

tainly be very wise comments. However, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention, as others did, and I think it is perfectly logical, this change that unfortunately made me lose very good parishes. I should like to say that when we have worked in parishes for years we know them better and we know better their problems and the people who live there. I am very sad that because of these changes I will lose very interesting parishes that I did know very well and with which I always cooperated in a large extent. Also, I must say that I am very pleased and I welcome the new parishes that will be added to my riding and that I shall try to represent as well as possible. Finally, can the Commission readjust the boundaries to seriously account for the relationship between parishes that are even more easily related to the constituency of Joliette? But even if those parishes are in the neighbouring constituency of Berthier, I will still have the privilege of living near them. It is not always easy, of course—

Mr. Prud'homme: You cannot represent both constituencies.

Mr. La Salle: I am not saying that, Mr. Speaker the hon. member for Saint-Denis reminds me I will not represent both ridings. I am aware of that. But I am happy to see that the parishes will still be close to Joliette, which will allow me to meet some good friends among the thousands of constituents the majority of whom have put their trust in me. I regret of course to see those parishes go. Must we submit to the findings of the Commission inasmuch as it did prepare good recommendations? I hope nonetheless that, considering the comments heard this evening, the Commission or subsequent ones making potential changes will take into account valid remarks, and I am convinced that everyone who participated in tonight's debate had in mind the well-being of their fellow-Canadians.

● (2320)

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous applause versus the point I am going to make, I hope we are going to remain as unanimous as we are this evening.

Because it is so very late, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be extremely brief in presenting my case.

From the very start, the commissioners have been congratulated, and that is all very well. Still, I would like to stress the fact that I should have appreciated, even at this late hour, their presence in the galleries. I hope they were there during the day and heard the wishes expressed by the hon. members who made comments concerning the ridings they represent here in this House.

I should have hoped that the commissioners would have been here in the galleries; we know they cannot attend the sittings of the House, but they should at least have had the decency of sitting in the galleries to find out what is now going on. If that is an exercise in democracy, I agree whole-heartedly, but I really would have liked the commissioners to hear the debate on the electoral ridings.

The first point that I wanted to make concerns the report filed and read during the public hearings of September 4 last, that is the report submitted by the Chamber of Com-

Electoral Boundaries

merce of the City of Laval concerning the new electoral boundaries.

The City of Laval is the second largest city in Quebec where population is concerned. The City of Laval is now asked to share its development, which has had no equal in Canada in the last few years.

I believe that we should take for granted the fact that the population is as shown by the 1971 Census. In view of the development of Laval during the last five years, I hope that this considerable population increase will also be taken into consideration. A report was filed on September 4 last at the Court House by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Laval, and I also made representations on behalf of the City of Laval stating that the city represents a unit in itself as concerns economic and sociological problems, as well as political considerations perhaps, as the hon. member said earlier, but this I can easily brush aside. In my opinion, since we are a steadily growing city, we do not want—and I am now expressing the views of the mayor of the City of Laval, Dr. Lucien Paiement—to become some day a mere suburb of the Montreal urban community.

Mr. Speaker, you can be assured that I shall be the first to support the mayor of Laval by saying that we do not want to be incorporated in the Montreal urban community. I would like to submit again the brief tabled on September 4 last concerning the problems that this could cause eventually, and to once again submit my arguments, especially to prove that in view of the present development, the island of Laval should have three seats in the House of Commons and not two seats and a half; that is to say that one seat is now shared with the Ahuntsic riding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if no change is eventually to be made, we shall welcome all the able and willing voters of the Ahuntsic riding to fall in with the City of Laval because our ambitions are known.

● (2330)

The potential as far as urbanization is concerned is there, but we must not forget that the reason why I am trying for the last time to sensitize the commissioners about the limits of the constituency in which the city of Laval is situated, is the report submitted on September 4 last. I hope that we will learn why the report submitted at the public hearing held on September 4 last by the Laval Chamber of Commerce was not accepted.

If I have risen this evening, Mr. Speaker, it is to try for the last time, on behalf of my constituents of the city of Laval, to explain that we should have three seats in the House of Commons. But once again, if the Commission wishes to divide part of the city of Montreal, namely the constituency of Ahuntsic, we will welcome it but we do not intend, as far as I am concerned, to become part of the metropolitan area of Montreal.

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the Commission who to some extent took into account the recommendations I had made during the hearing which took place in Montreal on September 4th, 1975. It is my duty tonight to take part in this debate in order to express my point of view to the members