

extra indemnity which at the time of the original withholding of the resources was given to the provinces concerned. One would think by the emphasis and the advertisement given to this action on the part of the Administration that it was a new and wholly original thought.

The House, of course, is aware that for ten years that precise proposal has been before the western provinces. It was made ten years ago by the then Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden. It was repeated afterwards, repeated by myself specifically in 1920, when I attained the premiership, in letters to the prime ministers of the western provinces. But from the first the proposal has been rejected; it was rejected in 1911, and every year since, and it stands rejected to-day. I do not know what value there is in making the proposal once more, nor do I quite understand the complacency evidenced by language which indicates that in making the proposal which in the past had been rejected, all eyes are turned to the future and to this "new method" of solution. It is true that that letter goes on to propose arbitration as a means of solution if this offer is again refused, but we have no intimation either in the letter of the Prime Minister to the three western provinces, and much less in the Speech from the Throne, of the nature of the arbitration that is to be conducted or the character of the tribunal that is to be erected.

As hon. gentlemen know—and no one knows it better than the Hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) for no one was more emphatic than he in the claim that he made when Prime Minister of the province of Quebec—the assertion has been persistently made on the part of British Columbia, on the part of the province of Quebec, on the part of the province of Ontario, and possibly more emphatically still on the part of the three Maritime Provinces, that they as provinces have a claim in respect of those resources, and have a claim particularly in regard to any adjustment of provincial subsidies that may be made as a result of the return of the natural resources. Is each of these provinces to be represented on this board of arbitration? Let the Prime Minister now make good his boast and tell this Parliament. Let us know, first, whether the province of Nova Scotia is to be represented, whether the province of British Columbia is to be represented, whether the province of Quebec is to be represented, and whether the province of Ontario. I do not know how there can be

an arbitration with their approval unless they are represented, and if there is to be an arbitration board on which all provinces are represented, on what principle and by what right is any such arbitration board going to assume functions that are essentially functions of the Parliament of Canada? All these provinces are represented here. They have sent their representatives to this Parliament. Why, the leader of the Government elected one of his supporters in this House, even the hon. member who succeeds him in the representation of the county of Prince, by advancing a claim on behalf of Prince Edward Island that that province had millions of dollars of interest in the resources of Western Canada. I read from an advertisement published under the heading "Why vote for MacLean?" Among other reasons, none of which appeal very strongly to those who have had experience in this House, the following is given:

Because by doing so you will be upholding your birthright in the public domain of the western provinces, in which millions of dollars are involved and justly coming to us, in spite of Mr. Crerar's contention and assertion to the contrary, and we can surely do with that money now.

Again I ask, are we to acquiesce in a proposal which proposes to erect a tribunal, composed of representatives of all the provinces, to be substituted for this tribunal in which the constitution vests responsibility for apportioning the rights and claims as among all the provinces of Confederation? Is Parliament to make that surrender? It is for this Government—this Government whose members for years criticised the late Administration because we were not able to get the representatives of the various provinces to agree upon any terms that would have been acceptable to Western Canada, and which belaboured us for the delay that intervened—to come to this Parliament with a proposal which they believe will commend itself to a majority, a proposal not for the abdication of the rights of this Parliament but for the assertion of those rights in solving a problem that Parliament alone can solve. Let the Prime Minister come down with a proposal that commends itself to a majority of Parliament, and then it will become the law of this land. But, is something to become the law of this land because it happens to commend itself to certain others selected by the Government to represent the constituencies of this country when it does not commend itself to those selected by the people to represent those consti-  
tuen-