

town and, second, to present to the commissioners the case that there might be more equal distribution between the proposed riding of Brampton and the proposed riding of Halton. I would think that one of the objectives should be—and many hon. members have raised this point—that there should be good relativity between the federal, provincial and municipal bodies. In this case, if the commissioners were to decide, in their wisdom, to have only the city of Brampton in a riding, this might be the only riding in Canada that would elect a mayor, that would elect a member to the provincial legislature and would elect a member to this House all within the same boundaries. That would be an ideal situation.

● (1650)

Returning to the point I was making previously, I think that the people in Halton Hills north of lot 10 and east of the seventh concession have the same point of view as the people in the town of Caledon, that is, that the north-south relationship is certainly stronger than any east-west ties. One could argue that the figures are difficult to relate to for the commissioners and that perhaps the town of Caledon would be a more acceptable area to add to Brampton than would part of Halton Hills.

I know that the commissioners are not allowed to take into account future growth. I think various hon. members have commented on how they think this should be handled the next time. I suggest that the next time redistribution is tackled, we should consider at least using up to date figures, if not giving some consideration to future growth. I want to put on the record the fact that the city of Brampton is the fastest growing area in Canada and possibly in north America. I should like to put some figures on the record to give the House an idea of the rate of growth in Brampton at present.

The city of Brampton has recently signed an agreement with the province of Ontario, through AHOP, to have 15,000 new homes built in that municipality in the next three years. This is a phenomenal rate of growth for any community. In 1971, using the figures that are available, the population of Brampton numbered 70,838. In 1973, it rose to 84,788. By 1975 it was 98,590. If we project those figures at 4.3 persons per home, and as a low estimate that perhaps two-thirds of these 15,000 homes will be occupied by the next election, that would give a population of 141,600. If all were occupied at that time, it would give a population of 163,000.

If you look at the voting statistics, you will find that in Brampton in the 1972 federal election there were some 41,000 voters. In the 1975 provincial election there were 52,419 voters. If you project this at approximately 2.3 voters per house owned, using the low figure for 1978, that would raise it to over 75,000 and it could well be in the order of 87,000.

The case I am putting forward for consideration is that if you add Georgetown to the riding, or that part of Halton Hills which we have described, in 1978 in terms of the population there would be 161,600 people there, or a possible total, if all the 15,000 new homes are occupied in 1978, of 183,000. That would be either 98,500 voters or 110,000 voters. This would make Brampton by far the largest riding in the whole of Canada. As a matter of fact, it would

Electoral Boundaries

be 1½ times as large as the whole population of Prince Edward Island. I think we should give some consideration to that fact. I put these figures on the record for the consideration of the commissioners because I really want to draw the following conclusion.

I would like to recommend to the commissioners that riding No. 3 as set out in their report contain only the city of Brampton, and that riding No. 28 referred to as the riding of Halton be as described, plus that part of Halton Hills north of lot 10 and east of the seventh concession which it is now proposed be added to the city of Brampton. What I think is fairly easy for the commissioners to accept is that if they made this change it would not involve any riding other than the two adjoining ridings, in other words, the periphery boundary would not need to be changed in any way; it would only be a dividing line between the two adjoining ridings. In that case there is certainly unanimous agreement between the two members of parliament who represent the two ridings.

The whole purpose of asking the commissioners to reconsider this is simply the fact that having the city of Brampton in one riding only, and having Halton, as requested by my colleague, include that part of Halton Hills would give a better distribution of population between the two ridings because that change would align both these ridings very closely with the municipal and provincial boundaries and would give a better distribution of population between the two.

I think we should recognize—and I am sure the commissioners will—that making this very simple change will still mean that the riding of Brampton and the riding of Halton will be two of the largest ridings after redistribution. I think the commissioners would want to be very careful to achieve as close a balance as they can between the two ridings.

I should like to conclude by saying that if, in their wisdom, the commissioners should decide to leave the boundaries as set out in the report, I would ask that they give consideration to changing the name of the riding from Brampton to Brampton-Halton Hills or Brampton-Georgetown because that would reflect more accurately the make-up of the proposed riding. Finally, I should like to say that in general the commissioners have done a responsible job. It is certainly not an easy job to try to divide up Ontario with its various interests and various population densities. I think that one of the basic objectives must be to achieve as close a balance of population in adjoining ridings as possible. This could well be accomplished by transferring that part of Halton Hills north of No. 10 sideroad and east of the seventh concession to the riding of Halton and by establishing a Brampton riding embracing the city of Brampton only.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments about redistribution, particularly as it concerns northern Ontario where we had a net loss of one seat in 12, and northwestern Ontario with a net loss of one seat in four, or a 25 per cent loss.

First I would like to support the hon. parliamentary secretary, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) in his concern about the legality of the present report of the