

did not rub shoulders with one or the other of them could not possibly be equal to the task of filling a position in the ministry as it ought to be filled.

I am afraid my hon. friend is not as widely read in social movements and reforms as he ought to be. Speaking of labour, as I think of some of the names that in the past have stood out as beacon lights in the path of reform there comes to my mind first of all the name of Lord Shaftesbury. Lord Shaftesbury has been upheld in all countries as one whose life was devoted to the welfare of the working classes. He was not himself a working man, and most extraordinary of all perhaps is the fact that he was a member of the House of Lords. That at the time was going about as far in the other direction as anyone could possibly go. But according to my hon. friend's doctrine, Lord Shaftesbury would not have made a good minister of labour because he was not a working man; nor would he have made a good minister of agriculture because he had not been brought up on a farm.

I might mention many other names, but I might refer to one name that stands out as perhaps few others in the history of the world, the name of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. He belonged to the same profession as my hon. friend. He was a lawyer. But he had a heart and soul for the well-being of the masses of the people, as great as that of any man who ever lived. Take the Prime Minister of Great Britain to-day. He is neither a farmer nor a working man, but will anyone say that Mr. Churchill is devoid of sympathy for the masses of the people, devoid of any knowledge of their interests, and that the sort of talents that Mr. Churchill possesses are not the talents very much needed by men, women and children on farms, in the workshop and everywhere else to-day?

Let me mention another name which my hon. friend very naturally is fond of citing, and which comes equally to the minds of all of us. What about the present President of the United States, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt? Mr. Roosevelt also belongs to the legal profession. He is a lawyer. Will anyone say that Mr. Roosevelt has not played his full part in the public life not only of his own country but of the world, and that he lacks sympathy for and understanding of the lot of those who work with their hands, those who work on the farm, in the forests, in the mines, on the railways, or in the workshops, or those who go down to the sea in ships? Did it, I wonder, occur to my hon. friend that he was reflecting on every leader his party has had

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

with the exception of two? There have been eight Conservative Prime Ministers in Canada's history, and with the exception of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who was a journalist, and Sir Charles Tupper, who was a doctor, all the rest have been lawyers. Did my hon. friend think, when he was speaking, of the friend who is sitting immediately to his left and who so generously provided him with the seat he occupies to-day? That hon. gentleman is also a lawyer. I imagine he has sympathy with labour and with the farmers. He has always told me he had, and I believe he has. I cannot imagine that he would be ruled out of a position in any government if his party ever came back into office.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope my right hon. friend is not being unduly exercised over something which I said with respect to the inclusion of more farmers and labour men in the government. I was very careful, as my hon. friend knows, not to make any reflection on any other members of the government or on these two gentlemen. I simply made it clear that I thought it would strengthen the government to have more farmers and labour men among its number, and I wish to make that clear to the Prime Minister in case he is under some misapprehension.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not under any misapprehension. When it comes to choosing men for government I believe the first essential is character, and that what above all else the people desire in their representatives in a government is heart and brains. These are the qualities which I believe count for most in public life. Nor should my hon. friend rule himself out of any future cabinet because he, too, is a lawyer. I think he does possess broad sympathies, but he should not seek to trade on them for political purposes.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think my right hon. friend, in all fairness to me, should withdraw that because I did not have any such design in mind. I was not trying to make political capital, and I think my right hon. friend has overdrawn the picture.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can see I have touched a tender spot, and as my hon. friend has taken on new duties I certainly wish to assure him that I was not reflecting upon him. But he took great care to call attention to the fact that in order to merit the support of labour and of the farming community it was very desirable that one should belong to one or other of these classes.