

that he was a Progressive of some kind, and that this criticism of him was all ill-conceived. He does not seem to accept the new situation with that grace which a man so long in public life might well be expected to display. He is still smarting under defeat. From 1908, when he entered Parliament under the patronage of Hon. Robert Rogers, until 1921, my right hon. friend had a wonderful period of political success. He made the mistake, however, when Sir Robert Borden retired from the premiership, of proceeding to usurp the control of public affairs. Everyone who recalls the events of 1917 knows very well that when the men who composed the Union Government went to the country they did so on the claim that they were to be absolutely non-partisan. They asked for a mandate for the period of the war only, and a combination of gentlemen associated with both political parties formed that government. They each and all declared, in various parts of the country, that the moment the war's necessities should cease they would return to the allegiance which they had paid their respective parties. No one ever thought, when voting in 1917 for Sir Robert Borden and his Union Government, that he was voting for the present leader of the Opposition to proceed to form a government of his own without a mandate from the people. Yet the right hon. gentleman proceeded to do so, and created the conditions which confront us to-day with reference to the railways, purchasing and appropriating railways at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, and creating difficult situations without any authority whatever from the people. Speaking in Toronto some weeks ago, my right hon. friend attributed his defeat to what he termed a mental rebellion on the part of the people. Well, I think he used a very happy phrase, because, from all parts of the country, in every province, there came from the people evidence that there existed a determination, as an hon. gentleman expressed it last night, that whatever men they might return to Ottawa they would see to it that they should "vote against Meighen." My right hon. friend intimated that the action of the province of Quebec, in its display of this mental rebellion, was the acme of infamy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I made no such statement, but I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman attributes it to me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am quoting from the report of an address de-

livered by the right hon. gentleman before the Conservative ladies of Toronto, in which he said, speaking of Quebec:

In it had taken the form of Nationalism, a blight which masquerading under the banner of Liberalism had cried wildly for revenge because that part of the Dominion had been asked to submit to the same laws that bound the rest of Canada. That particular form of the expression of the spirit of revolt, the speaker felt, should be characterized as "the acme of infamy."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not make the statement as quoted by the hon. gentleman. What I said was that the conduct of the campaign in that province had reached, in its depths, the acme of infamy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Well, perhaps my right hon. friend has not recalled that one of those ministers whom he brought into being for a few short weeks was perfectly willing to deal with the situation down there which he condemned by the use of this phrase, and was perfectly willing to adopt as a candidate a gentleman who declared that the chief plank of his platform would be never to support England in any war in which she might be engaged. Let me remind him that when first he came into this House, in 1911, the government he supported owed its existence to the fact that there had been elected in the province of Quebec twenty-six or twenty-seven men called Nationalists, men who were returned on the principle that Canada should not embark in any of England's wars or participate in her affairs. He enjoyed his position as a member of that government, from 1911 to 1917, as a result of support from that quarter. Let me tell him, if he chooses to characterize in the same way the men and women of any province, in regard to the expression of their opinion upon him or his government in the last contest, that speaking for the province of Nova Scotia, I declare that we shall share the epithet he has applied to Quebec in this case. We will take these words as describing our own unanimity. My right hon. friend paid a visit to our province, and, in association with his Minister of Public Works, he made a tour, the progress of which might be compared to the famous march of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Our province has had a distinctive position in regard to the Conservative party. It has given to Canada three Prime Ministers who led that party: I refer to Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Robert Borden and Sir John Thompson. Now, the people of Nova Scotia heard my right hon.