

—but they agreed with the principle of repayment of an advance by promissory note. Both said they did not want to get anything for nothing, that they wanted to pay for what was advanced to them. They added that all the farmers they knew in their district were of the same opinion.

Yet this is quoted as purporting to deny what the Prime Minister said about this taking of notes being at the instance of the people themselves. That is the best story they could make out.

As to the right to take such notes, the ex-Minister of Agriculture, the other night held the act up and said: Where in this act is there any authority to take a lien note? Where in this act are there provisions for seed grain liens? He referred to the fact that he had consulted the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and that the latter had assured him there was no such provision in the act. Need it be stated to the house again that property and civil rights are entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces; that this relief is being given to the provinces; that the money is being sent out there and paid to those people through the provinces; that they have passed the legislation respecting seed grain liens, and that any man who pays money has, under the law of Canada, the right to get a promissory note if he wants one? Frankly, I think he was putting a little more than was right on the shoulders of the ex-Minister of Justice, and from the aspersions of his colleague I would rescue the reputation of the ex-Minister of Justice.

There is only one other point with which I want to deal. A good deal has been said by the other side about the matter of cooperation. Whenever we mention that, they say: You do it in this way and we will cooperate. That is rather characteristic of the Liberal party; they believe they govern this country by divine right, and that they have a right to govern it whether they are in opposition or on this side of the house. Consequently, when they go over there they say: We will cooperate with you if you will govern the country in the way we tell you to, and on no other basis will we cooperate. In other words, they say: Whether we are on the government benches or in opposition we are going to be the government or there is going to be no cooperation and there is to be no passing of the business of the house in a reasonable time and in a reasonable way.

That is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. The people of Canada, and particularly of western Canada, are not going to forget the attitude of the opposition when they say: You have to put through this relief measure

in the way we tell you or it is not going through the house without a great deal of delay.

Mr. J. K. BLAIR (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat says that this side of the house believes in divine right. I am inclined to think that is true, but we believe in the divine right of vox populi, vox Dei—the voice of the people is the voice of God. We do believe in divine right, but we do not believe in the divine right of any individual.

The issue before us is an old one. It has arisen in every age and in every country. It is simply a matter of who shall control the treasury of Canada. We do not believe the representatives of the people should hand over control of the treasury to one individual. It is bad enough when the Conservative party as a whole has control of it, but it will be very bad if one individual has control. On this side of the house we are prepared immediately to vote to the government any reasonable sum they will suggest, but to give absolute control of the treasury so that he, the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) can use that money when, where, how and as much as he wishes, is not Liberalism and is not in harmony with the British constitution. I cannot understand how any individual could ask for such power. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a school section, a township, or any organized body of men saying to one individual: Here, you take charge of all these moneys that we vote, and spend them how, when, where and as much as you please. While the government has no doubt power to vote this legislation through the house, under the pretence of an emergency measure, we would not be true to ourselves or to the British constitution, to Canadian traditions or to the spirit of our fathers, we would indeed be traitors to the constituencies that sent us here and would write down our names in disgrace in Canadian history, if we allowed a measure of this kind to go through without lodging a strong protest. Often there has been observed in this country a tendency to remove control of expenditure from the people who pay the taxes. We find that same tendency in the school sections and in the townships and counties. We have noticed it in our home districts for years. I have always earmarked it as a Conservative tendency, and now I am sure that it is, because right at the summit, here in the federal capital, we find the Prime Minister asking that this domineering role of having complete control of the treasury be assigned over to him. He in effect simply