

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That was the nature of his protest. I would not like to run against an opponent supported by 5,000 new votes.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: My honourable friend is not giving a correct interpretation of the document Mr. Tucker read in the other place, and which was signed by Mr. Diefenbaker.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Mr. Diefenbaker gave me an explanation. The original draft proposal involved 5,000 adverse votes. The revised arrangement leaves 1,700. I do not believe there is any dispute at all about these figures. The point is that this redistribution is made at Mr. Diefenbaker's expense. Three of the constituencies in southern Saskatchewan are to be represented by two members; their total population is small, and all are represented by members of the C.C.F. Nobody will be harmed. But so far as Lake Centre is concerned the only purpose of re-drawing the boundaries is to eliminate Diefenbaker from the House of Commons. I do not think it can be done; I do not believe the people of Saskatchewan will permit it.

With regard to one observation of my honourable friend from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert), I venture to suggest that if the Conservatives had to do their redistribution work of 1933 over again, there would be no interference at all with the constituency, because they were always advised to leave it alone.

Now let me recount a little incident which occurred in 1923. At that time the Liberal party were in power in this country. One of the members of the redistribution committee was an M.P. from Manitoba with whom I went to university. He did not know much about rural Manitoba; I knew quite a bit about it. He said, "Jack, how shall I divide this province?" I believe that Manitoba was then getting three or perhaps four extra seats. He asked me how I would divide the city of Winnipeg, to which one more seat was to be allotted. I said, "I would run the division east and west". He said, "Would that help your party, or mine?" "Well", I said, "I'm blessed if I know". My idea about it was much the same as that expressed by the honourable senator from Ottawa. I said: "My experience is that if a fair redistribution is made the party which makes it gets the benefit; whereas the party which makes a bad redistribution gets kicked in the face for doing so". He ran the line east and west. A revision was made in 1933 under a Conservative government; the same line was retained. Subsequently there was a revision under a Liberal government; still the same line was adhered to. It has

remained in effect ever since. In 1925 the Conservatives carried two seats and the Liberals two seats. In 1930 the Conservatives carried two, the C.C.F. one, and the Liberals one. In 1935 the Liberals carried two and the C.C.F. carried two. I think we have there a perfect illustration of a reasonable plan of redistribution, which ultimately benefited those who made it. If it were my business to re-draw constituency lines in Winnipeg, I could do it in a manner which would give the Conservative party at least a chance in the next fight, and I could make it very difficult for the C.C.F. to get more than one seat.

I have nothing to add; but I thought that a reference to some examples of redistribution made by Conservatives, but never mentioned by Liberals, would help to correct some misapprehensions. I also wanted the house to understand that the re-drawing of this bill was not a Sunday afternoon picnic.

Hon. THOMAS VIEN: I had not intended to speak at all, but the honourable leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) has brought me to my feet by his references to "gerrymandering" and the implication which was obvious from his words. Neither had I the intention of being exhaustive in the few remarks which I made; that is why I did not go into all the details which the honourable gentleman has now developed in his argument on the third reading.

I entirely agree with what he has said about the gentleman who now represents Lake Centre. He is extremely gifted; he is a dear personal friend of mine; and I sincerely hope that for a long time to come he will be returned to act as an opposition critic.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I know you are genuine in that—I am not speaking cynically.

Hon. Mr. VIEN. Just as genuine as my friend was when he came down here in 1934—

Hon. Mr. Haig: 1924.

Hon. Mr. VIEN—in 1924, and suggested a certain division in the city of Winnipeg. One would have had to be more than human not to do so. The honourable senator suggested a division favourable to his friends. I do not blame him for that.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: You misunderstood. The friend was a member of the committee and a Liberal member for Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. VIEN: Yes, but I cannot convince myself that when the honourable senator suggested a certain division of the city of Winnipeg he intended to help the Liberals. I may be wrong but I am con-