

*Electoral Boundaries*

The reason is that there has been some community of interest between Lanark and Renfrew for many years and a community of interest between Carleton and Renfrew. In fact, Lanark, Renfrew and Carleton represent three historic counties in that area which came from the district of Bathurst. Within the boundary of the constituency marked 40 on the map there will be three townships, two towns and three villages of some size within that portion which is part of Renfrew county which will be included in constituency No. 40.

I ask the commission to consider the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton rather than Lanark-Carleton because I believe the people in that portion of Renfrew county are interested in being recognized. I know that subsequently the members may have private members' bills passed to change the names of constituencies with relative ease, but I think it would be better to try to finalize the names now in order to avoid the excess of printing involved in the changing of names on maps, and so on, at a later stage. In dealing with the riding marked 40, I have no further comments to make.

I have spoken to a number of people, especially those in eastern Ontario who, relatively speaking, are quite pleased with the redistribution. I know it is very difficult for a boundaries commission to give effect to redistribution within the guidelines, within the bounds of community of interest and within the parameters of population in respect of the divisions. It is interesting to note that in most areas throughout Ontario the commissioners have tried to respond to the criticisms and comments made at the commission hearings.

Having been chairman of the Conservative caucus for the province of Ontario, and having had to keep an eye on many of the areas in which people were interested, it would seem to me that the commission has given effect to the various concerns expressed by the municipalities and by the sitting member from whatever party, as much as it was possible to do so within the concept of community of interest within the population. Nothing is perfect in this world. There are a number of small technical errors. Some people would like to bring up some points.

I should like to mention the position I take in giving an over view on the province of Ontario. One thing that concerns me happens to deal with the constituency of Sault Ste. Marie. It has been drawn to my attention that there is a division of people within Sault Ste. Marie noted as No. 70 on the map, known as the constituency of Algoma. I have here a letter which I should like to read into the record. It is from the provincial member for Sault Ste. Marie who directs his attention to the fact that part of the city would be split in a set-off against the large rural riding of Algoma. Ward 1 on the map now before us of Sault Ste. Marie, which would be called Algoma ward 1, is the area of Sault Ste. Marie which has the highest density and greatest number of residential streets. This is the area in which 10,000 or 11,000 of the people of Sault Ste. Marie live. The letter reads:

Dear Mr. Dick:

As a member of parliament from Ontario, you no doubt are concerned about any matters that would have an adverse effect on the province and it is with this in mind that I bring the following to your attention.

[Mr. Dick.]

It is my understanding that the Electoral Boundaries Commission has recommended part of the City of Sault Ste. Marie be removed from the federal riding as it is now constituted and transferred to Algoma riding.

This in effect would remove 11,000 city residents from Sault Ste. Marie's federal election rolls, an action which I feel would be highly regrettable due to the urban nature of the riding.

I would point out that consideration was given to a similar proposal prior to the recent redistribution of provincial ridings but it was decided that it would be a serious error to tamper with the close urban ties this portion of the riding has with the rest of Sault Ste. Marie.

● (1810)

Even though this is a federal matter, I have received numerous complaints from people within this portion of the riding and this has prompted me to solicit your support when the matter comes up for debate in the House.

Your assistance in this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

John R. Rhodes

He is the MPP for the area. To give more effect to this, I would like to read into the record a copy of the resolution passed by the council of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie on March 22, 1976. It was moved by Alderman F. Manzo, seconded by Alderman R. Collins. It reads:

Whereas a report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission tabled in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27, 1976, would split and decrease the Sault riding by 11,000 voters; Therefore be it resolved that city council go on record as being opposed on the grounds that they are basically different ridings by nature, Algoma being rural and the Sault being predominantly industrial and that this resolution be forwarded to the relevant federal ministry as well as to Cyril Symes, MP, Dr. Maurice Foster, MP, John R. Rhodes, MPP, and Bud Wildman, MPP; and, further, that this city council go on record as opposing the elimination of the complete Cochrane riding.

I received a copy of this resolution and I read it for the record. I took it upon myself to talk to a number of people in Sault Ste. Marie about this problem because I wanted to make sure it came before the House. It appears that ward 1 is the area south of the Canadian Pacific railway, east of Churchill Boulevard and west of the city limits where it goes into the Garland River Indian reserve, with a small sliver being north of CP railway, the area goes right down to the Canada-U.S. border.

This is the area about which they were worried, and indeed it was suggested to me that this area is the heart and core of the major bedroom area of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, and if any decision had to be made that a portion of the city should not be included because of the population, that part of the city which would be west of Gooleigh Avenue would perhaps be excluded. I was informed that that is the area which has recently been annexed by the city. A large part of the area is still rural, many of the houses are scattered along the roads and are not tightly held together. It does not have the same community of interest as there is in ward 1, with the present redistribution going to the Algoma riding rather than staying with Sault Ste. Marie. So I want to emphasize that there was some concern. I will read a portion of another letter from a Mr. De Fazio of Sault Ste. Marie which states in part:

I am quite concerned that they are cutting off about one third of our city and putting it in the riding of Algoma East, which is predominantly a rural riding—This is very important to the future of Sault Ste. Marie riding.

Then he expresses a hope that this will not happen. There are another couple of points which I wanted to make