

Electoral Boundaries Commission

you meant was not from this side of the house; it was to worry whether you could get the whip to whip these boys into shape and get them to do something that the government had approved some months ago.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that he wanted to be fair. I wish he would read the sentence that begins at the bottom of the page. I refer to the last sentence on the page beginning, "I do not hesitate to say". That is what I said, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to read those words.

Mr. Woolliams: All right, I will read it all so there will not be any question about it. Mind you, there is always a question when you are reading the words of this distinguished and illustrious minister:

I say unreservedly that I have every confidence that no matter who occupies those offices, any person who becomes leader of the opposition in the parliament of our country—

That means he has confidence in Mr. Diefenbaker or any other future leader of the opposition, of whichever party—

Mr. Walker: Or yourself.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right; you are absolutely correct. That is the nicest thing that has been said to me all day.

Mr. Churchill: Do you want to withdraw?

Mr. Woolliams: I am quite certain that the same tactics as have been used—I do not want to go off on a tangent—on others will be used on me, and I do not know whether I want to lie on that bed:

—or prime minister in the parliament of our country would take this responsibility seriously and make the kind of nominations that all of us would feel were appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is the next sentence that I should like the hon. member to read.

Mr. Woolliams: I know, and I am coming to that. Don't get excited.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am just getting intoxicated by my own words.

An hon. Member: That is not unusual.

Mr. Woolliams: I read a speech made by this minister four years ago, and when I read it I was drunk.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: I continue:

I do not hesitate to say that with respect to this provision or with respect to any other method which commends itself to the house or

[Mr. Woolliams.]

to a majority of the house and which seems likely to produce as fair and effective a result, the government will be quite prepared in committee to consider on its merits any amendments—

That is, we were going to consider them in committee.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is where we are now.

Mr. Woolliams: But they considered it before we reached the committee stage; they had made up their minds. So we might as well talk for days, or stop talking because the minister has made up his mind. If he was wanting to be fair this afternoon he would stand up and say that he had already made up his mind because he is in partnership with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Some hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sorry, I mean Winnipeg North Centre. I correct that.

Mr. Hellyer: You do not even know in which direction they are.

Mr. Woolliams: I always have trouble with south centre and north centre, but I certainly meant north centre there.

Now, I know that the minister always puts safeguards in his phrases, and he did that when he said he would do it in committee. He thought that something might happen and that he had better put in one of his safeguards in the last sentence of one of his paragraphs. He intended that the clause in the bill would stand and to lead the Conservative party, the official opposition, to believe that he would support the official opposition and the government throughout on that particular clause, making no change. This may be imputing motives, but I think that there may be some ulterior motives in this respect. Because if we are to have an independent commission I think we will have a better chance to achieve it under the old clause than under the new. I can see why they want it, because to date there is still the provincial government of Saskatchewan to be considered. Whether they call themselves the C.C.F. or the New Democratic party they are the same, because in their ballots they include both. It is a catch-all phrase for the party.

I know that on the national level we do endeavour to get independent people in the civil service. I do not know what goes on in all the provinces, but perhaps there is not quite so much care taken in this regard. We have trouble with our negotiations; and surely we have enough as it is, with the contributory pension plan and various other plans. So let