

Because of common problems, we had banded together in order to solve our problems, and by working together, we have been having excellent results. But with this proposed new division, our efforts will be nullified.

In all humility, I left a small portion of that paragraph out as it was complimentary to me. I am sure the House will understand. When I look at those particular pieces of correspondence it becomes evident why the section relating to community of interest was placed in the statute, but unfortunately it was not abided by.

Let me reiterate my second point. All rural members for ridings in northern Ontario as well as in northern Canada are faced with a dire and crucial problem, namely, the erosion of our power within this House because our numbers are disproportionate vis-à-vis members representing urban ridings, so much so that urban members now accept their right to control the destiny not only of their urban or high-growth centres but of the whole of the nation.

I was amazed last week, on March 29, when the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) participated in a debate regarding constitutional reform. Let me quote what he said as recorded in *Hansard* for that date at page 12238:

The rate of urbanization is nothing short of a phenomenon. Before the end of this century, 94 per cent of Canadians will be urbanized and three-quarters will live in 12 major cities. Urbanization is caused by an interlocking set of developments spawned by exploding technology. Government efforts must be directed toward managing the process of urbanization. The special problems of urbanization—public assistance, transportation, environmental management, leisure, recreation and housing—interact on one another and demand more money which municipalities have no way of raising, thus exacerbating their dependence on provincial and federal government grants.

The quality of life in urban centres is diminishing, despite local efforts; the institutional framework of government was established long before the social impact of urbanization was ever dreamed of.

That was said during a constitutional debate. In what direction was that hon. member moving? He was seeking an amendment to the constitution which would give more power to the municipalities. What else would he be after, and who is there to resist that sort of pressure? After all, rural members are being eliminated as a result of this decennial redistribution, which to my mind is silly and premature.

We are rapidly approaching the time of the Conference on Human Settlements in Vancouver. I am looking at the notes for a speech to the Montreal Rotary Club by a Mr. Jim MacNeill, commissioner general, Canadian Habitat secretariat. What does he tell the Rotary Club? Does he say that Habitat has to look at various problems, including that of urbanization? No, he says that "we in Canada must confront our own exploding urbanization". He is saying we have to look at how we will deal with those problems. He continues:

● (1800)

Few Canadians realize it, but we—in common with other developed countries—will have to build as many new communities in the next three decades as we have in our entire history.

He recognizes urban explosion as an irreversible fact. He says that in respect of the human settlement at this conference we ought not to look at how we should reverse the trend toward urbanization. He says it is a known fact which must be accepted. He goes on:

Electoral Boundaries

This is unprecedented—in terms of scale and rate of growth. We, fortunately, have the skills to turn this into a great opportunity, providing we learn from the experience of other nations.

Habitat gives us that chance. At Habitat we can begin a process of exchange with other countries about managing urban growth, about transit systems, about housing designs, about all kinds of things. We must seize that chance.

What will the commissioners of Habitat for Canada talk about in Vancouver? According to the commissioner, they will talk about urban problems, not human settlements in rural Ontario, rural Quebec, rural Alberta, or northern development which is essential to this particular nation and its continued development. They will talk about urban explosion and urban development as though that were the primary concern of Canada. That sort of misconception about Canadian growth is directly attributable to the decrease in the importance of rural representation in this House and the increasing representation from southern portions of Canada and the urban centres of Alberta, and so on.

When I see this, I have a great deal of trepidation. I said that at the beginning of my speech. We are not dealing with figures and how to elect members; we are dealing with development because, surely, if we believe in democracy we also believe in the fundamental strength of representation from all areas of Canada. That strength is being dissipated when we see that by the turn of the century 94 per cent of Canadians will live in 12 urban areas. Unless we change the instruments available to the commissioners, 94 per cent of the representation in this House will be urban. Those areas which have made the wealth of this nation, through raw materials and the processing of those materials and through agricultural products which are the products of rural Canada, will be given second place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does he have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the House is sitting during the dinner hour, I might mention that I propose to call the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), in that order.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in making my comments this evening I perhaps will not have as much in the way of volume as my predecessor in speaking in this debate, but perhaps I can stick to the topic rather than to philosophy. I should like to draw to the attention of members of this House and, hopefully, the commissioners, the constituency marked No. 40 on the map called Lanark-Carleton. As the representative in that area, and as a person who spoke in making representations before the commission at one stage on behalf of certain municipalities in that area, I should like to urge the commissioners to consider the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton rather than Lanark-Carleton.