

Mr. McNEVIN: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are here to discuss the Bank Act. Should we not go on with it?

Mr. BLACKMORE: We are discussing the Bank Act from the standpoint of government ownership.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: My second question is this: in your question you make use of the phrase "the self interest of the central provinces". I wonder if you could tell us just who you have in mind when you speak of the central provinces?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Just who in Ontario and Quebec? Are you thinking of the farmers or the workers of Ontario and Quebec, the industrialists of Ontario and Quebec or the government of Ontario and Quebec? Just who does put forth this self interest in the central provinces?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I say it is the economic going concern activities of Ontario and Quebec. The system under which we are operating to-day—the competitive system, without any adjustment—naturally brings those provinces into competition with the other provinces. For example, take the matter of canning. It is probably not greatly in the interest of the canning concerns in Ontario that Alberta's canning industry should develop so far that it supplies not only the whole Alberta market but begins to compete with the Ontario canners and manufacturers.

Mr. FRASER (*Northumberland*): What has all this to do with the Bank Act?

Mr. CLEAVER: What assistance has any government ever given to canners? Why have not the Alberta canners the same opportunity as the Ontario canners?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am afraid if I answer that question—which I am ready to answer—it will draw us away from the point with which we are concerned.

Mr. CLEAVER: Why bring it up if you are not prepared to face up to it?

Mr. BLACKMORE: - I brought it up to show Mr. Noseworthy what I had in mind.

Mr. FRASER (*Northumberland*): How long is this debating society going on?

*By Mr. Blackmore:*

Q. I think Mr. Bickerton will see from illustrations that have been given that mere government ownership does not guarantee equitable administration?—A. No.

Q. The reason I raise that point is that I think the chief objection of your organization, as it prepared its brief, is to the inequitableness of the administration under private banking concerns. You can see how your fundamental argument is undermined by that simple illustration?—A. I do not want you to run away with the idea that we dare to suggest that if ever this was done and if what we think of is achieved—

Q. If whatever what is done?—A. The public ownership and administration of banks—that the troubles of all civilization and of Canada will be solved. We still have a lot of ground to cover.

Q. I am not implying that. What we are examining—you and I whose boys are fighting in this war and whose grandsons will fight in the next one if we do not do the right thing—what we are concerned about is to determine a set-up under which we are likely to have a better chance of working out our difficulties; we are not advocating solutions at all; we are working on great principles. That is why I am discussing this matter now?—A. It is very important at the present time because we are in a state of very intensive