

*Redistribution*

criticize the work of the commission in relation to the boundaries of the constituencies because of the fact that at some time or another they may appear before the judge who is a member of the commission to plead a legal case. This difficulty can only be overcome by changing the act so that it does not make it mandatory that a judge be a member of the commission.

It was my understanding that there was to be no partisanship in the appointment of members to these commissions; yet it is strange that of the four members of the commission in Alberta three were Liberals and one was a Social Crediter. Perhaps that did not make any difference, and we hope it did not. In any event we did not register a complaint. This situation caused a great deal of criticism throughout Alberta. I suggest that the act should be changed so that such a situation cannot again occur. I do not lay any blame on the commission but rather on the parliament of Canada which passed the act.

Every member from Alberta who has spoken has criticized the proposed establishment of constituency No. 17 which would be known as Rocky Mountain. I have great regard for the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer. He has accurately stated that this situation has created every other constituency boundary problem in the province of Alberta.

In order to create this constituency a huge area has been taken from the west part of Macleod riding, and the constituency extends for a distance of 410 miles. Can anyone imagine a constituency being 410 miles long, embracing three national parks, the Crowsnest Pass area and a multitude of rich industrial and natural resource areas?

I represent Macleod riding which extends from six miles south of Banff to the international border. It includes the Crowsnest Pass area as well as the tremendous grazing areas in the mountains and foothills. These grazing areas are utilized by livestock producers who trail or transport their stock to these pastures in the summer and back out in the fall of the year. In other words, the people living adjacent to these areas are the people who utilize them. Having represented this area for eight years I am aware of the specific problems which these people encounter. We have held many meetings to discuss these problems.

Like the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock), I must concern myself with problems relating to the Waterton Lakes national park, and this requires a good deal of time. My colleague and I held a meeting at Waterton Lakes which had an attendance of

about 400, and this constituency boundary question was raised. The entire assembly voiced objection to the proposed creation of constituency No. 17 by the boundaries commission.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Some of the arguments advanced at that meeting were: How would you choose a candidate to run for any political party when the constituency is 410 miles long? Where would you hold the meeting? Would you hold it in Banff, Waterton Lakes or Jasper? No matter where you held it, everyone would have to come out to the main north-south highway from either Edmonton or Macleod to Calgary and, if it were to be held in Banff, go in from the main north-south highway to that point. The distance to be travelled would be hundreds of miles.

If I know anything about nominating conventions—hon. members in all quarters of the house are familiar with nominating problems—people who were anticipating attending such a convention would hesitate to do so because of the distance to be travelled. In addition, at a nomination convention of this kind you would have a “bulking-in” of people from the immediate vicinity. If it were held at Banff there would perhaps be a sprinkling of people from Waterton Lakes, Crowsnest Pass and Jasper-Edson but the bulk of those attending the convention would be from Banff.

After a candidate had been nominated he would, of course, have to represent the whole constituency if elected to this house. But after appropriations had been made or set aside to run the affairs of the national parks at Banff, Jasper and Waterton Lakes, I am certain that if only one member were representing all three areas each park would blame the others for not having received the lion's share. As it is, the hon. member for Lethbridge and myself represent Waterton Lakes. We do our best to obtain appropriations, public works, swimming pools, roads and all the other things needed for that park. We are proud of the park. We are proud of what we have been able to do for it, and the people in the area are 100 per cent satisfied with the job that has been done. But if Waterton Lakes park is joined with the other two so far as representation is concerned I can assure you there will be discontent on the part of the people in the area. This in itself is an argument against the implementation of the proposal to make Rocky Mountain a constituency.