

Redistribution

problem to the individual who expresses them; that is human nature and is not unreasonable.

Mr. St. Laurent: The strong expressions usually come from that side, but it is not always the same people who are over on that side.

Mr. Drew: That is quite true, Mr. Chairman, and may I assure the Prime Minister that the members on this side are not always going to be on this side—and perhaps for not very long.

Mr. Gauthier (Sudbury): They may be out altogether.

Mr. Drew: In earlier remarks, I did point out the fact that the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King had expressed the same view when he was on both sides of the house concerning another method, which I know I cannot discuss in detail at the moment. Unfortunately, when he was in the government the views he expressed, which were not contrary to those he expressed when he was in opposition, were not expressed at a time when a bill was under consideration which might have changed the procedure in a way that would have conformed with the views of many members in this house. Nevertheless, the views have been expressed on both sides of the house, by members of the Liberal party as well as by members on this side, and undoubtedly those who have sat in this house before during these debates must be reminded of those lines we learned when we were young:

For old, unhappy, far-off things,
And battles long ago.

There is no expression that could be used now in regard to what is taking place that could not be strengthened by quoting from *Hansard*, except that I am inclined to think if we quoted some of the things that were said by members on both sides of the house there would be an immediate appeal to the chairman, in view of some of the reactions we have seen to very much milder expressions on this occasion.

I only want to refer to the point the Prime Minister raised in his suggestion that I communicate with him. He did, as he has indicated, present certain opinions to me. I did communicate with him, but I was not presenting opinions with any idea that there should be a rigid acceptance of one point of view or another. The Prime Minister replied, and said that those would receive consideration. However, I do think I should deal with one comment of his, and that was the suggestion left in relation to the constituency that I have the honour to represent, that it was as a result of any representations of

[Mr. Drew.]

mine that there was a change in attitude in regard to that constituency. I have made inquiries from the members of the Conservative party who were on that committee, and I am told that there was never a proposal before that committee that there be a change in the boundaries of Carleton.

Mr. McIlraith: I am sure the leader of the opposition wants to be accurate on that. Early in the proceedings there was a very definite proposal put forward with respect to that constituency and it was asserted with considerable vigour, I may say, as well. There is no confusion on that point. So that there will be no confusion about it at all the effect of the proposal was not to eliminate a member, but rather to take part of the constituency which is contained within the limits of the city of Ottawa and make it into one constituency, subject to possible boundary changes which might develop, and to take the rural part of the constituency, which has some 17,000 persons in it, and put the three townships adjacent to Grenville-Dundas with Grenville-Dundas, bringing that constituency up to some 40,000 in population, and putting the other part in with the adjacent constituency of Lanark, bringing that constituency up to some 45,000. The thing was debated at some considerable length, because there was the constituency of Danforth in Toronto which was very much under size, and the argument was being advanced by the opposition that we must not change Carleton, but we also must not change Danforth, although it was not much smaller than the section of Carleton wholly within the city of Ottawa. The matter was brought before the committee.

Mr. Fleming: As one of the members of this party on the Ontario subcommittee perhaps I should clarify this reference to the subject of any proposals for changing Ottawa, or the riding of Carleton. It is true that the hon. member who has just spoken, the hon. member for Ottawa West, who was chairman of the Ontario subcommittee on the redistribution, did touch on this question and did sketch out what would be involved in it, but never at any time did I understand that he was putting this forward as a definite proposal. I want to make that clear and I so reported to the leader of the opposition.

I think the hon. member for Ottawa West will agree that on the one or two occasions where this was mentioned in general terms his following statement was: "But I am not pressing it".

Mr. McIlraith: I must make it clear, Mr. Chairman, I never said such a thing.