

two constituencies. The changes involve a great deal of detail. I suggest that whoever may be in the house at the time of the next and subsequent redistributions should regard representation on redistribution committees from the standpoint of the number of constituencies in a province. I do not believe it is fair that a province such as Ontario, containing one-third of the total membership of the house, should have an opposition membership on the committee of only one.

In view of what has been said by the Prime Minister and other government members since this bill was introduced I believe the redistribution schedule as now recommended is as good as we are likely to obtain, even if we were to spend the next two weeks of the time of the house and a good deal of the country's money in further discussion. Some concessions have been made, and if the schedule is put through as finally passed by the committee, I do not purpose taking up further the time of the committee of the whole house at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the schedule as amended carry?

Mr. SANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like some explanation in regard to schedules 46 and 49. Number 46 is:

Oxford, consisting of the county of Oxford and that part of the town of Tavistock that lies in the county of Oxford.

Then number 49:

Perth, consisting of the county of Perth, excepting therefrom the townships of Fullarton and Hibbert, but including the city of Stratford, the town of Mitchell, and that part of the village of Tavistock that lies in the county of Perth.

In number 46 Tavistock is described as a town and in 49 as a village.

Mr. BENNETT: I noticed that. Which is it, a village or a town?

Mr. SANDERSON: It is a village.

Mr. BENNETT: At the top of page 10 the word "town" should be "village."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the schedule carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not like to allow this schedule to carry without protesting very strongly against what I think is a ghastly gerrymander of the constituency of North York. That constituency as it was framed and kept by the redistribution of Sir Robert Borden of 1914 was a compact rural constituency, essentially rural with important towns and villages. It included the village of

Stouffville. In the redistribution of 1924 two townships in the county of York were added, rural townships, Vaughan and Markham, but leaving the constituency a compact, purely rural constituency. The present redistribution takes out one of the townships which was added in 1924, the township of Markham, but what is more extraordinary it takes out the village of Stouffville which is in the township of Whitchurch, and in so doing makes a considerable jag in the side of the constituency as it has been heretofore. While the whole of Markham township is taken out there is added to the southern part of the constituency the township of North York, a township which reaches down close to the city of Toronto. It makes a constituency that is semi-urban, and certainly it loses the aspect of cohesion and compactness which a constituency of the kind should have.

I cannot believe this change has been made for any reason other than to give a distinct advantage to whoever may be the Conservative candidate. In the election of 1930 Markham township, which is being taken out at the present time, gave a Liberal majority of 248; Stouffville village a majority of 282, and Markham village a Liberal majority of 25, a total Liberal majority of 555. That will all be taken away when the township of Markham and the village of Stouffville are taken out of the constituency. On the other hand North York township is being added, which gave in 1930 a Conservative majority of 615. So if we take the figures of 1930 we shall soon see why the present distorted shape has been given to this old historic riding of North York. The position of the Conservative candidate, whoever he may be, will be bettered in the following way:

Liberal majority lost.. . . . .	555
Conservative majority added.. . . .	615
	1,170
Total gain.. . . . .	1,170

And this notwithstanding that as the riding stood the Conservative candidate had a majority in 1930 of 298. That, I think, indicates very clearly what was in the mind of those who have been urging and who have insisted upon this change. The change is the more regrettable for a reason which I gave the other day, namely, that speaking broadly and generally, rural opinion is too little represented in this parliament in comparison with urban opinion. I think every effort should be made to see that rural constituencies should be as largely as possible distinctively rural. As the Prime Minister mentioned, we have now reached a point where the urban popula-