

opponents. In order to keep the record straight and prevent the drawing of a certain inference from the remarks of the honourable leader of the opposition, I wish to say that whether the word originated in the United States or elsewhere I do not know—

Hon. Mr. HAIG: In the United States.

Hon. Mr. VIEN:—it was introduced to our political vocabulary when the Liberal party had cause to complain that the Conservative party in office was using its powers to rearrange the boundaries of constituencies to suit its own purpose. I should add that it seldom profited from this action, because in most of the gerrymandered constituencies the Conservatives were defeated at the polls.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: Does the honourable senator offer that as a prophecy or forecast of what will happen from this gerrymandering?

Hon. Mr. VIEN: I am not attempting to make any forecast.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: From his great store of political knowledge can the honourable gentleman tell me with what regime the phrase "hiving the Grits" originated?

Hon. Mr. VIEN: I believe the phrase "hiving the Grits" originated when it was decided that in certain Conservative ridings there were too many Grits or prospective Grits, and that they should be transferred to other constituencies where it was conceded that the Liberals already had a majority among the electors. I feel sure that the phrase will bring many interesting recollections to the minds of our honourable friends opposite.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: My honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) started this discussion. He ought to have heard enough now to hold him for a while.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: May I ask the honourable senator from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Vien) if he expects that this measure will bring about the same result as the 1934 redistribution?

Hon. Mr. VIEN: I am afraid that the honourable senators from Peterborough (Hon. Mrs. Fallis) and Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) are indulging in a little wishful thinking.

So far as I can judge from the discussion in another place, there was no sinister motive in the preparation of the bill now before us. The last decennial census showed that there had to be a change in the number of elected representatives from various provinces, and this made necessary a change in the number

of constituencies. Saskatchewan, for instance, which was much to the fore in the discussion in another place, had its members reduced from 21 to 20. Clearly there had to be realignment of constituencies in that province. The chips had to fall somewhere. It has been pointed out that the honourable member of another place who most violently protested against the committee's report had given his written assent to that report. Quebec is another province whose number of members had to be changed; in this case there was an increase. One electoral district might have a population of only thirteen, fifteen or sixteen thousand, while that of another might be sixty thousand. The disparity was due largely to the 1934 redistribution. Advantage has been taken of the present opportunity to correct that situation and to de-limit constituencies in such a way as to bring about a more even division of population among the ridings. As I say, I do not believe that there was any sinister motive behind this bill. If the Liberals ever had a gerrymander in mind, they would have been convinced of its uselessness by the experience of their opponents.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I think you are going too far now.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: The honourable senator said the chips had to fall somewhere. Does he not think it is a rather remarkable coincidence that they fell in the ridings of the leader of the opposition and his four ablest lieutenants?

Hon. Mr. VIEN: Nobody regrets that more than we do.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: They did not fall in Glengarry.

Hon. Mr. VIEN: I sincerely hope that the redistribution will not prevent the honourable leader of the opposition from continuing in that office for many years to come.

Hon. NORMAN P. LAMBERT: Honourable senators, I do not intend to indulge in any historical perspective of this question of redistribution. It seems to me that we can do very little about this bill. I think it should be pointed out, however, that the only justification for a redistribution measure is the taking of a decennial census which records the increase or decrease in the population of the various constituencies. It is true that where changes are made in the boundaries of a constituency some inconvenience is caused to the member who represents it.

In my opinion debate that has taken place on the subject in the House of Commons in the past and just recently, was brought about