

time yet. But it will be reciprocity not merely in natural products of the farm; as a quid pro quo the United States Government will demand also reciprocity in certain lines of American manufactured goods. That is the reciprocity deal that we shall get, if we get any. Therefore I say that the manufacturers of Canada are the class that will suffer the most in the future for not having accepted the reciprocity proposal of 1911, that did not touch them or hurt them at all.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: Would the honourable member allow me to ask him a question?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: I am interested in the speech of the honourable member. In case the United States refuse to give us reciprocity, what shall we do then? Shall we open our markets to them?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Yes. Surely my honourable friend would not advise that if we cannot get reciprocity we should say to the United States, "You cannot sell any goods in Canada." What would that be doing for the farmer and the workingman? It would be putting the farmer in the position of having to buy any goods used on the farm at any price the home manufacturer chose to ask. Under the conditions which my honourable friend from Mille Iles (Hon. Mr. David) mentioned, my suggestion would be—and this is part of the Progressive policy—that we should lower the duties on all goods coming in from Great Britain; we should increase the preference to Great Britain; or, if the Americans shut out everything from Canada, then we might go so far as to say, "We will open our markets absolutely free to Great Britain." For if the United States shut out our farm products where are we going to find a market for them? They must go to Britain and to Europe. That would be my suggestion as to the best way to meet the condition, and it is quite possible that the condition mentioned by my honourable friend from Mille Iles may come about. However, I have not very much fear of it coming about.

One thing I notice has not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. There is no word about redistribution. I can understand that that does not effect a great many people in Canada; but I would like this House to remember that, until we have a redistribution, the West, like all other parts of Canada, is represented in the

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF.

House of Commons on the basis of the census of 1911. That was taken eleven years ago. We on the prairies would be entitled to, I think, twelve or thirteen new members. If we had had redistribution before the election, as we should have had, there would probably have been nearly that many more Progressives from the Western Provinces. My opinion is, and I suggest it to my honourable friend the leader of the Government, that a redistribution Bill should be brought down at this Session. We do not know what may happen. The Government have not a majority, and they have to depend on the Conservative party or on the Progressives in the House of Commons. They need help from one or the other or they cannot continue. I think it would be good policy to pass a redistribution Bill at this Session. It would probably take only two or three days, for there is now no party in Canada, whether Liberal, Conservative or Progressive, that would try to pass an unfair redistribution Bill. That fact was made plain enough in the returns at the last election. My honourable friend the leader on this side of the House (Hon. Sir James Lougheed) pointed out yesterday that it took 18,000 Conservatives to elect a member of the House of Commons, while it took only 11,000 Liberals or 11,800 Progressives to elect a member. So I suggest that a Bill be brought down. It could be referred to a committee, and the committee would lick it into shape. Only two or three days time would be required for the House of Commons to pass it. Then we should be ready for anything that might happen. My honourable friend the leader of the Opposition—if I may call him so, in spite of what the leader of the Government said yesterday—lamented that, although his party had not been at all to blame and had done everything right, yet the different interests went against them. He mentioned as one instance that they had voted \$20,000,000 for the education of farmers, and still the farmers had voted against them. I want to ask my honourable friend from Calgary if he really thought that by educating the farmers they would be induced to vote Conservative.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Their vote shows want of education.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: My honourable friend (Hon. Sir James Lougheed), as his next point, complained of the great newspapers of Canada going against the party as they did. He complained also of the big interests, of the manufacturers of Can-