

*Electoral Boundaries*

a recommendation, because on page 16 of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, we find in schedule "d" section 23, the definition and the make-up of my constituency named Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. However, they wanted to change that name for that of Glengarry-Prescott.

Section "a" concerning the make-up of the constituency mentions the county of Prescott, section "b" the county of Russell, section "c" the county of Glengarry, except the township of Charlottenburg and the village of Lancaster and the above mentioned section "d" the township of Cumberland. Section "b" refers to the county of Russell and not part of it. I therefore suggest that the commission did not take in consideration the fact that the population wished to keep their identity as citizens of Russell. On their behalf, I ask the commission to recommend that the name be changed.

[English]

Under section C the Township of Charlottenburg and the village of Lancaster are excluded from the county of Glengarry. My objection would have been only to the changing of the name of my riding had the commission omitted the last part of section C which states "but excluding the village of Lancaster and the township of Charlottenburg".

This part of my riding was referred to as Glengarry not only since the last redistribution, the one before or others in the past, but since well before Confederation. I should like to mention for the record that the hon. member who represented Glengarry before Confederation was none other than the Hon. Donald Alexander MacDonald. I should also like to mention for the record that he was born in St. Raphael in the township of Charlottenburg, which the commission wants to withdraw from Glengarry. The hon. gentleman was elected to the legislative assembly of the province of Canada in 1857 to represent the riding of Glengarry.

Because the riding existed before Confederation and because the hon. gentleman from Charlottenburg represented it when it became part of Confederation I have received many complaints from constituents who wish to remain Glengarrians, those in Charlottenburg and those from the village of Lancaster.

As one who has shared the first 50 years of his life with fellow Glengarrians, I also object to the recommendations of this commission. How would we explain to a young piper from Lancaster that he can still belong to the Glengarry Pipe Band but he is no longer a Glengarrian, or worse still, how would we explain to a veteran of the Glengarry Highlanders who lives in Charlottenburg and served his country as a Glengarry Highlander that he will no longer be a Glengarrian?

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, the area I represent is made of three former counties and all three have their own page of history. So I suggest that this recommendation of the commission be reconsidered and that these three historical counties be left unchanged.

[English]

**Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, by any political standards there is no reason for my objecting to the bound-

[Mr. Ethier.]

aries of the newly created riding of Prince Edward in Ontario. As outlined in paragraph 64 on page 27 of the Boundaries Commission Report for Ontario, it is made up of the whole of Prince Edward County and that portion of Hastings County comprising the towns of Thurlow and Tyendinaga, the village of Deseronto, and the city of Belleville where I live.

I have lived in this area all of my adult life and I have seen boundaries change, and change back again. As the sitting member for a major portion of the population of the new area since 1972 I do not, however, consider that I have any proprietary right to the new seat. Having said that, I wish to point out that my life has been spent in public service in the area, and I feel I am aware of its problems to a greater degree than some. Each time the boundaries have been changed, there has been a disruption of traditional communities of interest. Now we are faced again with a severance which will put aside these regional interests. This time there seems to be an opportunity, at least partially, to correct the situation without unduly disturbing any other boundaries.

● (2100)

So that there will be no misunderstanding, I should point out that I am going to speak in part about the proposed riding of Northumberland, most of which is now served by the most capable member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees).

Changes will also be suggested in the proposed riding of Hastings-Frontenac, but these will be of a nature which will not materially or drastically affect that area. Historically, commercially, from the point of view of municipal government, communications, and so many other factors, the area south of No. 7 highway in Hastings county has always related to the larger urban areas of Trenton and Belleville. Even the boundaries of this area set prior to 1968 when it was known as Hastings South took into consideration the natural bonds of the area south of No. 7 highway.

Let me now outline briefly the changes I propose, which are supported by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings. I suggest that the township of Rawden, with a population of 2,115; and the village of Stirling, with a population of 1,500, should be rejoined to the riding of Northumberland, making a new population for that constituency of 67,901. Let the two townships of Huntingdon, with a population of 1,635, and Hungerford with a population of 2,292, and the village of Tweed with a population of 1,738, be rejoined to the area to the south to be called Prince Edward, which will increase that constituency to 72,394.

On checking the arithmetic this will leave the proposed riding of Hastings-Frontenac with a population of 65,636. Very quickly we will see that this leaves a population in the area spread much more evenly than would be the case under the proposal now put forward by the commission.

Ending my very brief intervention may I say that by and large I am not unhappy with the decision of the commission. Over the next few hours there will be a number of suggestions for minor variations, such as mine, all of which I am sure will bear close scrutiny. Only the commission itself will have the final opportunity to make changes.