

that they made any complaint at that time; they were perfectly satisfied to lose two members.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has not read the records. If he will do so he will find a resolution on the very subject introduced by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff).

Mr. MACDOUGALL: And supported by how many members from Nova Scotia? I have read the record.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend can look; I cannot tell.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I have read the record.

Mr. SHORT: Because we are losing two members under this redistribution my hon. friend considers it is a terrible thing. I regret that just as much as he does, but the fact is that our population has decreased to such an extent that we must bear the penalty until the constitution is changed. I cannot understand why he should blame this government for Nova Scotia losing two members when the same thing happened in 1924.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend misunderstood me entirely; I did not blame the government.

Mr. SHORT: At that time Nova Scotia was represented by sixteen Liberals.

Mr. GOBEIL: Just before six o'clock the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) stated that the delay in reprinting the bill was due to certain changes made and agreements arrived at at a late hour in connection with some of the provinces, including the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) then got up and said that as far as Quebec was concerned no agreement had been arrived at and that the bill was now as bad as it was before. As a member of the Quebec subcommittee I cannot allow that statement to pass unanswered because it is absolutely inaccurate and contrary to the facts. With all due respect to the hon. member for Quebec East may I tell him that as he was not a member of that committee it was quite possible that certain agreements might have been arrived at without him being consulted. That is exactly what happened. On Wednesday night between eleven and eleven thirty o'clock there was a meeting of several members from the city of Montreal, including the hon. members for Hochelaga (Mr. St-Père), Maisonneuve (Mr. Jean), St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) and Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). I do not think these hon. members will

contradict me when I say that a final agreement was arrived at for the city of Montreal. Before leaving the room to go up to the committee room to see if the bill had been sent to the printers I asked these gentlemen, "Is this a final agreement?" and every one of them said, "Yes." I went up to the committee room but as we could not supply the boundaries at that time the matter had to be left over until the next morning. That is one of the reasons why the bill was late.

There have been included in the bill several changes suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. For instance, the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) suggested the other day that the counties of L'Assomption, Joliette and Montcalm should be joined together. We did that. Certain changes were made in the county of Terrebonne by returning the parish of Ste. Therese to that county. Several other changes suggested by hon. friends opposite were made. When the hon. member suggests that the bill is just as bad now as it was before, he is not paying a compliment to his friends on his own side of the committee. I think this offers an illustration of the good faith of certain hon. members opposite in their work in connection with this bill.

Mr. DUPUIS: To whom does the hon. member refer when he mentions hon. members from this side? I want him to name them.

Mr. GOBEIL: If the hon. member had been a little more patient his desire would have been met, as I was just starting to give them. I am pleased to say that several of our hon. friends opposite have shown a real desire to arrive at a compromise, but I must say also that since the first time the hon. member for Quebec East appeared before the committee I have felt personally that he had no desire to arrive at an agreement and that whatever concessions were made would not satisfy him.

Mr. CARDIN: Will all due respect to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gobeil), I am afraid that I must say that he is not reciting exactly what happened. Certain suggestions were made with regard to Montreal and certain points were in agreement between the representatives, but my information is that there was no final agreement and that the bill as it is now printed and the amendments as now made are not what was understood when several members from Montreal met with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DURANLEAU: In what respect?