

if you read Hansard from one end to the other for the last four years you will find it is replete with innuendos and insinuations by the right hon. gentleman when he was addressing himself to members or supporters of the then government. He is an adept at insinuations. I know no other man in Canada who can do more insinuating and use more innuendos in argument than the present Prime Minister of Canada. I can give several examples of that. For instance, there are the insinuations he made in connection with the tariff board to the effect that they had no independence as a fact-finding body. He made insinuations even in regard to ministers of the crown; when he could not speak of them in a respectful manner he would insinuate that this and that were wrong; but the greatest insinuation I ever heard falling from the lips of any gentleman fell from the lips of the Prime Minister when years ago, seated as a supporter of the Conservative government in this house, he took upon himself to insinuate that one who did afterwards become his leader was a tool or instrument in the hands of Mackenzie and Mann. All through the speeches for the last four years, Hansard is replete with insinuations of this nature. It seems to me to be a case of a thief crying "Stop thief!" in order to cover up his own tracks.

He also referred to the absurdity of the argument advanced by the leader of the opposition when he stated that there was no necessity for the special session to vote relief to the unemployed. The Prime Minister said that a Governor General's warrant could not be issued. In 1926, what do we find? We find that the right hon. gentleman as Minister of Finance, if I mistake not, in the "shadow government" recommended and approved the issue by governor general's warrants of \$55,000,000. Why could he not do the same thing in regard to \$20,000,000 to relieve the emergency situation in the Dominion of Canada last fall? I feel my time has expired and I do not wish to trespass any longer upon the patience of the house.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues who have spoken, I should like to extend my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Cormier) and the seconder (Mr. Porteous) of the address, as well as to some of the younger members who have also spoken in the house for the first time. Not being acquainted with the French language, I was unable to understand what the mover of the address said, and I have not yet had the privilege of reading a translation. I listened, however, to the address of the seconder and also to the speech last night by the hon. member

for Stormont (Mr. Shaver), and I should like to congratulate those young men on the facility with which they were able to express themselves. I make the confession that although this is my tenth session I have never been able to feel completely at home on the floor of the House of Commons.

I was interested particularly in the address of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Pickel), who is no longer a young man, since I see in the Parliamentary Records that he has contested a good many elections in his district, but I could not help thinking of the contrast between the views expressed by him and those expressed by former representatives of that old constituency of Brome, the Hon. Sidney Fisher and the Hon. Andrew McMaster. I see also by the Parliamentary Guide that the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi is a physician. I was not able to determine whether he was a homeopathist or not. Some things led me to believe he might be, while others made me think he was not. Proceeding on the theory that a cure is effected by taking a hair of the dog that bit you, I thought he must be a homeopathist, but by the magnitude of the doses he prescribed I could not help thinking otherwise, for his cry is for more and more tariff, on the assumption, apparently, that if much is good more is better.

The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) called the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that there was not in the House of Commons a minister of labour. It had already been brought to our notice that there is also not a minister serving in the capacity only of minister of finance. It seems strange that such a situation should prevail in view of the large numbers of members opposite, and I have frequently had called to my mind a story that, I think, illustrates the situation. The principal of a theological college, when giving his students lectures on pastoral theology, used to talk to them somewhat in this strain. He reminded them with what circumspection they should treat the women of their congregation, treating the old women as mothers and the young women as sisters. He would conclude his remarks in this way: "For you know there are always lots of women in the congregation who think they would make good ministers' wives." I am sure there are plenty of members opposite who think they would make good cabinet ministers. Indeed, I have in mind two or three hon. gentlemen sitting down towards the other end of the chamber who, I think, would look much happier than they have been able to do since they have been in the house if they had been honoured!