

Electoral Boundaries

boards, the historical atlases, the maps, the instruments of social communication and social intercourse within the area that was under discussion. That submission was prepared and submitted to the commission by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton and others and it was accepted, not because of its length, but because it was a rational explanation of the way in which the commission had gone wrong, in our respectful submission, and how the criteria of the act, in terms of numbers, could be answered and the other criteria not be ignored, and the important community of interest preserved.

As a result, with the regrets I have expressed personally as to that redistribution, as any person who represents an area must, I believe the best possible job was done by the commission in terms of the ridings that make up the national capital area on the Ontario side of the river and slightly beyond. I know there may be differences of opinion with respect to that, but I hope my colleagues in the House will understand the basis upon which it is made and I would be very happy to show my colleagues, when this debate is completed, the submission to which I referred, which was complete and covered every detail and to which each of us was able to make what I hope was considered to be a constructive comment upon the original proposals for the area.

The northern part around the city has its roots in the old part of Carleton County, and its centre of gravity toward the county seat, now the regional government seat and the seat of the board of education in the area, and all of these things reflect a community of interest which is buttressed by employment factors and locations of places of employment in the area.

All in all, Sir, I believe the best that could be done was done. The wishes of the people, at least as expressed by their representatives in the local area, were answered. Those matters which contribute to that broad field of community of interests were honoured. So this redistribution is a sound one.

There is always a problem with names. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton would, I am sure, like to have his constituency remain with the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton. When one looks at the map and the location of the municipalities which are included in his constituency, one sees that the name "Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton" is still applicable because contained within the boundaries of that constituency is still the Township of March—an historic part of the County of Carleton and one which has produced many fine public men in the municipal field, some of whom became wardens of the county over the years.

It was important in my judgment, and formed part of my submission, that the name "Carleton" be maintained because of its historic significance to the Townships of Goulbourn, a newly constituted Rideau, a newly constituted Osgoode, and Nepean and the portion of Gloucester, all of which formed part of old Carleton County. I think it is self-evident that if Ottawa were to form the base of the names for constituencies within the area of the City of Ottawa, that certainly there was justice and propriety in maintaining the name Nepean, the Township of Nepean, as part of the area which focuses upon, in a geographical sense, the Township of Nepean. This was done.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

There has been a return, regretful from my point of view certainly, at least in my personal feelings, of the County of Grenville, to the historic area known at the municipal level as the united counties of Leeds and Grenville—there has been a return in that way and the area of Dundas has gone in with its historic association with the balance of Dundas into the area now called Stormont-Dundas. I think that is regrettable but there is not much one can do about it on the basis of statistics, strive as I did to try to find an argument to thwart that particular idea. The area known as Carleton, Nepean, Goulbourn, Rideau, Osgoode and part of Gloucester and Long Island now forms a constituency which, in terms of representation, is sound.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that quite often commissioners are criticized for joining rural and urban areas together. It is contended there is not a community of interest. I do not think that is so. I think there is a potential for this to happen but I do not think it necessarily follows. A lot depends on the attitude of those who occupy the political institutions on the municipal level within the areas we are discussing.

If there is a desire for alienation between the rural and the urban area, then I think alienation will take place. But if there is no such desire, but rather a desire the other way, to find a community of interest and to realize that fate and circumstances and redistribution and population growth and a lot of other things throw people together into relationships they would not otherwise have found, then a community of interest can be found. I have found that, Sir. I have found this to be true in terms of Grenville-Carleton, which in terms of north and south is as different as night from day. We managed to develop a community of interest over the course of the years,—my predecessor in this House and I worked hard to do that.

● (2140)

My predecessor has now gone to a reward that I think is just and fitting, but we did manage to develop a community of interest between the ends of the riding which, prior to that time, had been alien to each other, so it is not necessarily the case that the difference between rural and urban is irreconcilable. I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in the debate and to follow the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas. I trust that these submissions will go forward in the usual way to the commissioners.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour is aware there is still a considerable number of Ontario members who are seeking the floor in this debate. I have learned that it will be very difficult for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) to be here tomorrow to take part in the debate when it centres upon the electoral boundaries commission for Quebec. I would therefore ask if the House would give unanimous consent to allow the minister to make a short intervention at this point, and then revert to the discussion on the Ontario boundaries.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, just to make sure I understand this before we deal with the matter, is the hon. member saying that in the event there are Ontario members wishing to speak who have not yet