

*Electoral Boundaries*

And if you say: And if someone says Blainville, we know he means Sainte-Thérèse. We include Sainte-Thérèse-Ouest, that is the town of Boisbriand, established in honour of the founder and his daughter. As far as education is concerned, we have the regional board of Blainville-Deux-Montagnes. The name Blainville applies directly to one area and Deux-Montagnes the nearly region. All the territory of greater Sainte-Thérèse including Rosemère, Lorraine and Bois-des-Fillion is serviced by the postal office of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville. For all this territory, the land register of the village and parish of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville is being used and it cannot be otherwise. Mr. Speaker, all this underlines the importance of the name of Blainville in our area and in that which is being considered for this new riding. Now I would like to quote some statistics in order to stress the size of the population of both areas, namely Blainville and Deux-Montagnes.

The Blainville district covers a territory of 48 square miles and the Deux-Montagnes district covers a territory of 50 square miles, which make them almost similar. The Blainville district consists of five municipalities: Boisbriand, Lorraine, Blainville, Sainte-Thérèse and Rosemère; the Deux-Montagnes district has five municipalities: Saint-Eustache, Deux-Montagnes, Sainte-Marthe-sur-le-lac, Saint-Joseph-du-Lac and Pointe-Calumet.

If we examine the population of these two groups of municipalities in 1961, the Blainville district had a population of 25,087 while the Deux-Montagnes district had a population of 19,995. In 1971, if one examines again the statistics, one realizes that the population of the Blainville district was 43,938, that is 80 per cent more, while Deux-Montagnes has a population of 32,858 representing a 65 per cent increase.

We can see that the population of the Blainville district is slightly more important in 1971 than that of the Deux-Montagnes. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that after the 1981 census, and given the same increase that the one which has taken place between 1961 and 1971, this progression will be even a greater, due to the fact that the Mirabel project announced in 1971 is already having a considerable impact on the development of this region.

After 1981, it will be necessary to divide this new constituency in two, as a result of the population increase, and then it will be possible to name one of those constituencies Blainville and the other Deux-Montagnes. If this change were made now, as I suggested, we would settle the problem and kill two birds with one stone.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a well-established practice recognized by this House and all political parties, namely that each time a change of name of a constituency is requested by an hon. member through a private bill, the change is accepted. If the Commission agreed to the proposed change, it would eliminate the need to introduce a private bill, which would save time for this House and money for the Canadian taxpayers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking the Commission to change the name of the constituency of Deux-Montagnes to that of Blainville-Deux-Montagnes.

● (2310)

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to make a few remarks as so many of my

[Mr. Comtois.]

colleagues on a matter which interests all hon. members and their constituents. I would like of course to congratulate all hon. members who have taken the floor, which clearly demonstrate their concern for their constituents, who give us their opinions on the electoral changes which are made at various times.

I would like to say right now, as many of my colleagues, that the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission is for from easy. I would also like to congratulate the Commission for the work they have done and especially for the concern they showed at meetings, or about the comments made at public hearings.

Of course, as far as my riding is concerned, the first proposal made, I think a year and a half or two years ago, was rejected. It would have provided 74 ridings in Québec and now the Commission is submitting a second proposal which will give 75 ridings to Québec. Being from that province, I am very glad to see that we will have an additional riding; as would be the case for any other member who would see the representation of his province increased.

So, I appreciate much more the new proposal, because in the first case my riding would have been dealt in a way that would have brought comments not only from my constituents but also from the municipal authorities. So the original proposal had to be modified and, after the hearing, the Commission took into account the recommendations which had been made. I can share the concern expressed earlier by my colleague from Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois) who submitted a brief at that same hearing. It was largely been taken into account. As for most of my colleagues on the northern side, I would not say they are entirely satisfied but almost so. As far as I am concerned, I am very pleased by this very interesting improvement. Therefore, in these circumstances, I would like to thank the chairman and the members of this commission who have understood the importance and the seriousness of the recommendations made by various people.

When population figures are being considered, I would like to invite the Commission to take into account as much as possible, and I know it is not always easy, the social and economic factors when changes are to be made.

I know it is difficult to coordinate all those aspects. But it is always the same issue that keeps coming back as there are changes really difficult to accept. Tonight we heard some comments which are definitively justified. But to what extent should we, as members of this House, examine this future possibility? And if some changes are to be made according to the proposals before this House, I suppose that the Commission will be tempted to listen to the comments made tonight and to recognize the difference between an urban and a rural area. I am one of those who believe it is unthinkable to give the same figures for a rural and a urban riding. Considering all the differences, the demands are different and the number of services is also different. Therefore I think it would be unthinkable to believe, if we want to be fair to the people that the member of an urban riding should have the same number of constituents than the member of a rural riding.

I do not wish to extend this evening further as I know that my colleagues of other provinces are interested in discussing and making their comments and they will cer-