

largely by a sense of inconvenience on the part of the sitting member, who views with some concern the necessity for adjusting his organization to the demands of new conditions. I think it is most natural that objections should be forthcoming.

I am quite certain that an examination of our history would show that redistribution in the long run has had very little effect upon the outcome of the ensuing elections. I was not sitting in parliament in 1934, but was very closely in touch with what went on. May I say, by way of illustration, that the party to which I belong was then in the opposition, and that the redistribution bill, particularly as it affected the province of Quebec, met with a great deal of criticism by members from that province? As a matter of fact the leading representative from that province, the late Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, was so critical of the measure that he challenged the government to go to the people on it. All that can be said is that when the election of 1935 came along his apprehensions were shown to have been entirely unfounded, because every seat in the province of Quebec was returned for his party.

As to the suggestions that have been made about gerrymandering or the hiving of one group here and another there, I believe that public opinion in this country is in such a liquid state that the passing of this measure will have no effect at all upon the outcome of the next general election. People form their views upon the issues of the day as they are advanced by the various political parties in what they believe to be the general interest of the country. If opinions are turned in the right direction, my view is that the technical differences between the constituencies has very little bearing on the outcome of elections.

I conclude with the thought that when we revise the Election Act something more can be said about what goes on in the constituencies.

Hon. S. S. McKEEN: Honourable senators, it has been said by the honourable leader opposite that this house takes little part in the discussion on redistribution. It occurs to me that if a satisfactory redistribution has been arrived at by a committee of the other house and a report has been presented, this house should stand by that report.

True, redistribution is purely a matter of compromise, and no one party should be entirely satisfied with the results. It is a case of each one giving a little to satisfy the whole. I believe that agreement has been reached among at least a majority of the parties as to the seats to be added. As for its effect on British Columbia, I was a little disappointed that the redistribution came so long after the

taking of a census. If it were made on the figures as shown by the ration board we would have at least another two seats.

Since the Senate is not particularly interested in the redistribution of the seats of the House of Commons, it might well consider the manner in which the seats in the Senate are distributed. That is a subject that should be examined into in this house. The Senate is intended to give numerical as well as geographical representation; therefore, more seats should go to some of the larger provinces. British Columbia is now larger than either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, both of which have ten senators while British Columbia has only six.

There is talk of bringing Newfoundland into the confederation. Such a move would necessitate additional representation. It should not be forgotten that the other coast, west of the Rockies, is still part of Canada and should have at least two more seats in the Senate.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Honourable senators, just to keep the record straight, in reply to my honourable friend's statement that certain members of the committee of the other house signed the report on redistribution, I should like to say that according to the Commons *Hansard* the report was signed on the understanding that the matter would be brought up in the house. The members were not agreeing to it, but were steam-rolled into signing it.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: A case of "on division".

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time, on division.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I move third reading now.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, the honourable member for De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Vien) referred only to the redistributions of 1896 and 1917.

Hon. Mr. VIEN: And 1934.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: He did not mention the other years. I think he should have told us that the average population per seat in the house is about 47,000, but that the Prime Minister's constituency has only 17,000, and its boundaries are left unchanged. He should have mentioned that the constituency of Carleton has a population of approximately 50,000 and yet a large number of votes were taken out of Ottawa and put into Carleton. It happened that in the last election the