

Street—do tend to share more of a community of interests than those who live west of Bathurst Street who may go into other parts of Toronto to go to work.

Here is another one—boundaries. One will find them in rural constituencies running down the middle of the main street of a small town. In the case of St. Paul's, Lytton Boulevard cuts right through a closely-knit community. It is a quiet residential street with little traffic and has no rational basis as a natural dividing line. Lawrence Avenue, a major artery several blocks to the north, is the more obvious choice.

● (1950)

Strangely, in its preliminary work the commission made conscious attempts to conform to both provincial and municipal boundaries. Yet with regard to the report for the province of Ontario, the commission departed entirely from that conformity and did not give reasons. I am told there are no reasons in the Ontario report. Why not? They must be there. It is not the task of members of parliament to punch at pillows. The commissioners do not have the God-given or legal right to hand down a ukase from on high and challenge others to prove them wrong. Their changes must be made on the basis of law. They must give reasons. If those reasons are invalid, they must expect to be attacked. Hopefully, as a result of criticism, they will change their conclusions. I submit that nothing should prevent the commissioners from making the changes required.

I have almost used up my time, Mr. Speaker. The former member, Mr. Atkey, made alternate proposals to the commission. He presented proposal A and proposal B. He considered some of the advantages of proposal A, and some of the disadvantages. Strangely enough, the commission disregarded both proposals A and B and brought forward a solution which runs counter to many of the principles I have tried to enunciate, and which members on both sides have repeated time and time again. I must confess that it is frustrating to find that people—and I do not say this patronizingly—who are certainly as intelligent as members of parliament should assess a situation in a vacuum, treat people as mere ciphers, ignore demographic factors and community of interest and arrive at the sort of results we now see.

I intend to speak with regard to the Alberta objections tomorrow, and will go into detail about my own city. I shall speak about some of the problems which have resulted from proposals made by commissioners who have, shall we say, considered facts which exist in a vacuum, which are a figment of somebody's imagination, and which do not exist in reality. They have used such facts in coming to a conclusion. I hope that hon. members are not arguing in a vacuum. I know that there are many submissions concerning Ontario and many concerning the other provinces.

I hope the commissioners realize the disruption which a wrong decision can cause. I hope that the commissioners will consider the census figures, allow a tolerance of 25 per cent on either side, and remember that the best job of redistribution is the one which changes boundaries the least. As it is, the people in the constituencies have a tough enough time knowing who their federal and provincial members are. They know that their problems will eventu-

ally receive attention. As it is, our people have some difficulty in recognizing which member represents which constituency. It gives us no satisfaction when people come to our constituency offices with a problem and we have to tell them, "Well, no, this is the wrong place. You will have to go down there, to Mr. So and So, the provincial member."

Not all our constituents are perfect linguists in English or French. It does not behoove us to make their life that much more complicated. As it is, John Q. citizen has a tough enough time, and the commissioners should take another look at this matter and un-complicate some of the tangled webs they have placed before the House in the form of redistribution plans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Andras: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am the member for Port Arthur. Some ten years ago, shortly after being first elected to this House, I made reference to an article I had written for some publication, the name of which escapes me, in which I advocated government support for studies of the feasibility of creating a new eleventh province. I think it was to be called Aurora.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not Aurora Borealis?

Mr. Andras: No, but in the end it could have been called that. It was to comprise northern Ontario and parts of northeastern Quebec. I was astounded at the response to this whimsical idea of mine. There was a response from residents of northern Ontario, all the way over to the Quebec boundary, and in Quebec itself. People from Mattawa to Kenora, from Parry Sound to Nipigon, sent letters into my office supporting this suggestion. The letters poured in.

I raise the matter in this context for this reason: by doing this, residents of northern Ontario vented their individual feelings of frustration and isolation, and made known their discontent with the manner in which they had been treated by governments generally, federal and provincial.

I hasten to say, Mr. Speaker, that whatever separatist leanings I had in those days I soon abandoned, particularly after my own somewhat cursory study of the constitutional issues involved indicated that only the most drastic action, revolution, could bring it about. I did not, however, reject the legitimate aspirations, and very legitimate feelings of my fellow northerners. As a member of parliament and member of the government for many years I have been advocating and supporting legislation the aim of which is to relieve regional disparities and improve the social and economic well-being of Canadians everywhere. If the quality of life in northern Ontario has improved in the ten years since I made those comments, the reason is partly the