

*Redistribution*

raising a question of privilege. I followed what the hon. member for Kamloops said and I would say that it is a borderline case. It is very difficult perhaps on this occasion not to recognize that there might be some privilege in what the hon. member is complaining about; but on the other hand it is so much easier when the member who has the floor is asked for his consent. Normally, according to my experience, members give way and resume their seats, letting an hon. member correct part of a speech by an hon. gentleman who has had the floor. Perhaps the hon. member for Kamloops would care to resume his seat and the question will be settled.

**Mr. Fulton:** If the hon. member says I have been incorrect as to the facts and wishes an opportunity to correct me I will gladly give him the floor; but I do not think it should be done by way of privilege.

**Mr. Laing:** That is my purpose. When I was chairman of the committee I met as individuals all members of the house from the province of British Columbia, including opposition members. I had a discussion with the hon. member for Vancouver East; I had a discussion with the hon. member for Nanaimo; and I had a discussion with the hon. member for Kamloops. I must say that I was very disappointed to find out the manner in which he treated that interview which was of a private nature without being so regarded by him. He wrote me a three-page letter and sent copies of that letter to the Vancouver papers. That is not the way in which I would have acted.

**Mr. Fulton:** After you had already published the map.

**Mr. Laing:** I had published no map.

**Mr. Fulton:** The Vancouver papers published the map you gave them.

**Mr. Laing:** I think the hon. member for Kamloops will agree with me or at least take the statement that I published no map. I endeavoured to work with the members and get their views. I had the views of the hon. member for Vancouver East and the hon. member for Nanaimo and I am going to say that their views were of great value to me. I think they were in substantial agreement with the proposals that we made at that time. As a matter of fact, at the interview that I had with the hon. member for Kamloops, which I considered to be of a private nature and which he has made public, he was not greatly critical at that time of the views expressed—not until he wrote the three-page letter and sent copies to the press.

[The Chairman.]

**Mr. Fulton:** The hon. member has made a statement which conveniently omitted certain details which are not pleasing to him. Certainly we had an interview at which general proposals were discussed. I did not, as the hon. member has claimed, release the details of that interview to the press although, for reasons which I will indicate in a moment, I think I would have been quite entitled to do so. No details of the proposed riding boundaries were discussed at that interview. There were outlined general areas within which new ridings would be located along the lines of what is now being done, including one seat for the city of Vancouver. This can be verified by the member for Vancouver-Quadra. No details with respect to where or how that seat would be fitted into the city of Vancouver were discussed at that time. Shortly after that reports appeared in the Vancouver papers discussing in detail the proposals for the new riding in Vancouver city and giving an outline of just how it was proposed to fit that riding in. Those reports appeared in both Vancouver papers.

The details had not been discussed with me although I was a member of the subcommittee. I know that they had not been discussed with the member for Vancouver-Quadra who is a Vancouver member although not a member of the subcommittee; and the details then published were quite different from anything which either of us had been led to suspect would be the way in which the extra seat would be fitted into the city of Vancouver. The report appearing in the press carried the implication, if not the definite statement, that these plans had been discussed with and were pretty well approved by the British Columbia subcommittee. It was as a result of these press reports which were different from my understanding—of the details as a result of interviews with the hon. member—that I thought it well at that point to reduce to writing, so I might have it on the record, my view of how redistribution should be carried out in British Columbia.

I wrote the letter to the hon. member on a Friday. At that time he was away and I was unable to locate him. I am not trying to suggest anything improper there because a lot of other members were away at that time, on a visit organized for members of parliament. It so happened that he was not here and I let the matter rest over the week end. On Monday, without any apology—and I make no apology for it now—in view of the fact that these details he had furnished to the press had already appeared in the Vancouver papers, and in view of the fact that he was not here and that the letter had been available to him