

resources of those provinces so that it could administer them "for the purposes of Canada," according to the act, which is 4-5 Edward VII, chapter 42. In other words, they wanted to develop that western country according to national needs, and kept control of our resources so that those provinces could not in any way interfere with what was being done. Immigrants were brought in and settled on Western farming land; advertising campaigns were carried in order to bring people to western Canada, and Saskatchewan and Alberta had nothing to say in the matter. Those people came and worked hard, made homes and became good citizens, and they have a right to look to the federal government at this time. Surely the federal government has an obligation to us, having destroyed our markets and almost ruined us by virtue of a high tariff policy, further having taken \$229,000,000 from us in the period after the war by deliberate monetary policy. Have we not a right to come to this parliament and say that we need a reasonable measure of help in our present day of trouble?

The present government realized the position I have outlined, that confederation was not working fairly to the prairie provinces. It has set up a commission, namely the Rowell commission, which is going into that matter carefully. I submit that until that commission has reported and until we know what it proposes should be done to redress the unfairness to western Canada due to federal governmental policies, it is unfair to say this government is not doing anything to redress that unfairness. That is not the question before the house to-day—namely as to whether or not that unfairness is being redressed. That matter is being argued out before a royal commission. It will be time enough for my hon. friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Social Credit party, if the government does not act properly under the report of the royal commission, to claim then that the government has not acted fairly towards western Canada in respect to those matters. So I say that is not the issue so far as these bills are concerned. It is not an issue as to whether or not unfairnesses to western Canada are being fully redressed. The simple issue is, are these good bills or are they not?

There is another matter to which I must refer—I would not be fair to myself and my earnest convictions if I did not mention it in my speech. I believe this country would not be poorer if it gave our farmers on the western plains the means to buy things the rest of Canada could produce in their present idle factories and with their present idle men. I believe that out there in the west we need

[Mr. Tucker.]

better houses to protect us against the weather, especially in the winter. We need more in the way of clothing, to clothe our children so that they may not suffer from the cold in our hard winters. We need more in the way of household furnishings. Then, too, our people in the west have as much right to motor-cars, radios and other luxuries of life as have people in any other part of Canada. We know the people of western Canada work as hard and as intelligently as any other people. I believe that if the rest of Canada has the ability to produce in its present idle factories with its idle workers the things we need, it would be much better for those idle workers to be busy producing those goods needed so badly by our people than to be kept in idleness.

I believe that by the use of state or national credit placed in the hands of our western farmers on an acreage basis whereby they could buy things the rest of Canada can produce, we would not in any way be lessening the wealth of this country. On the contrary we would be increasing it. That is one justifiable use of state credit or national credit. I would not be fair to my present views—and I say this from my place in the House of Commons—if I did not say that after listening to the governor of the Bank of Canada I am more convinced than ever that a great improvement can be worked in our economic system by a change in the use and the issue of credit by our government. However, that is not the issue before the house at the moment. That issue will have to be fought out at some other time. The people of Canada will have to be convinced of the wisdom of such procedure before any policy can be based upon it.

An hon. MEMBER: The west is.

Mr. TUCKER: But that is not the issue before the house. That is a condition which can be brought into force only when the whole of Canada has been convinced as to its wisdom. I, for one, will not get up and rail against the Minister of Agriculture because my ideas of monetary policy are not carried into play in every bill which comes before the house. We are confronted with the definite question: Are these bills good or are they not? The question is not, do they meet my monetary views? It is not, do they redress all the troubles of western Canada? but, are these good bills?

That is, I think, the proper way to approach the question. I do not demand a complete upset of the system over-night. I do not say this: "Even if this is a good step forward, I am going to vote against it, because it does not go all the way at once." Under our British