

Mr. BLACKMORE: I was giving certain details in answer to questions asked me, otherwise I should not have been speaking along that line for more than a minute. The idea is being put forward that we would be better off if we could centralize control in this dominion, and one reason given why the privy council has generally put us into the "morass" is that it has decentralized power, which, we are told, is one of the reasons why we should abolish appeals to the privy council. If my argument is not pertinent to that question, then I am afraid I am unable to reason straight. It is strictly pertinent to the argument brought forward by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) and by many others. They have repeatedly stressed the fact that the privy council, by interpreting certain sections of the British North America Act and giving greater and greater power to the provinces, have thereby put us into a position in which it is impossible for this parliament to carry on. Therefore the privy council have completely confused the issue here; therefore we should abolish the appeal to the privy council. Is not that one of the arguments which have been advanced? And in dealing with that we have to show that the mere fact that absolute control will return to Canada is not necessarily an evidence that all things will be managed aright. I hasten along, not desiring to digress, because there are several other observations I have to make on this question, the pertinence of which I think no one can challenge.

Take the matter of tariff; the tariff structure of this dominion has been so arranged that the province of Manitoba is paying \$9,274,000 a year more than it is getting; Saskatchewan is paying \$25,000,000 more; Alberta is paying \$19,000,000 more, while Ontario is receiving \$51,000,000 more than it is giving. And all that has been done under the jurisdiction of a body which had absolute control over everything pertaining to tariff in Canada and which should have sat as an umpire seeing that every province got a fair deal.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the authority for that statement?

Mr. BLACKMORE: The present Minister of Labour (Mr. Rogers). This hon. gentleman is an authority, especially when his brief is in the records of a royal commission of this dominion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That was before he became a cabinet minister.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes. I look on the hon. minister as an exceedingly fine man, one whose judgment is worthy of acceptance on any practical question, a man for whom I have the highest regard. His finding is worthy of the respect of everyone in Canada.

Probably I had better not deal with any other point than relief and unemployment. No doubt what we have been saying here during the last few days shows what Ottawa will do in matters over which we have absolute control in this country. Of course hon. members will say, "Oh, we have not control over the provinces." But I have never yet seen any province refuse to take money, if offered without too many strings. We hear reports of certain provinces not accepting money, but usually there was a string tied to such money.

I do not wish to delay the house any longer. I shall say a good deal more by and by on these subjects, because it must be said. We are seeking the reason for the strains and stresses now so apparent. Does any hon. member want to know the reason for the United Farmers of Alberta movement in Alberta? They were fighting for the right to live. Do hon. members want to know why there is a social credit movement in Alberta? They are fighting for the right to live. We talk about fascism and communism as though these things were a visitation of some supreme power over which we have no control, instead of a malady generated by conditions which we have allowed to develop. They are a result of certain causes, and we are not removing the causes. Right in this house lies the power to remove the cause. So I shall say a good deal more about these matters as we go along.

With respect to the bill, I think hon. members have gathered pretty well from what I have said that I agree in the main with the hon. member who spoke last (Mr. Pottier). I am not going to say just how accurate the decision rendered by the privy council was in each case, but to a most astonishing degree those decisions have agreed with the judgment of the supreme court of this country. That was shown clearly by figures cited this afternoon by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). What more would one ask? I do not wish to be mean in any way, but a man cannot help having a suspicion. I noticed that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George became agitated about this whole question of appeals to the privy council right after the decision regarding those three acts—

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. member does not know the personal history of the member for