

*Redistribution*

parliament's closing. There has been far more at the bottom of this debate than perhaps many people realize.

**An hon. Member:** We hope so.

**Mr. Graydon:** It largely stems from the fact that we have a rotten system of redistribution; and when you have a rotten system it is pretty hard to have anything but rotten results, no matter how conscientious may be the men connected with its operation.

So I am going to ask one favour in connection with this whole matter, if I may. It seems to me this thing may run on for some considerable time. The longer it runs the less good will there is in the house, and perhaps the further we are away from any really concrete conclusion. More than that, it seems to me that if we are going to start afresh and have a different system in years to come there are a number of these outstanding trouble spots, which have been revealed in the debate, that demand some attention from a higher level. Therefore I am going to suggest to the Prime Minister that before we continue with the debate tomorrow morning he and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration sit down and review the debate that has taken place up to now to see if between them they cannot come to the house and make some concrete suggestions that will wipe out most of the difficulties that have been brought forward in this debate, in an effort to see if we cannot have some greater measure of equality and equity with respect to matters which have been bothering so many of the members at this time.

I make that proposal in perfectly good faith because frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am not enjoying this spectacle. Nobody in the house is enjoying it. There are some things that could be done to wipe out the difficulties overnight, and I would suggest to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that they at least make a try and see if we cannot reach agreement and bring this session to a close.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Chairman, one of the purposes of a debate of this kind on the first clause in a bill is to place before the members of the house the opinions of other members in the hope that there may be some reconsideration of the course that was originally proposed. The arguments that have been put forward in support of a reconsideration of the proposed redistribution as contained in the schedule of this act have been advanced with an earnestness that could not have failed to impress members on the other

side of the house with the sincerity of the arguments, whether they agree with them or not.

I do not think any hon. member of this house who extended the courtesy due to other members and sat in this house during the arguments of the hon. member for Lake Centre, the hon. member for Haldimand, the hon. member for Huron North, the hon. member for Souris, the hon. member for Anna-polis-Kings and other members of this house, could possibly have been unimpressed with the sincerity and the earnestness behind the plea that what is being done here should be examined, not in the light of its effect on any individual member of this house so much as from the point of view of the effect it would have on the people of Canada who have the real right to expect impartiality, justice and common sense in the redistribution of the seats where their members will be chosen.

We listened this afternoon to the right hon. Minister of Agriculture give an extremely interesting political history of his own province of Saskatchewan. Much of it was new to members who are not resident in that province; much of it was probably new to the residents of that province as well, but little of it had to do with the problem before us and none of it had anything to do with the direct problem of explaining to this house why there has been such a cynical and outrageous gerrymandering of Lake Centre as well as other seats in that province.

I am speaking of Lake Centre particularly because of my interest in the hon. member who represents that riding; but even if it were not the member who sits here today, who has put forward his own case in such clear and cogent terms, nevertheless the fact would remain that there can be no explanation of the butchery—to use a term that has already been applied—that was performed in seeking to arrive at a new constituency which retains the name but little relationship to the historic background of that constituency.

I need not repeat the arguments that have been put forward by the leader of the C.C.F. party, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart. His argument has not been answered. None of these explanations we have had offer any satisfactory argument whatever. Not one of them in any way seeks to explain the failure to approach this vitally important question in the way we would expect any problem of this kind to be tackled. There was no attempt to agree upon some basic principle which would apply. There was no attempt to consult the members of the committee and agree upon a method of drafting the boundaries of the changed constituencies.