

when it is suggested that a certain amount of money now raised through the tariff should be taken from the revenues of the country, it would be only fair and reasonable to expect a man, who is looking at the country's interests, to specify in what manner that money could be replaced in the public exchequer. It was a matter of regret to me that the leader of the Progressive party did not in his very able address indicate how that was to be done.

There is another matter to which I wish to allude. The hon. gentleman who introduced the amendment, which we understand is to be supported largely by the Progressive party, took, it seems to me a rather peculiar stand. When an amendment is introduced into this House by any serious minded member, it is surely introduced in the hope that it will carry. If this amendment carries the effect of it, I think, must be apparent to hon. members opposite. I do not know that the question is as to whether or not there is an exact precedent for it, but the amendment, if carried, would be equivalent to an expression of want of confidence in the government, and that would mean immediate dissolution. Hon. members must know that this is so, and I have no doubt they will endorse my statement. In that case, we would find no fault whatever with them. But this is the position in which those who support the amendment, whoever they may be, would find themselves; they would force the government to the country before they had time to introduce a redistribution bill. I presume they have their reasons for such a desire, although they have not explained them. I presume they could explain if necessary. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, they would have to explain to those people who expect, and who are, by constitutional right entitled to greater representation when the redistribution bill is passed, and they would have to justify themselves in causing a dissolution and a general election before a redistribution bill had been passed. It seems to me that is very plain. Members from certain provinces expect additional representation. Their increase in population entitles them to it. There would have to be an adjustment of the representation in the cities. The representation of the city of Toronto, for instance, is based, I think, on a population of some 300,000. In the redistribution the representation would have to be based on a population, I think, of 507,000. Manitoba, I understand, would be entitled to an increase of some three or four members, and the province of Saskatchewan would have an increase of five members. How would these

[Mr. Raymond.]

hon. members answer the people who live in the cities and provinces if they brought about a general election, which postponed for five years the redistribution which would give them the additional representation to which they would be entitled?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does it not follow from the hon. member's reasoning that as long as the government neglects to pass a redistribution bill nobody should vote against it?

Mr. RAYMOND: If I understand the hon. member aright, he stated that as long as the government failed to pass a redistribution bill nobody should vote against them? The answer is that the government has not had an opportunity to pass a redistribution bill, and you would have an opportunity to vote against them after they had passed redistribution.

I think that it is worth while to bring this matter to the attention of hon. members opposite and the members of the House generally. It does not seem to me that it is a contentious question particularly. I think it is a very plain question. I do not observe any legal quibbles or anything of that kind in it. It is a plain proposition; it is common sense and good judgment. If an election is brought on before the redistribution bill is passed, certain parts of the country will not be represented, and it will not be the government that will be responsible, but it will be the hon. members who forced the government to resign and go out of office. That is plain enough.

Another matter has been alluded to in various ways, and the omission of it from the Speech from the Throne was referred to by more than one hon. member who spoke on the other side of the House. No particular reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the Near East troubles which occurred last September. The discussion on this question in the House and in the press rather tends to show what a variety of views may be taken of it. Some made it a ground of attack upon the government. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) in referring to it, described himself as a patriot and a lover of peace, and at the same time wished to place himself with those who would condemn the government because they avoided war. It was a position which was hard for me to follow, as were other things in the hon. member's address. I thought, however, that it was very difficult to see how a man could be a lover of peace, a conscientious man and a patriot, and at the same time find fault because war had been avoided by the government of the country in con-