

at Ottawa that corresponds to the Defence Committee in London, men who are honorable, expert in regard to a given matter, and who meet to discuss in an intelligent, detached and scientific way what should be done concerning the matters they have to deal with. Some such body at Ottawa to advise the Prime Minister is just what is needed. Our present Prime Minister is a marvel in many ways, but he wants to deal with all these matters himself and he is a hard man to get to take any advice.

The other day I heard a suggestion made that one or two bankers should see him and endeavour to make him see just where we are drifting. A prominent banker in the party said that he thought good would come of two men seeing Mr. Bennett, but if four appears Mr. Bennett would begin to perform, and if six men were present the circus would be in full swing. Our Premier, apparently, cannot resist the temptation, when he has half a dozen men present, to tell them just what he is going to do and where they are going to get off.

You mention Bill. I have not seen him for a year and a half, and outside of an invitation to visit him in Washington last November I have had no communication from him. As I intimated to you before, there are those who are fearful of Bill's influence. I do not know whom he sees when he comes to Canada. I doubt if he sees anyone except the Prime Minister and one or two personal friends in Ottawa. With the latter I am quite sure he discusses nothing of a political character.

I have not seen any press clippings from the Western papers, but somebody told me they were very critical of my suggestion. I have thought very little as to how my suggestion could be carried out, although I realise that it is impossible for Mr. Bennett and Mr. King to work in harmony in the same Cabinet. If they can't, then we should have to get along without them. The only thought that has come to me about the personnel of such a government is that Mr. Taschereau would have to be in it. Our Liberal friends will say that he does not count in federal politics in Quebec nearly as much as Mr. Lapointe. I see no reason why both of them should not be in a Cabinet.

I should be very much interested to hear what Mr. Daffoe would have to say. A number of correspondents have suggested to me what the composition of a Cabinet in a national government should be, but with none of the suggestions could I agree, although I have not said so in replying to them.

Please remember me kindly to my Winnipeg friends if you see any - Harold Aikens, the Rileys, Judge Montague, Hugh Osler, Sir Charles Tupper and the rest, and with all kind wishes to you,

I am,

Ever yours faithfully,