

*Redistribution*

great sincerity" and I admit that—but "great sincerity" or "sincerity" does not mean that they are right.

I think that when we reach each one of these individual cases they should be looked at with great sincerity by every member of the house and the right conclusion reached. The special committee that was set up has reported and is now *functus*. Each member of the committee of the whole should discharge his own personal responsibility as a member of the house in determining whether or not every part of that report should be accepted or some parts should be modified. On that, I invite all hon. members to form their own opinion, and not be influenced by what may be the opinion, honest as that opinion may be, of any member here who happens also to be a member of the executive branch under our constitutional set-up. I am going to take my stand on each one of these questions as it arises, not as the Prime Minister but as the member representing the constituency of Quebec East.

**Mr. Drew:** The Prime Minister has expressed an approach to this problem, Mr. Chairman, to which no hon. member can take exception in so far as that statement represents an interpretation of the kind of approach that all of us would wish to see followed once we recognize that, by the majority decision of the house, no other system of redistribution can now be adopted. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we must recognize the extent to which any of the hon. members, and not of the Conservative party alone, are undoubtedly strongly convinced that the approach which has been described by the Prime Minister is not the approach which has been followed in reaching these decisions.

It was because of that indication by the Prime Minister of his desire that there be an approach of this kind, that I had made the suggestion last night that there be a review by the general redistribution committee of the proposals that were made in the light of the discussion that has taken place, so that we might hope that the decisions of that committee would be in conformity with the hope expressed by the Prime Minister at the beginning and reiterated this morning, that we would be able to deal with this subject on the basis of the general interest of the people of Canada rather than the narrow interests of any particular consideration in one area or another. One of the difficulties of dealing with this problem at this stage by amendments moved in relation to each constituency as that constituency comes up is that the complaints which have been made are not of a nature that could be solved by a change in a single

constituency. It would necessitate a re-examination of the general approach to this problem.

May I say to the Prime Minister that, far from suggesting at any time that there should be no change in any of the boundaries of the constituencies represented by members of the opposition, I have said exactly the opposite. I have said that in examining this subject we should do so on the basis of some agreed-upon principle which was settled by the members of the redistribution committee in advance of the decision as to what the boundaries would be. I never at any time, by inference or otherwise, left the slightest impression that I did not think the boundaries would require change. The boundaries must require change if this subject is to be dealt with satisfactorily. What I have emphasized on different occasions in my earlier remarks has been the obvious fact that old and historic ridings, represented at this time by Conservative members, have been brought together by the redistribution committee in a way that gerrymanders those constituencies, and prevents the possibility of one or two Conservative members representing the people they represented on an earlier occasion.

I have pointed out on several occasions that there seems to be a particular coincidence in the fact that there should be such an attraction to the committee in bringing together constituencies which happened to be represented by Conservative members. It was because those could have been changed, and these objections met, that I did urge that this matter go back to the committee.

I recognize, as the Prime Minister does, that this is not the first time debates of this kind have taken place. The Prime Minister has spoken of the earlier strong expressions that have been used.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** They have been used before.

**Mr. Drew:** As the Prime Minister says, he has heard them before, and *Hansard* records expressions on earlier occasions, which makes one wonder if we are becoming a particularly thin-skinned group of members when one heard some of the objections to the descriptive terms employed yesterday, which were terms that might be used at the most modest tea party. One can read the extremely violent expressions used on earlier occasions by members of the party on the opposite side, as well as by members of the parties on this side. This is a subject which, apparently, has always aroused very strong views. Undoubtedly, the views are stronger in direct relationship to the nearness of the