

Here we have this beautiful spectacle. A minister of the crown's presentation of the tariff of this federal authority; this tariff which he averred was enhancing prices, tiring out the consumer by an unreasonable burden that he could not carry and survive, made the basis of redistribution of legislative powers on the recommendation of a royal commission that his government appoints. Now, sir, since when was it the habit of a government to appoint a commission and then prepare the ammunition with which to destroy the value of its work? Since when was it regarded as sound, both from the standpoint of the country as a whole and from that of individual provinces, to have the case prepared by one member of the government made the basis of the case against the policies of the government itself? That is the story. But when the Prime Minister in the speech from the throne asks his excellency to indicate that:

The strains and stresses which economic and social developments since confederation have placed upon Canada's governmental structure have disclosed the necessity for adjustments—

I ask him now and I ask the government whether or not they are, in the face of what is before us, going to abandon this tariff? Is it to be abandoned? Has the Minister of Labour no further use for tariffs in his position as minister and, if so, why does he whose statement is the foundation of the claim before the Rowell commission remain a member of the government? I do not know. But what I do know is that this statement, this brief of his, is the basis of the claim made upon this federal power in the four western provinces, and I assume it probably will be in the provinces by the sea.

Let us go a step further. Why have we to-day the disharmony that at present exists in this confederation? Has there ever been a day in the history of confederation in which there has been such lack of unity as exists to-day? Do hon. members recall the great Toronto gathering just before the last general election when there was broadcast from the eight provinces the demand for another Liberal government? The happy family! They could not have foreseen the C.I.O. and Beauharnois and other such matters in their true light. They could not have foreseen the shortage of power—they may have foreseen a shortage of ammunition. But, let us ask ourselves this question: Is it right or just or fair that they should complain of this lack of unity and harmony in this confederation when

[Mr. Bennett.]

they have themselves laid the foundation for it? Take our western provinces, take Alberta and Saskatchewan; when they were made into provinces they were told that they were not to have their natural resources, that they should be paid a sum of money for them. There were those of us who said: This is not adequate, it is not proper, you are not going to have one province of one kind and another of another kind. In the end that view prevailed, and the government of that day brought down an agreement by which they left with the provinces the money that they took in lieu of resources and also turned the resources over, and then provided that they could make a claim for the resources they lost between the time they got paid for the whole and the time they got part of them. That commission made a report indicating millions of dollars to go to Saskatchewan, millions of dollars to Alberta; and in the case of Manitoba just before the election will anyone ever forget how the Prime Minister of that day, the Prime Minister of to-day, handing over this cheque for over four million dollars, indicated what a fine thing it was to have a government that was prepared thus to remember with this little nest-egg the little province of Manitoba? There is the story. Is it any wonder there is difficulty? Other provinces of course found themselves in a position of inferiority with respect to receipts from the dominion, and what happened? We had the Duncan commission and the Duncan report.

Mr. DUNNING: It preceded the one my right hon. friend has just referred to.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it came before, but if by using the words "we had," it was intended to indicate that it was after, I correct that. You had the Duncan report from the maritime provinces, and that report gave certain financial benefits to the provinces by the sea with a provision that they could be heard before a commission with respect to additional sums. They were heard by the late government, and a report was made that they were entitled under the terms of that document to additional sums.

So you have the maritimes and you have the three western provinces, but British Columbia was untouched. Why? Mr. Justice Martin was appointed to report with respect to railway lands, and the railway lands were turned over to British Columbia. But did you ever look at the figures as to receipts by British Columbia as compared with the other provinces? In the end the government of Canada paid to British Columbia on account, in order to make it