

Electoral Boundaries Commission

explain to the members of this house, to Canadians at large and to the caucus of his party when it meets that he had changed his mind. The reason he has changed his mind is that he has been sold a bill of goods by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. In fact, I do not think they were even sold a bill of goods; they have been in partnership on the whole thing right from the beginning.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody yelled, "Shame", and my answer to that is, it is a shame because it is going to usurp the workings and functions of this house. This is not my personal opinion; I have talked to a great many people about this, as I told you this morning. There is a feeling in this house that there is a great deal of justification for what I have said. If there is, I think the minister should clear up this matter because they have a long session ahead of them; there are some very tedious problems to be debated, and if the minister undermines the confidence of this house, as the person who takes responsibility on that side of the house, because many of us believe he is more powerful on that side of the house than the Prime Minister himself—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question. Do I understand from what the hon. gentleman has just said that his conduct on any other measure before the house would be influenced in any way; that his judgment would be affected in any way by anything that happens with regard to this bill?

Mr. Woolliams: I am very happy to answer that question, Mr. Chairman. No, that is not my point and I am sorry the minister mentioned it. Here is my point.

An hon. Member: Ah.

Mr. Woolliams: You may say "Ah", but because of the conduct of the minister at this moment we will always place him in that category and will feel he is guilty of this type of conduct on every occasion; and this will undermine the very workings of this house—that is my answer to the minister. I would like to read what he said. What is the justification for the charge I have made? Let us read the very words used by the minister himself, which are to be found on page 741 of *Hansard*, the fourth paragraph of the right

hand column, if anybody else wants to follow them:

After various other possibilities were considered—

This is dealing with this problem:

—the government—

He did not say himself; he said the government, and that means, if anything, to me, the cabinet.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is right.

Mr. Woolliams: I continue:

—the government finally agreed to put in the bill the suggestion that the chief justice of the province should nominate the chairman from a member of his court; that the leader of the government, the Prime Minister, should nominate one of the members of the commission; and that the Leader of the Opposition, who is an officer of parliament, should nominate the other.

He said "after they gave it some consideration". After they gave it a year's consideration. He said he has been making studies of what has gone on in Australia, Great Britain and other countries—probably the United States, although I do not know how they work redistribution down there. But after giving it that kind of consideration they came to this conclusion. He no doubt led the cabinet in this regard. I know he cannot disclose what goes on at cabinet meetings, but he as the Minister of Transport is the spokesman, the one they know has the special skill to steer the ship of state and this bill through this parliament. He has been chosen by the grand old Liberal party to do this. He was no doubt steering the cabinet. No doubt he said, "Don't worry about it; Pick will do it"; and Pick was supposed to do it because the government chose him to do the job.

Mr. MacEwan: They got a "Pick" in a poke.

Mr. Woolliams: They then considered the matter. He left it out very carefully at the time of the resolution—

Mr. Pickersgill: Second reading.

Mr. Woolliams: Second reading; I am glad to be corrected in that regard. He left this out, either intentionally or unintentionally. I want to be fair to him but I do not think I will be quite as charitable as was the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. Perhaps he is more sophisticated because he has been here longer than I have. Instead of sweeping these things under the table I say to you, sir, that you have to make up your mind. You made the statement this morning that we would have time for consideration in this regard. The consideration