

miraculous about his marvellous success; it was quite a natural result from the qualities which he possessed.

I set down as my first point that Mr. King was endowed by nature with a keen, sound and unusually powerful intellect. Thus, he had the capacity to reap the fruits of long training and great experience. The combined result of such ability and experience was wisdom.

As my second point I said that Mr. King had an abiding faith in the efficiency of right, together with a clear grasp of what is right and a genuine desire to do what is good for all mankind. From that it followed that his impulses were sound. Men marvelled at the soundness of Mr. King's advice and the way in which his judgment was continually justified. Of course his judgment proved sound: the reason was that right was his pole-star, and when he laid a course through uncharted seas he always arrived in port because he took as his guiding star some high principle of truth, right, justice and humanity.

The third point which I noted was that even at the height of his fame the pomp of high office never affected his personality; he was always able to maintain a delightful humility—not the humility of Uriah Heep, but a genuine humility that kept him on the same level as those with whom he spoke. Power never spoiled Mackenzie King, nor did flattery ever turn his head.

He was genuinely kind-hearted, as I know from my own personal experience.

The leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) spoke of an occasion when, after opposing one of Mr. King's policies, Mr. King approached him in the same unruffled way as he would have done under other circumstances. I could reminisce for a long time, but I will only mention an instance which occurred while I was a member of the House of Commons and I had occasion to disagree with a resolution moved by Mr. King. One often hears about the "rule of the whip" and the "discipline of the party". On the occasion to which I refer, I, a back-bencher in the house, presumed to move a resolution opposed to that of my leader, who was also the government leader. My proposal was ruled out of order. A short time later I met Mr. King in the lobby, and we proceeded to discuss the question. I said, "I am sorry to have moved a resolution opposing yours, but I have to live with myself in the future". He replied, "But you were all wrong". We discussed the matter further, and parted the same good friends that we had been previously. Such an experience explains why Mr. Mackenzie King was able to gather around himself the most powerful political party in the history

of Canada. It was not because he had a well-disciplined following, but rather because his followers were loyal and capable, and could walk with him as well as after him. The faithfulness with which he worked, the industry which he devoted to his task, and the exclusiveness with which he gave himself to that task explains the success of the great leader whom we mourn today.

One of my main contacts with the late Mr. King was in connection with labour. I looked upon him then as the greatest Minister of Labour that Canada ever had, and I still hold that view, though there have of course been other great ministers of labour. Perhaps at this time I should mention the continuity of policy carried on within that department. Mr. King was made Minister of Labour because of his experience in dealing with humanity and because he had exposed certain outrages to working girls, chiefly some employed in the match trade. As a result of his ability and understanding of humanity he was chosen, first, by Sir William Mulock, to be Deputy Minister of Labour, and then, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to be Minister of Labour. All through the years he carried on his policy of careful, efficient and capable protection of human rights, particularly the rights of those least able to take care of themselves.

The labour portfolio has always been regarded as a tough one to handle. The Minister of Labour, ancient or modern, has always been involved in some labour dispute; and as it is his duty to be impartial, the tendency of both parties engaged in the battle has always been to think that the impartial man is taking the opposite side. These disputes are so absorbing that one is inclined to lose sight of the forest, so brilliantly lighted are the trees.

Mr. King commenced a policy of impartiality that was splendidly followed by another Minister of Labour, the late Honourable Humphrey Mitchell. We are missing both these men. The wisdom of Mackenzie King and his strong hand would be very welcome in Ottawa today, and the democracy, good will and ability of Humphrey Mitchell would be equally welcome. The late Humphrey Mitchell played a great part in the development of Canada in recent years. We all remember how during the war he kept our working population engaged in their tasks. It is true that war measures of an almost repressive character—we would certainly call them such in times of peace—were necessary during the war years; but Mr. Mitchell, with his genial character and common sense, and through the patriotic efforts of the people of Canada, was able to regiment the working force of this country as it had never been