

says to us: You are only the representatives of the people; hand over the treasury to my care.

It is a peculiar coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that we should just be passing the Ides of March. Caesar was a man of exceptional brain power, perhaps the brainiest man in Europe. So large was his brain that natural birth was impossible. He became dictator of Rome, and the politicians, suspecting that he would acquire complete control of the government, had him put to death on the 15th of March. The Roman governors were afraid that Caesar would get absolute control of the treasury, but Caesar perhaps had qualities to recommend him for such a high position. The temples were filled with his statues; everywhere laurels were heaped upon him. He had won victory after victory. All nations were at his feet. He was put to death by his best political friends, not that they loved Caesar less, but they loved Rome more. But I do not think the present Prime Minister has won so many laurels. He was handed the gift of an election by the people, but that was something passive, not active. There is a vast contrast between Caesar and the present Prime Minister. This attempt to take control of the expenditure away from the people has been made time and again in British history. The Stuart sovereigns wished to have control of the British treasury, and in consequence of the struggle that ensued one of the Stuart kings lost his life. We find the same thing coming up in connection with the family compact. We all remember the misery which it caused to the poorer classes of the people in this country, but after a long struggle the people in Canada, with the aid of the British government, got control of the treasury. We say, Mr. Speaker, that having gone through that struggle, history should not be repeated here to-day, but we are being asked now to hand control of the treasury over to one individual. No; we firmly believe in the principle that the people who pay the taxes should have absolute control. People should vote for their own pockets.

Speaking of the money that was appropriated for unemployment relief last session, I wonder if hon. gentlemen observed that out of every \$100 spent, only \$30 went to the labouring men. That just shows how leaks can occur in public expenditures. It would be interesting to know where the other seventy per cent went. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Beynon) spoke as if some of it went to some of the Liberals who had charge of administering these funds in different

[Mr. Blair.]

parts of the country. Certainly it did not look good to some of us that seventy per cent of the money should go to the white collars and only thirty per cent to the labouring men.

Mr. TURNBULL: Is it not a fact that seventy per cent was spent largely for materials which in turn were the products of the labouring man?

Mr. BLAIR: I am not sure that seventy per cent went into materials, but no doubt a considerable part of it did. I understand that in British Columbia many of the materials and supplies are lying around and have never been used. I have it on good authority that a great many of the tools, for instance, were never used, but were given over to individuals. But no doubt some of the seventy per cent went into the purchase of supplies.

Speaking about wages, I would refer to the cut that was under discussion here in this house the other day. The general principle was not altogether right. The first suggestion was that there should be a horizontal cut of ten per cent in all civil service salaries. Then at the request of some hon. members that proposal was changed so that the smaller salaries were cut only five per cent. That principle should have been carried still further, so that those receiving salaries of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars should be subjected to a greater percentage of reduction than those drawing salaries or indemnities of four thousand dollars. I also believe that the mounted police and the naval and militia staffs should have received the same cut as the rest of the service, and that judges should have had their salaries cut just as much as members of parliament.

The Prime Minister in his attitude towards labour shows plainly that he does not understand the poorer classes. It may not be his fault. Perhaps he has not had any experience with them. To understand people you have to sit where they sat; you have to have had similar experiences. The Prime Minister and this government have a tendency to hand to the poor a bowl of soup or some food. There is too much of the attitude of "take that and go." What the government is doing to-day makes no provision for the future. It is an improvident way of looking after the unemployment situation. We do not think Canada can keep up this incessant giving. Of course we must necessarily feed those who are in need, but we should look to the future and take steps to obviate as much as we can a repetition of present conditions. In this country we are blessed with vast resources, and surely