

endorsing the course of the government of British Columbia in connection with the advocacy of better terms for this province. They hereby pledge themselves to strongly support the continuation of the struggle for better terms until brought to a successful issue, and the rights of the province fully secured.

Again in 1926, at the time the hon. member for Victoria was elected to the leadership of the Conservative party in that province, a series of resolutions were passed strongly advocating action endorsing the traditional policy of the party in connection with British Columbia's demand for better terms. I will not take time now to read these resolutions, which are to be found in the report. But immediately on the arrival of the hon. member for Victoria in Ottawa a resolution was placed on the order paper requesting the appointment of a commission, and to the credit of the government that commission was granted.

And now in closing may I ask the government not only that they carry out by legislation the findings of this commission, but that they give consideration to the equally important question of subsidies to the province. I believe this question has been discussed at different interprovincial conferences, and I venture to think it will be discussed at the next interprovincial conference. So far, however, nothing has been gained, and British Columbia remains the most unfairly treated of the provinces. I would remind you again, Mr. Speaker, of the great concessions which have been given to the two older sister provinces of the Dominion, Ontario and Quebec. Ontario, to-day, is practically two and a half times the size of that province at the time of confederation, while Quebec has increased to nearly four times the size it was then, notwithstanding that no quid pro quo has ever been given to the federal government. The lands whereby these two provinces have been increased are lands in which every other province in the Dominion has a proprietary interest, and I remind the house that, from these great additions that have been given to the two provinces in question, enormous revenues from royalties on minerals and forests have accrued to the provincial treasuries. I think that hon. members and the government will realize the fairness and the equity of British Columbia's claim to better consideration when it comes to a readjustment of the question of subsidies.

Mr. K. A. BLATCHFORD (East Edmonton): I hesitate to make my first speech in the House of Commons and I trust that hon. members will bear with me under the circumstances. I have no set speech to deliver, nor have I prepared anything particularly; but I take it for granted that I was elected to come here and give to the house my

opinion on questions as they appear to me. Naturally I shall spend most of my time discussing matters pertaining to western Canada. There are very few Liberals in the house from the west and I have been sometimes criticized for being absent on many occasions. Hon. members must bear in mind, however, that there are only two private Liberal members here from Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, so that when anybody wants to write to a Liberal he usually writes either to the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw) or to myself.

I regret very much not having heard the speech delivered the other day by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae). From a reading of the hon. member's address as reported in the newspapers and in Hansard it appears to be a masterpiece; and on paper the scheme suggested by the hon. gentleman seems on the surface to be a fine business proposition. Of course, when one says "three hundred millions" rapidly it does not strike one as being so enormous a sum. But when you undertake to collect \$300,000,000 from the people and the settlers of the country, I know one man at least who will object; and I know, besides, a lot of pioneer homesteaders in the west who will refuse to subscribe to such a proposition. I quite agree that the hon. member for Vancouver North could carry out such a project to a satisfactory conclusion; he is a big business man and has undertaken such schemes before. But I, like him, believe that the homestead law is the most obsolete, antiquated, old-fashioned piece of legislation on the statute books of Canada to-day. What do you suppose you have to do, under present regulations, to get 160 acres of land? You put up \$10 with the government against that 160 acres, on which you must sleep six months of the year; and you must do this for three years. You sleep on it six months of the year for three years, break fifteen acres, put up a shack, eat flapjacks, and finally come out a blithering idiot. It is not life; it is worse. The poor bachelor who goes there returns broken-hearted and broken in health, and the man who would take a woman to such a place to live under the conditions that obtain is not a man. I went through the mill and I know; I bet my \$10 against the 160 acres and I won. I did it to see whether it could be done. There are some homesteaders to-day who are prosperous men, who might say, "You do not know anything about farming now." Well, I may not know so much about it now, but I may say that I was born on a farm; I went to the west in a Red River cart, and I saw that country grow from a bald-headed