

great city of Winnipeg, before a gathering of his Tory friends, no doubt. He is reported as follows:

The Hon. Robert Rogers, a former colleague of Sir Robert Borden, who claims that he was the first to propose Union Government, says that the Union Government is "a Government of tinkers and jobbers, a Government of second-hand dealers, their energies almost entirely devoted to second-hand theories that are the product of the diseased brain of some poor unfortunate uplifter."

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Who is the uplifter?

Mr. McKENZIE: There are so few uplifters in the Government that it is not hard to place him. I will leave it to the jury to put their finger on the uplifter. I do not agree, however, with Mr. Rogers that the uplifter has any diseased brain. I think his brain is very active. It is not so much the brain that is at fault, as the channels in which that brain is directed. We might ask Mr. Rogers a few questions: What position, for instance, he held in the Tory Party. He would answer that he was Minister of the Interior, and later, Minister of Public Works, and that he stood high in the counsels of that party.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Also minister of elections.

Mr. McKENZIE: If we ask him why he left the party he would refer us to his letter of resignation which we all remember very well, and which appears on Hansard, in which he said that he was leaving because he wanted to get from under the crash that was coming in this country, due to the inaction and lack of ability in the Government of which he was a member. That was the reason he gave for leaving. In the face of that evidence I would ask my right hon. friend who leads the Government if it is not time he took serious thought as to whether this Government is such a substantial structure as he would seem to think it. If it is my privilege and my duty to address this House, it is also my duty and my privilege to warn my right hon. friend that this structure with which he is so satisfied is but a house built upon the sand which, when the storm comes and the rains descend and strike upon it will fall, and great will be the fall thereof. If he chooses to stay in that house after I have warned him, and prefers not to dig around a little and put stones under the corner to prop it up a little, when the crash comes and he loses his political life he will not be able to blame me.

Referring a little further to the speech of my right hon. friend, he was very sore,

very sorrowful, and in great pain apparently, about the lack of sympathy in this country with public men, and particularly with prime ministers. As he was speaking I could not help asking myself, Is this a real Damascene conversion or is it a mere moment of weakness? I remembered, as we all remember, that there were times when he was not so sympathetic with prime ministers as he is now. Be that as it may, it was somewhat peculiar that from speaking of the lack of sympathy with prime ministers he immediately turned to birds and eggs in a nest. I presume, however, he will sometime explain how these thoughts were conceived. Now, there were some remarks in the Rt. hon. gentleman's speech with reference to ministers, and it is only well that his observations should be fairly and properly answered. He brought the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) severely to task for suggesting that ministers of the Crown should be in their seats. There may be, and I am sure there are, occasions when the business of the country demands that ministers shall not be in their seats but shall be attending to matters of importance elsewhere. I cannot conceive, however, of any circumstances that can render it impossible for a minister of the crown at some part of the day during the session of parliament to give some time, half an hour or an hour, to the proceedings of the House, particularly in the early stages of the sittings, so that any hon. member who was desirous to ask questions of the minister might have an opportunity to do so, in order that all necessary information might be vouchsafed the public. That is all that the leader of the Opposition meant, and I think it is only fair, if we are to have responsible government at all and if the operations of government departments are to be known to the public through the proper channel, that at some time during the day—not every day perhaps, although that would be highly desirable if it were possible—ministers of the crown should be in their places to answer such questions as might be properly put to them in regard to the administration of the affairs of their departments. Now, in regard to the position of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) possibly my right honourable friend (Sir George Foster) did not quite clearly apprehend the observations of the leader of the Opposition, and I feel that some explanation is necessary concerning his remarks anent the absence of the Prime Minister. I am sure that I myself, as a Nova Scotian,