

Redistribution

[Editor's note: The tables referred to above are as follows:]

Summary of Population Figures under Revision Proposed by R. A. Bell—1961 Census and 1964 Estimate		
	1961 Census	1964 Estimate
Renfrew-Lanark		
Commission Proposal	55,418	55,671
—Fitzroy, Torbolton, Huntley, March	5,731	5,740
	49,687	49,931
+Smiths Falls and Montague	14,257	11,887
R. A. Bell Proposal:	63,944	61,818
Leeds		
Commission Proposal	62,656	59,033
—Smiths Falls and Montague	14,257	11,887
	48,399	47,146
+Augusta, Prescott	10,281	10,288
	58,680	57,434
+Edwardsburg, Cardinal	5,590	5,611
R. A. Bell Proposal:	64,270	63,045
Stormont-Dundas		
Commission Proposal	68,233	67,980
—Winchester Township, Win- chester Village, Chesterville	5,546	5,673
	62,687	62,307
+Matilda and Iroquois	4,253	4,262
R. A. Bell Proposal:	66,940	66,569
Grenville-Carleton		
Commission Proposal	63,715	79,694
—Augusta, Prescott	10,281	10,288
	53,434	69,406
—Edwardsburg, Cardinal	5,590	5,611
	47,844	63,795
—Matilda, Iroquois	4,253	4,262
	43,591	59,533
+Fitzroy, Torbolton, Huntley & March	5,731	5,740
	49,322	65,273
+Winchester Township & Village and Chesterville	5,546	5,673
	54,868	70,946
+Ottawa (not included by Commission)	235	371
	55,103	71,317
Net Changes in Population of Ridings between Commission Proposals and R. A. Bell Proposals		
	1961	1964
Renfrew-Lanark	+8,526	+6,147
Leeds	+1,614	+4,012
Stormont-Dundas	-1,293	-1,411
Grenville-Carleton	-8,847	-8,748

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): As indicated in the notice of objections, the electoral district I propose would be known as Carleton-Grenville-Dundas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a basic problem with the riding of Grenville-Carleton as proposed by the commission is that it could have no permanence. As I have submitted, every effort should be made to create a relative permanence from one redistribution to the next. I say to you, it is bad for parliament; it is discouraging to members and to prospective candidates; it destroys public interest; to have revolutionary changes every ten years. Every effort should be made to obviate it.

The proposed Grenville-Carleton riding, for example, has no cohesion, no mutuality of social and economic interest between the St. Lawrence front and the Ottawa valley area. On the St. Lawrence, the patterns of trade run east and west, not north and south. This redistribution runs directly counter to all historical patterns.

• (7:20 p.m.)

I have not dealt with the redistribution of the Ottawa ridings because frankly it is beyond me, as one individual, to complete the necessary research. To prepare statistics for the Ottawa ridings such as I have given the commission, and the summary of which are placed on the record, for Grenville-Carleton would take many days of research in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and in the City of Ottawa assessment department. To do this is the responsibility of the commission staff.

These facts only I mention. In my opinion, the proposed Ottawa-Carleton riding should not cross the Rideau river to include Carleton Heights and Courtland Park, torn from the old Carleton riding. These areas simply have no mutuality of interest with the east bank of the Rideau and will turn out to be political orphans. Properly these communities belong with Nepean.

The figures for the proposed Ottawa Centre take no account of the great loss in population in that electoral district due to the expropriation and razing of LeBreton Flats and part of the Preston street area. In the proposed Ottawa West, no account is taken of the development of some of the largest apartment buildings in Canada, with many thousands of new residents. To equalize the population of Ottawa Centre and Ottawa West, certainly it is not necessary to carry the boundary of Ottawa West eastward as far as Bayswater avenue.