

pull toward the Ottawa river. I have met no elector of Carleton or Grenville-Dundas who does not object to this proposed riding of Grenville-Carleton, and I think they object on sound grounds.

The second objection advanced by the members from Ontario is this:

2. The commission has proposed establishment of electoral districts having no physical, social or economic cohesion, and no unity or community of interest, thereby rendering the adequate representation of the people in parliament a virtually impossible task.

The chopping, the slicing done by the commission creates very many ridings in Ontario without cohesion, without the compactness of which Mr. Mackenzie King spoke, and thereby intensifies very greatly the problem of balanced representation by any member of parliament. Just as an illustration, the present Carleton has been sliced into five new electoral districts without any regard to the interests of the voters in the five sectors.

The third objection reads as follows:

3. The commission has ignored the rules specified in section 13 (c) of giving attention to special geographic considerations including the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof.

With great respect, I submit the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Commission went completely wrong in its interpretation of section 13 (c). According to the Representation Commissioner, the commission did not examine—and I believe he asserts it was not entitled to examine—actual population growth since the census of June, 1961.

I specifically ask the commission to reconsider its position in this respect. In my view and in the opinion of a considerable number of lawyers to whom I have spoken, the commission has made a grotesque misinterpretation of the amendment made in committee of the whole on November 13, 1964. The whole purpose of the amendment was to prevent before 1971 the fantastic disparities which occurred between 1951 and 1961. The author of the amendment, Mr. Moreau, who was then the member for York-Scarborough, made it clear that he wanted to deal with factual situations subsequent to the census. The sense of the house and the true purport of the amendment, I submit, was expressed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) who with his usual clarity said at page 10059 of *Hansard* of November 13, 1964:

I am glad to see this amendment introduced. When I spoke on this bill some months ago in

#### *Redistribution*

the earlier stage of its consideration I expressed the view that some account should be taken of population growth, that is the growth which had actually taken place since the census on which the redistribution was based.

Mr. Speaker, I pause to repeat those words, "which had actually taken place since the census on which the redistribution was based." The hon. member for Calgary North went on:

There is no doubt in my mind that the absence of such a consideration at the time of the last redistribution in 1952 is one of the main reasons we have such an inequitable position at the present time as far as the suburban areas of our cities are concerned.

It is true that the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made some equivocal comments on the amendment, but even his comments speak only of the use of "official figures" and clearly such official figures are obtainable from the assessment rolls of each municipality.

My submission is that the normal and natural meaning of the amendment to section 13 (c) is as the hon. member for Calgary North stated it. What astounded me is that the two members of the commission—and only two were present for the hearing—who sat in Ottawa allowed me to make a complete submission based upon this interpretation of the section without ever once raising the question that they were proceeding here in Ontario, and elsewhere in Canada, on a wholly different interpretation. Apparently, for some extraordinary reason it was a practice of the commission in Ontario not to ask questions for fear of embarrassing those persons who were making submissions. I have lived a good part of my life in the courts, before administrative tribunals, on the public platform and in this house, and I do not embarrass easily by being asked questions.

It was bad enough to have the hon. member for Renfrew South, the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) and myself make presentations to a commission without any questions at all being asked of us and with only two of the four members of the commission present. Any other administrative tribunal before which I have ever appeared before would have adjourned in order to hear as a full commission serious submissions made by people like the hon. member for Renfrew South; and I hope I can be considered in the same category as a serious person. This was bad enough. But thereafter to be told that you had made your argument on a totally wrong premise, without its being presented to