

*Electoral Boundaries Commissions*

about right at present with 62,000. Kent and Lambton counties at the present time have been adjusted so that the constituency crosses the Lambton-Kent boundary line. However, with some slight adjustment, that is by moving municipalities from one constituency to the other, these two constituencies could be left alone with an average population of 57,000. This comes within the maximum and minimum limits.

Going a little farther north we come to Huron, with a population of 48,000, which is slightly under the minimum. However, by taking a municipality off the north end of Lambton West or whatever is necessary off the north end of Lambton West, which includes the city of Sarnia a well populated area, the average for Lambton West and Huron works out at 63,418, again well within the limits.

Then going north again we run into a problem in the Bruce peninsula. Bruce has 29,000; Grey-Bruce has 36,000; Grey North has 38,000 and Wellington-Huron has 32,000. It is difficult to see how these areas could be adjusted. The only place one finds more population in an adjacent territory is Waterloo North, where that one constituency has a population of 115,579 according to the 1961 census.

I am giving this information to indicate that sweeping changes across these Ontario constituencies are unnecessary if the commission is willing to adopt a practical, non-disruptive program. With the 25 per cent tolerance allowed, these constituencies can be left alone except for very minor adjustments.

**Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to raise relates to the dual constituency matter. I left the chamber before the vote was taken on it in committee the other day, and so did not get a chance to express my objections to it. Now having read the observations of the minister who sponsored the bill I am even more put out about it. Could we have a clearer expression from the minister of what he was talking about? As recorded at page 10064 of *Hansard* for Friday last he said:

Mr. Chairman, obviously I do not want to prolong this debate, but may I say I do not feel I could propose such an amendment. On the other hand, I have one drafted here that is slightly different from the one shown me by the hon. member for Queens, who was good enough to send me the one about which he was thinking. I would think that the one I have here would be preferable if this is going to be done, because the only real difference between the two is that in the one case it just says that the commission "may" and in the other case it says "may if it sees fit to do so".

20220—640½

In view of the queer interpretations sometimes placed on the word "may", if that additional phrase was not included I think there might be a suggestion that parliament's inclination was to have it done. My own inclination is not to have it done.

We are getting very clear here.

I say that quite frankly. I really feel about this matter, and it is going to be very difficult for me to vote. I have been thinking I might do something that I thought only members of the N.D.P. did, sit on my hands, if there is a vote.

The minister has a very short memory if he does not remember the session of 1957-58, when a lot of Liberals sat on their hands until one brave day in January a lion came into the house and then we did get a vote. To continue with the quotation:

I have not made up my mind yet—

Here is the minister who sponsored the bill, and right in the final stage of this very debatable issue he says he has not made up his mind yet.

—but I certainly do not want to influence the judgment of any other member of the committee. Particularly because of the objection reiterated by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I do not feel it is fair to impose upon the commission the making of another decision which in my bones I feel we ought to make ourselves if it is to be made at all. I think it would be very hard for me to vote for this. On the other hand I am rather impressed—

This is about the fifth "on the other hand." —by the argument put forward. I want to reiterate—

This is about the fourth reiteration.

I want to reiterate, however, that these historic constituencies will not survive anyway.

What is the point of all this? If they are not going to survive, why bother?

Halifax county is far too big to be one constituency, so we will not be preserving the historical situation there and probably not in Queens either. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes to do so I think the simplest way would be for him to move his amendment in order to test the committee on it and get the agony over with.

Here is a minister with largeness of spirit. First he is on one side and then he is on the other. He feels things in his bones and is a bit worried about the agony. I want to ask him what he means by saying it is not going to help Halifax anyway, that Halifax cannot survive anyway. Why did he go ahead and let the amendment come to a vote without putting it much more clearly that this was a nonsense amendment in so far as it affects Halifax? Or is it a nonsense amendment in so far as it affects Halifax? How does the minister see it?