

Redistribution

fact that the commission must have listened to some kind of arguments that proposed that the national parks should be in one constituency.

I think that the representation of the people living in the national parks could be much better if the representation were left as it is now with Waterton Park in Lethbridge constituency, Banff Park belonging basically to Bow River and Jasper Park belonging to Jasper-Edson with Red Deer in between. There are alternative ways of suggesting this, of course.

However, I wish to speak in full support of the hon. member for Bow River and the hon. member for Calgary North in what they have already said. I wish to say also that the two rapidly growing urban areas, the cities of Calgary and Edmonton, each deserve another member. At the present time, on the basis of their populations they could accommodate more than an extra member. That could be done if the extra population left over were to be assigned to such constituencies as Vegreville, Acadia or, if necessary, Macleod. What I mean to say is that the city of Calgary has a large enough population to be deserving of three and a half members on the norm basis of representation.

What we are asking is that an additional member be added to the city of Calgary and an additional member be added to the city of Edmonton. They are entitled to this. With the minor adjustments that are necessary in some of the former constituencies, those adjustments could easily be made.

Again speaking of my own constituency, it is entirely within the normal range and even if it were left as it was it would stay very close to the norm. Therefore the argument that we are presenting, which is concurred in by members of the Conservative party and other parties in the house, is that we should scrap this whole Rocky Mountain constituency altogether and in doing so leave the boundaries of the other constituencies approximately as they were, eliminating the problem that has been created in Peace River and Athabasca.

I submit also that as Alberta is entitled to two more members of parliament one being assigned to the city of Calgary and one to the city of Edmonton. I would think that there would be no objection to such adjustments. Also, I suggest that we ought to be able to work out a more equitable distribution for the remaining constituencies which may not

have as large a population as they should have.

In closing I should like to ask the commission, in considering the arguments that have been presented this afternoon, to take cognizance of the principles which have been outlined by myself and others, especially in such a situation as in the town of Three Hills to which I earlier referred, so that adjustments can be made which will not be contentious. That would certainly be an improvement. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the commissioners in Alberta will consider the arguments that are being made and bring about a more desirable situation than exists at present in the recommendations we have before us.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to underline what has been said by other hon. members from Alberta this afternoon about the unanimity of view in respect of certain changes and observations in regard to the report by the Alberta redistribution commission. I heartily concur with the remarks which have been made. I know that hon. members from the province of Alberta who will not have an opportunity to speak share these views.

Before going into the detail of the report perhaps I could touch again on some of the arguments advanced by our colleagues from Alberta. I should like to say in a general way that I find it regrettable that the commission has failed to include in its report any reasons for its recommendations. We get a blanket report devoid of any argument, devoid of any cogent reasoning. The burden is then put upon the populace and upon members of parliament to convince the commissioners that they were wrong. Yet it is the commissioners who are proposing the changes. I say with the greatest respect that it is for the commissioners to justify the changes they propose to make.

The law does not say that a commission can play tick-tack-toe within a province. I am sure that we can all sit down and on the basis of population alone come up with something. However, population alone is not the sole criterion. If it were we could come up with some of the most fantastic and glorious looking divisions. One could take a province and use vertical and horizontal stripes to cover with the appropriate population. This would disregard everything.

I refuse to accept the principle that representative government means the hiving within certain arbitrary boundaries X number