because at that time of course there was no thought of Digby-Annapolis-Kings. The agreement was on Annapolis-Kings, that it would remain as such,

[Mr. Nowlan.]

but that some redistribution would be made with respect to Queens-Shelburne. Certainly we were not agreeing and no one would think of agreeing that the constituency of Digby-Yarmouth should be even smaller after redistribution than it was before.

I am not going over the figures and arguments that were used yesterday in regard to this matter, but I did want to mention those two matters that had been raised. This morning there was also some suggestion that I had commandeered or drafted someone from outside the province into the debate. I commandeered no one. The only ones from outside of the province who spoke were members of the committee. The member of another party, as well as the member for Royal, sat on the committee and they gave their recollections of what took place in that committee. Yesterday as I recall it, the minister said he was in Nova Scotia at the time and read about this in the press. How could it have gotten into the press, Mr. Chairman, if it did not happen? The press must have been reporting something which had been agreed upon, or which they thought was agreed upon, because I am sure the reporters for that paper—I presume the minister referred to the Halifax paper—are reliable. If a report was carried in that paper on this proposed decision whereby Annapolis-Kings was to be left alone, then that reporter must have had something to base that story upon. He certainly did not get it from me. Apparently after some weeks a change was made in that, but now that is a matter of history; and I simply wanted to refer to those things which were dealt with yesterday.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph 7, Halifax, agreed to.

Paragraph 8, Inverness-Richmond, agreed to.

Paragraph 9, Pictou, agreed to.

Paragraph 10, Queens-Lunenburg, agreed to.

Paragraph 11, Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare, agreed to.

Nova Scotia schedule agreed to.

New Brunswick schedule agreed to.

On the schedules—Prince Edward Island.  
On paragraph 1—Kings.

**Mr. MacLean (Queens):** It is not my intention to detain the house for any great length of time, but there are a few general remarks I should like to make on this item. This schedule provides, of course, as has been the case for a great number of years, for four seats for Prince Edward Island. In some