

*Electoral Boundaries Commission*

suggest that one of the terms of reference for the commissions concerning the general rules under which they would operate should be that consideration shall be given to the growth which has taken place in some areas since the last census was taken. I also suggest that consideration be given to what one might call growth areas, areas in which it is quite apparent that growth will continue. If that is done, we will obviate very severe discrepancies arising in the future no matter what the tolerance be. I hope that something might be written into one of the clauses of this bill which would lay this down as a consideration which the commissions would have to take under advisement, when deciding what are the boundaries of the various constituencies.

I mention this particularly, because I have seen the bad effect caused by the absence of this consideration in my own city of Calgary. Prior to the last redistribution in 1952 there were in effect three constituencies in the city. There was Bow River, which took in the eastern part of the city plus the rural area to the east and to the north of it; there was Calgary east, which I represented and which really took in the central part of the city and the rural area to the south; and there was Calgary west, which took in the western part of the city and the rural area to the west and north.

In the Redistribution Act of 1952, in spite of the fact that a considerable amount of growth in population had taken place in the city of Calgary since the previous census was taken, and that it was quite apparent that this would continue at a very rapid rate, the number of constituencies was cut down to two, with the result that the two constituencies in Calgary at the present time are two of the most populous constituencies in Canada. I hope that mistakes of this kind will not be repeated and that the inclusion of a provision something along the lines I have suggested in the terms of reference of the commissions will ensure that there be some insurance, shall I say, against a constituency becoming too large in terms of population before the next revision of boundaries takes place.

The only other point I want to mention at this time is with regard to some remarks made by the Minister of Transport yesterday to the general effect that it was undesirable to have mixed rural and urban constituencies. If I misinterpreted what he said I know he will correct me. I think that the converse is the case. Mixed rural and urban constituencies are very desirable and from many points of view. For eight years I represented a mixed rural and urban constituency, and as far as the interest of the people is concerned, and as far as the more impartial attitude, shall I say,

toward questions affecting urban people on the one hand and rural people on the other is concerned, a member who represents a mixed constituency of that sort has a great advantage. I say that because he gets both points of view and can also do something to reconcile those points of view when they are opposed to each other. Therefore, rather than making any attempt to try and ensure that constituencies are either purely urban or purely rural, I would hope that there would be a considerable number of constituencies which would at least be of a mixed nature.

As far as the composition of this chamber and the representation of the people of Canada is concerned, I think that this would be of distinct advantage rather than disadvantage. I put that before the minister, ask him to think about it and perhaps reconsider the attitude he expressed before.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit me to say that really what I was doing yesterday was trying to agree with the hon. member for Regina City who had made the point. I had not given much thought to it, and perhaps the hon. member could carry on the debate with the hon. member for Regina City. The matter is very unlikely to arise in my case anyway.

**Mr. More:** Mr. Chairman, I do not want words put in my mouth. I did not say that mixed constituencies were inappropriate. I said that the complaint from my area had been that people outside the area of the city could not vote together with the city people. I did not say anything about mixed constituencies.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** All I did was agree with what the hon. gentleman said, and if I misunderstood him I did not know what I was agreeing with. In any case I can assure the hon. member I have no intention of seeking to direct anyone in this matter and I really have no very strong views on it one way or the other.

**Mr. Harkness:** Mr. Chairman, I was not thinking of the matter from the point of view of its possible application to the Minister of Transport. I was thinking of it from the general point of view of improving representation and thus the welfare of the country as a whole, as I am sure the minister is. But one reason in particular why I have mentioned this matter is that at the present time there is a considerable area around every urban centre of any size in which the majority of the people are really people primarily interested in and connected with the city. They live in the country but they earn their livelihood in the city. Their interests lie primarily in the city although in many cases