

voters in Ottawa gave a majority for the Liberal party and those in Carleton gave a majority against it.

My honourable friend did not tell us that the constituency of Muskoka-Ontario, whose representative in the other house is a prominent member of one of the opposition parties, has been divided up into a new combination. What has happened in the province of Manitoba? The change in population in the southern part of the province required that the seat to be lost should be from that district. The constituencies of Portage la Prairie and Neepawa were combined, which put the leader of the opposition in the other house into a new constituency with a population of twice the population of Glengarry. I object most to the dividing of the old constituency of Selkirk into two parts. The riding of Norquay is ideal for the present premier of Manitoba to run in—if he can be induced to come to Ottawa. That riding is a meandering one. It starts on the south side of Winnipeg and meanders northward, then east to Winnipeg, takes in some areas adjacent to the south centre of the city, and leaves a section to the north outside of Winnipeg.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It is like a dog's leg.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Unless you have a compass you are likely to get lost in trying to trace the boundaries of that constituency. The effect may not be so bad, because the population in that area is fairly cosmopolitan. I know Manitoba pretty well, and I am inclined to think the changes will not have any political consequences. The only member who may be hurt in this "jamboree" is the C.C.F. member for Selkirk; north of the town of Selkirk the constituency is divided east and west. If I were a friend of his, I think I would be fearing his defeat in the next election.

The really serious criticism of this bill relates to the riding of Lake Centre. The alteration proposed is an outrage. If my honourable friend had not indulged in references to this matter I would have kept quiet, but I think what has been said calls for a few remarks. The young man who represents Lake Centre is one of the ablest men in the parliamentary life of this country, as able a member as the House of Commons has seen in this generation. He is a worker; he is a veteran of the first world war. He comes down here at a great sacrifice, because not only is he a successful lawyer in his own province but his talent is such that he could attain high distinction and a lucrative practice in Montreal or Toronto, or in any other

Canadian city in which he chose to establish himself. But he prefers to stay in the West, where he is recognized as a leading counsel. Now the committee readjust his riding in order to defeat him, while they relieve the Minister of Agriculture of a district which in the main voted for the C.C.F. candidate at the last election. Three townships are taken from the south half of Humboldt and added to Lake Centre because in that district the vote was 550 for the C.C.F., 210 for the Liberal and 13 for the Conservative. Then, as if that were not enough, part of the city of Regina has been added to the constituency of Moose Jaw, with which it has no connection, solely to deprive the Conservative member of the 2,000 majority he received in that part of his constituency at the last election. If that is not a gerrymander which cries to high heaven for public protest, I do not know of any.

I am not worried about the situation in either British Columbia or Manitoba. It is inconvenient that the ridings now represented by two members—Mr. Bracken and Mr. Miller—and merged into one, because one of those gentlemen will have to step aside. I do not complain of that arrangement. As to Ontario-Muskoka things may not be so bad, because Mr. Macdonnell will undoubtedly be elected for the new seat. The really objectionable feature is the manipulation of Lake Centre constituency to create a potential adverse majority of 5,000 against the sitting member. In the committee, as the result of repeated protests the transfer of voters was limited, but the sitting member is threatened with 2,700 more opposition votes than were polled at the last election. My honourable friends may attempt comparisons with some other ridings, but in my judgment nobody can justify the kind of redistribution which it is sought to establish through this bill.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: May I ask my honourable friend a question?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Has not Mr. Diefenbaker, for whom I have very great respect, agreed to this?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: He did, but upon a condition. As he said yesterday in the House of Commons.

I was compelled to agree to the last proposal, or the full force of 5,000 votes would have been made available against me. I think I can overcome an adverse majority of 1,700, but had the original proposal been adopted, there would have been 5,000 against me, and under those circumstances I could not hope to win.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: He was in a position where he could not help himself.