

does not perpetrate the dislocations that were proposed in 1973 and found to be so repugnant, and which have been continued on this occasion.

I must say I was surprised and disappointed, but I was not nearly so disappointed or angry as a great number of the constituents in my riding who contemplate the changes that are being proposed by the commission. Along with my colleagues in the city of Edmonton I suggest the commission re-examine the situation and repair the damages that are being proposed by the 1973 report rather than perpetuate them. Then I think we will have a far better job done than has been done to date.

**Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by commending the commission for its diligent work in the arduous task of redistribution. In my judgment it has attempted to be fair. It has certainly exhibited a conscientious effort to draw both urban and rural lines that seem to the commission to follow the requirements of the law. But I am concerned that the recommendations that were made at the time of the public hearings, especially those presented to the commission on behalf of several Edmonton constituencies, do not seem to have been taken seriously by the commission.

I am also concerned at the lack of reasons offered by the commission for the final maps that have been published following the public representations. I believe that if we are to do an adequate job of representing our constituencies we need to know the reasons why the commission has deemed it advisable to do such things as the following.

May I draw Your Honour's attention to the revised map which maintains the same split on the west side of the city of Edmonton both north and south of the river that was first advanced and to which we objected as far back as 1973 in the twenty-ninth parliament when this redistribution first came before us? What I am objecting to in particular, and what I am at a loss to understand is how the commission has deemed it advisable to take the southern portion of the present constituency of Edmonton West and put it in a new constituency called Edmonton South. As I look at the map of the new constituency of Edmonton South I note that if constituencies are to have as one of their criteria commonality of interest, the only commonality that I can find with Edmonton South is that it is a rich man's constituency.

I do not believe it is the purpose of democracy and good representation to have one of the five constituencies in greater Edmonton so disproportionately wealthy, with the social and economic status of areas such as Grandview, Westbrook, Laurier, Valleyview, Crestwood, Parkview, and River Bend, which are the richest areas in Edmonton. In this regard I believe the commission has done a disservice.

I sincerely hope that the commission will take the representation I am making very seriously and redraw the map so that the riding of Edmonton West goes down to the river on the south side, as at present, and the ridings on the south side of the river stay on the south side. Incidentally I think the people in the lower part of Edmonton West would be quite surprised to wake up on election morning and find that they will have to vote in a riding called

Edmonton South when they do not consider that they live in the southern part of the city.

The riding of Edmonton South has an eastern boundary on the map before us that generally follows the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks to 82nd Avenue, jogs along 82nd Avenue to the west and then down 109th Street to the river. If the first recommendation that I have made, namely, that the riding of Edmonton South should terminate at the river rather than jump across it, is accepted, it follows that additional population will be gathered into it to meet the quotient contingency. Therefore the eastern boundary ought to be moved further east, and I would strongly urge upon the commission that it consider 91st Street as the boundary on the eastern side. I do that for this additional reason. By running the eastern boundary along 99th Street and eventually into the river it would preserve the basic area of Strathcona rather than splitting it up as has now been done in the revised map I have before me.

● (0050)

I have been following the difficulties, the challenges, and the opportunities of the old Strathcona historical group. Indeed, the renovation of that part of the city has been of considerable interest in the last two or three years. I have tried to be of whatever help I could to that group as well as to the city administration in their attempt to restore the heart as well as the potential of the old Strathcona area.

What I find when I look at this map is that the federal boundary comes down the middle and divides this common area where there is a community of interest. I cannot imagine why this is, with one side of 82nd Avenue to be in the riding of Edmonton South and the other side in the riding of Edmonton Strathcona. If my proposal were followed the eastern boundary would be moved to the east and then the entire area of Strathcona, with this rich and vibrant community of interest, would remain within the one riding.

Needless to say, I am very much of the opinion that the riding I have been describing ought to be called Edmonton-Strathcona. That is the very area of the city which lays claim to the heritage vested upon it by Lord Strathcona, and indeed was the first entrance way to the modern city of Edmonton coming up the North Saskatchewan River. This is where the docks and wharves were first located.

My suggestion would mean or entail a switching in the names of the two constituencies on the south side of the city as shown in the plan we are debating. Specifically I am suggesting there ought to be a transposition of the riding. The southern riding on the west side ought to be called Edmonton-Strathcona, with its eastern boundary moved over to 91st Street. The southern riding on the east ought to be called Edmonton-South.

I draw to your attention another very important factor which ought to be brought into these remarks. The riding called Edmonton-Strathcona on the map, about which I was speaking a moment ago, being on the eastern side, has a population listed in the report of the commission of 88,419, which includes the 1971 census figure for Millwood. The Millwood community development in 1971 was only getting off the ground with about 1,000 people, but today there are between 18,000 and 20,000 people living in Mill-