

*By Mr. Blackmore:*

Q. It might not do what?—A. It might not bring us closer together. It might not give us a better understanding. It might tend towards keeping us farther divided. Well, I do not know. We have not got it.

Q. May I interject a question?—A. We have not got a universal understanding, one with the other, that we ought to have.

Q. May I interject a question to guide you? Generally speaking, what has our British concept been—that you should have power centralized or that you should decentralize it so that the local community has more and more control over its affairs? Which is the more sound and democratic attitude to assume—to centralize power or decentralize it?—A. Is it your contention, Mr. Blackmore, that we ought to get sectional banking mediums in various parts of the dominion?

Q. I would lay down the principle that the power of control of currency and credit in respect of credit should be decentralized so that if Saskatchewan wants to make a loan to its farmers it does not have to come and get a Yes or No in Ontario or Quebec without any chance anyway of doing anything about it?—A. I do not think we will get to that place.

Q. We have got there now, I am afraid?—A. Unless you have complete control by the nation of itself, I think all we have to decide in that case would be whether the control would rest in Ottawa as you mentioned or whether it would continue to rest in one particular street in Montreal. That is the only difference I can see; the control is there.

Mr. FRASER (*Northumberland, Ont.*): That is not correct.

The WITNESS: That is not your opinion; it is mine.

Mr. FRASER (*Northumberland, Ont.*): From a factual standpoint it is not correct.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There might be contention about this, and we will avoid contention so that we can get somewhere.

*By Mr. Blackmore:*

Q. If Montreal is able to control Ottawa, does Saskatchewan want to put control of her financial interests entirely in Ottawa so that Montreal can control her too?—A. There are others who have disagreed on that point.

Q. I am not contending; I am examining.—A. I have mentioned several times that as an organization we adopted that as a policy. Don't make any mistake about it, I am not figuring that you are going to get there to-day, but there is a point we say we are aiming at, and as I look over the amendments that have been brought down we are moving up toward that end gradually. Some time we will get there.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: May I ask Mr. Blackmore some questions?

Mr. BLACKMORE: You had better ask them of Mr. Bickerton or through him; I think that is the more sound procedure. At least, it is better than asking me questions.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I will ask the chairman. In your reference to western Canada freight rates and your criticism of the present Board of Railway Commissioners, am I to understand from your criticism—

Mr. BLACKMORE: You had better say "implied criticism"; all I did was give facts.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Implied criticism—that we are to assume Saskatchewan would get a better deal if the commission were controlled by the C.P.R. directors?

Mr. BLACKMORE: It is very likely we would not get very much worse control, because the one case I gave you is so glaring as to shock almost any right minded person.