

briefly. One is that there seems to be a great deal of concern about the fact that there is not enough population in northern Ontario and they are losing one seat in the area. Unfortunately, I cannot comment on the whole of northern Ontario. We in this party have not had representation in northern Ontario since 1935 and perhaps I am not in a position to speak of it knowingly, but I do know Renfrew county, and to some degree Nipissing and some of the more urban areas in northern Ontario. One way in which the population was decreased was that certain townships, three to be exact, named Mattawan, Papineau and Cameron, were taken from the district of Nipissing and added to Renfrew county and to the new riding No. 65 to be known as Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. I note that there are almost 5,000 people involved in the town of Mattawa and these communities are part of the district of Nipissing. They are only 38 miles from the city of North Bay, whereas they are about 90 miles from Pembroke which is the heart and core of Renfrew county.

Indeed, the map is a very odd map in that this new constituency, No. 65 of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke would end up being about the largest constituency in southern Ontario, taking in half of Algonquin park, but in population the great bulk of it would be in the Deep River, Chalk River, Pembroke-Renfrew area, with a long highway line, Highway 17, which would then connect it to Mattawa some 90 miles away from the centre of the community.

I have had representations from people in the Mattawa area that their community is in Nipissing and North Bay; they do not come to Pembroke. I realize that the commission received representations from the council that they wanted to be with Pembroke. I can only indicate that four members of the council happened to be on the executive of the association of the present member for Renfrew North-Nipissing East (Mr. Hopkins) and that this is how it came about that the council passed the resolution. If northern Ontario will get those extra seats, they need all the population they can get. This does not enhance the Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke riding. It makes it the largest population in a rural riding in southern Ontario, with some 85,000 people, and it seems to be inconsistent with the number of representations I have received.

I want to bring it to the attention of the commission that the township of Cameron from 1867 to 1892, along with Papineau and Mattawan, were actually part of the riding of Algoma. From 1892 until 1924 all three of them were part of the federal constituency of Nipissing. From 1924 until the present, Cameron, the most easterly township, was part of Renfrew, but Papineau and Mattawan were never associated with Pembroke in a federal electoral district until 1966. So historically they have always belonged in the other area.

There is one other area to which I want to draw attention. That is constituency No. 78 which we are now discussing and which is known as Stormont-Dundas. For the first time, on this second map and in the present redistribution the township of Charlottenburgh was included in the constituency of Stormont-Dundas with the rest of the community. Historically, Charlottenburgh has been with the other four townships in the county of Glengarry, Kenyon, Lan-caster and Lochiel. From 1867 until 1915 this was the federal riding of Glengarry. From 1915 until 1924 these

four townships, added to Stormont, made up the federal riding of Glengarry-Stormont.

● (1820)

From 1924 to 1952 those four townships as a block were in the riding of Glengarry, from 1952 to 1966 they were in the federal riding of Glengarry-Prescott, and from 1966 to the present time those four townships, together as a block, have been in the federal riding of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. It seems odd that they now take that one township, break it away from its historical base and lower the population in riding No. 23, Glengarry-Prescott, to 66,074—by just the few people who happen to live there—to increase the Stormont-Dundas riding to 84,578. If that township were left with the other three in the county of Glengarry, it would continue the historical tradition and it would balance out those ridings more equitably. I wanted to bring that to the attention of this House and subsequently to the attention of the commission.

A few comments have already been made dealing with the township of Dunnville which is included in the new constituency of Erie which is No. 17 on the map. The suggestion has been that it should go to No. 27 which is to be known as Haldimand-Norfolk on the map we are dealing with. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) that the name change be completed here, but also that Dunnville has a historical relationship and that is the area in which the people from Dunnville would like to be with regard to representation at the federal level.

I can only concur in that to the extent that the same type of representations have come to my attention and I indicated that I would be glad to pass them on to the commission via this debate in the House of Commons. But there might be a problem with regard to how many people would be left in the constituency of Erie as a result of moving one township.

I hope the commission will be able to change the name of the constituency of Lanark-Carleton, No. 40 on the map, to Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton.

I think that is all the time I have to put my representations on the record. I believe the commission has had an extraordinarily difficult task to perform. In the main, I think it has tried to listen to the objections and to put recommendations into effect. In general, I think the commission has done an excellent job throughout Ontario with the material and the guidelines it has been given. It is a complement to the commission that it has been able to do so. Sometimes we politicians think we are put into a difficult position. I can say that I prefer to be a politician rather than a commissioner who cannot reply. It seems we are always kicking them because they have not kept in mind community of interest, size of population, size of riding or whatever. I think the commissioners have done an excellent job within the guidelines to which they were confined.

**Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take long in the House today speaking about the redistribution of the riding of Essex-Windsor. I will try to outline my concerns. I am concerned because the townships of Colchester North, Colchester