

*Redistribution*

fact been attempted with respect to the constituency of Carleton. Instead of these matters being settled by members of parliament of all parties in the house, acting as representatives of the people throughout the country and approaching the subject impartially by way of informal discussions between themselves, so that at all stages all shades of opinion could be heard on the question of how these maps are to be made up, they have rather been decided in secret behind closed doors, and have been decided with definite finality by one group in the house.

The results were then presented to the rest of the members of the subcommittees by which time it was quite impossible to have any substantial changes effected in the maps. What would have happened in the case of Carleton—

**Mr. McIlraith:** Read what the former Conservative member for Carleton said in 1946 and 1947.

**Mr. Fulton:**—was only forestalled because the chairman of the Ontario committee, who is now interrupting, then following his usual practice of saying things out of time and out of place, let slip to the candidate for the Liberal party in the 1949 election what was proposed with respect to Carleton and that gentleman in turn, speaking out of time and out of place, let it slip to the press. The whole plan of what was proposed to be done was prematurely revealed and a withdrawal was forced in that case.

**Mr. Mutch:** By whom?

**Mr. Fulton:** It is surprising to find that the Prime Minister should have so little knowledge of what is actually being done by his own followers, not only private members of his party but also by cabinet ministers, as to suggest that the principles he outlined have even the faintest resemblance to the reality of what has taken place.

**Mr. Mutch:** Would it be unparliamentary to suggest that that is an impudent suggestion?

**Mr. Fulton:** What came out this morning with respect to Carleton was not an isolated instance. We know very well that the same thing took place in practically every subcommittee at the instance of the Liberal members on those subcommittees. That was the case in the province of Manitoba. You will remember that it was necessary for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to rise on a question of privilege and to point out that a map, with the boundaries of constituencies clearly drawn, had appeared in the Winnipeg papers, and particularly to emphasize that the report accompanying the map to the effect

that it had been approved by the Manitoba subcommittee was in fact inaccurate, and that the members of the Manitoba subcommittee, other than the Liberals, had never even seen that map or discussed the details of what was proposed.

Mr. Chairman, it is to move in a world of fantasy to suggest that these maps and reports were not inspired by the Liberal members of the subcommittee; because the maps bear too close a resemblance to the maps finally produced for any other conclusion to be drawn. We found the same sort of thing in the province of British Columbia, particularly when the hon. member for Vancouver South was the chairman of the subcommittee, when a map in detail of the new proposed riding was reproduced in the Vancouver papers before the details of it had ever been discussed with opposition members of the subcommittee. The same thing is true with respect to the constituency of Carleton and particularly does that also apply to the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Laing:** On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the member has stated that an indication was given to the press of Vancouver indicating the territories before the matter was ever discussed with opposition members of the committee.

**Mr. Fulton:** Before the detail of the proposal was ever discussed, I said.

**Mr. Laing:** Well, in this case particularly I want to deal with this matter—

**Mr. Fulton:** It is not privilege that the hon. member raises.

**Some hon. Members:** Yes, yes.

**The Chairman:** Order. The point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South is not a matter of privilege according to the rules. If the hon. member wishes that the statement be made the hon. member for Vancouver South must ask the permission of the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chairman, surely the point taken by the member for Vancouver South is a valid one. This is a reflection on his character and he is seeking to answer it. I submit, Mr. Chairman, with great respect that he ought to be given an opportunity of answering an attack which by implication is an attack on his character.

**The Chairman:** The hon. member for Vancouver South is not going to be denied the right of having on the record his interpretation of what took place. The question is when should that be done and how should it be done. The hon. member for Vancouver South chooses to have it done by way of