

**Hon. Mr. Power:** Yes, by the commission.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** In any event, I have read and heard it stated that in Saskatchewan we will lose—

**Hon. Mr. Power:** Three seats.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:**—under this new distribution at least four seats, which will bring the number of seats down to 14 or even 13.

**Hon. Mr. Power:** As far as I know, it is three seats, and that will reduce the number from 17 to 14.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** We would lose three seats?

**Hon. Mr. Power:** Yes, you would lose three seats.

**Hon. Mr. Burchill:** May I ask the sponsor of the bill a question for the purpose of clarification? When the number of members to represent each province is established and this tolerance of 25 per cent as between the rural and urban constituencies comes into effect, does that mean the commission will have to keep within that 25 per cent in designating the boundaries of a constituency?

**Hon. Mr. Power:** Twenty-five per cent, up or down. I have not done the figuring myself, but I have figures taken from a newspaper that, for instance, in New Brunswick the highest maximum would be 74,000 and the minimum 44,000.

**Hon. Mr. Burchill:** And each constituency has to conform to that?

**Hon. Mr. Power:** Yes, exactly—within 25 per cent.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I must inform honourable senators that if the honourable Senator Power speaks now it will have the effect of closing the debate.

**Hon. C. G. Power:** If I may be permitted at this time, perhaps with respect to the questions asked by my honourable friend and successor in the House of Commons, Senator Flynn—

**Hon. Mr. Flynn:** For a very short time!

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** We are all glad he followed you here.

**Hon. Mr. Power:**—perhaps I could simply say that I am just as embarrassed as I can be with respect to the Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec. I do not know the answer to that question.

With respect to the tolerances spoken of by my honourable friend Senator Crerar, he was a little doubtful about the nomination of the Speaker of the House of Commons to make the appointments. May I say generally as to this bill, that I do not think perfection was obtained. Nearly all the do-gooders, who

are glad to get something they seem to like, played with it and did their darndest to make the bill so perfect it almost did not go through the House. So, like a good many others, I am satisfied that one has to put up with a slight amount of imperfection in order to get the general principle of the bill through. It is for that reason I support it very strongly.

With regard to the appointment of the two extra commissioners other than the Representation Commissioner and the judge, there was considerable discussion. Personally, I think I would have favoured the appointment of two politicians by the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition, because I firmly believe it is not a disgrace to be a politician. After reading the debates and the discussions in the newspapers about this, I began to feel as if I were almost a gangster or a goon, and that anybody who was in politics throughout his life was to be sneered at and condemned. In matters of this kind, which are purely political, I feel that the commissioners should not all be judges. In fact, one judge said to me yesterday, "An ordinary judge does not know anything about this business, and, if he does know anything about it, then he should not be a judge." In my view it would be far better that somebody who knows something of the feelings, the sentiments and the ideas of the people, and the interests involved in each constituency and each province, should be appointed. That is my own view, but I take it that the general opinion in the other place, arrived at perhaps by compromise, was that the Speaker of the House should appoint them. I am satisfied with this because it helped to get the bill through.

Now, if I may become garrulous in my old age and talk about something that has not much to do with all this but which may serve as an explanation: In 1882, when the first great gerrymander was brought about by Sir John Macdonald, I do not think the people of the country objected to it very much. They thought it was part of the game. Sir John was a great man and he did much for Canada, and the Grits who complained were only yelping at him and were not worthy to be listened to in matters of this kind. I think the people of the country felt that Sir John was a good Prime Minister and that he should stay there. If he took some devious way of staying there, then so much the better for him.

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** Those were the good old days.

**Hon. Mr. Power:** It shows the tendency of the people. As time went on people began to think there should be some fairer play as between the political parties. The minority Grits' howling began to get stronger. As time