

*Redistribution*

May I state to you, sir, certain principles which I submit should be applied by the commission. The first is that the alteration of electoral boundaries from one redistribution to the next should be kept at an absolute minimum. People are creatures of political and other habits, and violent upsets in electoral boundaries should be avoided where possible. Therefore, relative permanence is a proper objective and the division should be on the basis of enabling the electoral districts to accommodate expanding population with a minimum of future alteration of boundaries.

Especially is this imperative if we are to maintain proper political organizations. Regrettably no member of the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Commission ever had any experience in political organization and, with respect, I venture to submit that it has ignored this important fact. This is particularly evident because of the wide departures from provincial boundaries. From Confederation until the present it has been possible in many areas of Ontario to maintain common federal and provincial political organizations, and it will be found that in those areas political interest has been highest.

Under the proposals as they are before us a complete separation of federal and provincial organizations will be necessary, and to this there are likely to be many unsatisfactory by-products—by-products which may not contribute to our unity as a single nation. In my submission this was totally unnecessary under a proper redistribution, and the old tradition might have been maintained.

Stability of political organization is a factor which must not be overlooked if we are to preserve our parliamentary democracy. A parliamentary committee of persons who are experienced in politics and understand the nature of elections would never have permitted this to happen.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest that homogeneity of the ridings, culturally, socially and economically, is a vital factor in electing a genuinely representative House of Commons. The late Mackenzie King expressed this at one time as the need for "compactness".

In speaking on the second reading of the redistribution bill of 1932 this is what Mr. Mackenzie King said on November 25, 1932, as it appears in *Hansard* at page 1591:

There is an additional guiding principle that, so far as reasonably can be arranged, there should be an effort at compactness in the shaping of constituencies. That permits of an expression of opinion from a community that is familiar with its

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

own affairs, and in that way helps to give a more accurate representation of the views of the people.

● (7:00 p.m.)

In my submission it is absolutely essential to give priority to community of interest and to balancing of population centres within the geographic unit if redistribution is to be at all fair and equitable to the electorate. Let me illustrate this by a local example. Twelve miles west of these parliament buildings are two new residential communities, slightly over a mile apart, named Kanata and Glencairn. The new Queensway to be constructed next year will make it possible to drive to either of them from these parliament buildings within 15 minutes. Both are exclusively dormitory communities—satellite towns, if you will—of this national capital, with all their ties, economic, social and cultural, here with Ottawa. By 1970 the promoters of Kanata claim it will have a population of 10,000 and Glencairn is expected to reach nearly half that figure. Yet under the proposed redistribution Kanata is to be linked with the towns of Renfrew and Perth, with which it has not the slightest affinity, whereas Glencairn, a completely similar community a mile away, is to be linked with Prescott, Cardinal and Iroquois, with which town and villages it has no association whatever. This illustrates why the members for Ontario signed the notice of objection and set forth the first reason as follows:

1. Throughout the province of Ontario, in proposing new boundaries for electoral districts, the commission has almost completely ignored provincial and municipal electoral boundaries, social and economic ties, patterns of trade and communication, local and regional affinities as well as tradition.

Sir, I do urge the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission earnestly to re-examine their work in the light of that objection. Without hesitation I say that the provincial redistribution, made by the same three commissioners, is much fairer, much more equitable, much more balanced.

In eastern Ontario at least, in the provincial redistribution the commission did take into account social, cultural and economic ties, patterns of trade and communication, local and regional affinities; but in the federal redistribution they have cut right across these factors.

Using the proposed electoral district of Carleton as an illustration, I say that any knowledgeable person realizes that the patterns and ties of the St. Lawrence towns and villages are east and west, with virtually no