

*Redistribution Bill*

county with a representative in the house. I know this question was very much to the fore in the Quebec legislature some years ago. Rumours reached me that certain requests had emanated from certain parts of the county for the division of this county and to have a member represent that part of the territory I have just mentioned. However, Mr. Chairman, those requests and petitions never reached me, were never handed to me. As I was not a member of the committee, I was unable to represent the interests of those people who claim they are entitled to a member in this house.

Now, I am aware there was a somewhat recent agitation on the part of certain newspapers and a certain Conservative press of the province of Quebec asking in view of the disappearance of the county of L'Islet, that the part of the territory which I have the honour to represent and which embraces a large area be detached and divided by a line running from Chateau-Richer to Pointe Desrochers and extending to the Straits of Belle Isle. These suggestions were put forward by the Journal of Quebec in an article published on May 12. The article mentioned these facts in detail and stated that owing to the disappearance of a county in the Quebec district,—L'Islet,—a member should be added for that district and territory. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is rather difficult to grant a member for that region, today, in view of the fact the territory embraces an extensive area and does not contain the population considered necessary. However, I deemed it my duty to lay these facts before the committee, so that it may be well understood that the persons who might have made these requests did not address themselves to me but applied to members on the right. I do not know whether those requests reached them. At all events, I am in no way responsible for that.

Another observation and I will close. According to the reprinted bill, I believe a new parish is added to my county,—a parish situated to the north of Montmorency Falls. This parish forms part of the county of Montmorency at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I never meddled with the affairs of the committee and never asked a favour from anybody. I did not ask that such and such a thing be done in the district which I have the honour to represent until now. Yet, while the committee decided to add that distant parish to my county, a parish which can only be reached by a road that does not connect with the remainder of the county. I am happy to state, Mr. Chairman, that I welcome this new population of

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Ste. Brigitte de Laval in the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay, and I will do for those people as much as I have been able to do so far for the county which I have the honour to represent.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Division into electoral districts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask that that section stand, and that we proceed with other sections.

Section 3 stands.

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On the schedule—Ontario.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): I presume that we shall now take the schedule for Ontario, which begins at page 3 of the bill. I shall call No. 1, Algoma East.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the province of Ontario the bill which is in your hands has been before the committee and has been subject to some amendments since it was printed, and the reprint on the table to-night embodies all those amendments with the exception of some technical errors in description, and typographical errors. These have been corrected, and I now submit a schedule embodying the corrections, all of which have been submitted to and approved by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott), who represented the opposition on the committee. We have agreed upon all these changes, and they have been checked by the electoral officer and the officers who prepared the descriptions. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. MacNicol, that the schedule of the bill with respect to the province of Ontario be stricken out and the following substituted therefor. The substitution is in the terms of the schedule as it appears in the reprinted bill, with, as I have indicated, certain minor technical and typographical errors.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Before the motion is put may I say that while the schedule is not as I should like to have it, and while as a matter of fact there are in it some things which I much dislike, nevertheless I have realized throughout that the government has the majority and that the government must take the responsibility for this redistribution. A great deal of time has been spent on the Ontario schedule. It was unfortunate that the opposition was represented by only one member from a province containing eighty-