

ery in elections; and, I will not mention any names, but we have here in the House, gentlemen, or I might say, a gentleman, whose name is very frequently associated with the idea of corrupt practices in elections. The leader of the Government—I regret that he is not here to-night—goes to the prairie provinces and from every platform offers to the people a bribe of not less than \$200,000,000 if they will give him power and authority in this Dominion of Canada. I say no such corrupt proposition was ever placed before the people of Canada as was placed before the people of the prairie provinces during that campaign. The leader of the Government found then, and he will find when the next election comes, that the people of the prairie provinces are not for sale. I say it was a bribe, corruptly intended. It was not effective, so far as those provinces are concerned. But what will be said after to-night's debate, during which the Prime Minister was challenged here in his place in this House as to the promise he made, and refused either to implement the promise or to indicate that he ever will implement it? My hon. friends, on this and on frequent occasions, have used the argument, addressed to us on this side. 'You did the same.' I say that you may search the records of the Canadian Parliament during the regime of the late Government or any other government that ever held office in this Dominion, and you will not find the case of a Prime Minister who took the position that was taken to-day by the Prime Minister of Canada in this House. The question at issue is more than a question of natural resources; it is a question of good faith on the part of the Government of Canada. I say that, on the confession of the Prime Minister to-day, this Government of Canada has absolutely played false to its own pledges in one of the most important questions that it could possibly have undertaken to bring before the people of the country.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): It seems to me that we are spending more time in the discussion of this subject than the facts and circumstances of the matter warrant. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as is their custom, are not in this matter quite accurate as to the facts; they have become very enthusiastic and very eloquent upon false premises. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) became quite warm a moment ago in denouncing the Prime Minister for a breach of pledge, but it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite

mis-state what the pledge was. They have repeated over and over again to-night that the Prime Minister when in Opposition pledged an absolute and unconditional transfer of these lands to the different provinces. There is no evidence whatever that he did so. The Prime Minister said that he would transfer these natural resources to the provinces upon fair terms; hon. gentlemen opposite, in their speeches to-night, have left out these three words, 'upon fair terms.' The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) grew very heated over the matter, and said that the Prime Minister had made an absolute and unconditional pledge to transfer these lands to the provinces. That is not so, and there is no evidence that such is the case. It was a conditional pledge. If the words 'upon fair terms' had not been used, it would be implied, perhaps, that the provinces would accept the transfer and undertake to administer the lands without anything further being said about it, but these words, 'upon fair terms,' were used. Before hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with the Prime Minister of this country they should establish that the provinces have offered fair terms, and that the Prime Minister has refused to transfer the lands.

Mr. OLIVER: The provinces were not taking the initiative in the matter; it was the Prime Minister who took the initiative.

Mr. CROTHERS: He took the initiative by saying, in substance: I will transfer these natural resources to the different provinces upon fair terms.

Mr. OLIVER: It was up to the Prime Minister to say what he considered the fair terms to be.

Mr. CROTHERS: The provinces have not waited for him to make a proposal of that kind; they have proposed very unfair terms. The terms as contained in the document signed by the three premiers, as I understand them, are, in effect: We want to retain the money that we got for these lands in 1905, and get the land too. That is the only offer and those are the only terms proposed by the various provinces interested in this matter. The premiers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta say: We desire you to transfer these natural resources to us, and we will keep the money we got in lieu of these natural resources in 1905. The Prime Minister said: I will transfer these natural resources to the provinces upon fair terms, but no fair terms have been offered; on the