

may prove true, and prove true sooner than he anticipated or mentioned. We on this side of the House hope that within a few weeks, or within a month or two, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) will be restored to health, that he will come back to his place in this House, will once more place his hand upon the helm of the ship of state and direct its affairs. And, hoping that, I for one, and many more in this House, are going to vote against the amendment because we want a chance to see that hope realised. Take it as you will, the vote on that amendment means that those who vote against the amendment are giving expression to the hope that the Prime Minister will recover his health and come back to this House, and those who vote for the amendment are giving expression to the hope that the Prime Minister will not come back to resume his duties in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No; no.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is exactly what it means. What else does it mean? That is what it means in practice. You cannot disassociate the practical side of it from the wording of the amendment. It means that and nothing else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he noted the one word "regrettable" before the word "absence" with reference to the Prime Minister?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I did note the one word "regrettable," but I have lived long enough in this world to know what uses and abuses can be made of the English language.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am glad to see that sentiment so heartily endorsed and by none more than by the hon. member who represents East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe), because no man has abused the English language worse than he has. I do not attach very much importance to the word "regrettable" as coming from the leader of the Opposition, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. Throughout his speech he casts reflections upon the Prime Minister and upon the Government which are not borne out by the facts, as I shall show before I sit down.

The leader of the Opposition complained that there is no Cabinet representation from the Maritime Provinces. May I remind the

[Mr. Edwards.]

hon. gentleman that the Prime Minister comes from the Maritime provinces, represents a constituency in the Maritime Provinces and that he is a member of the Government yet whether the hon. gentleman thinks he is or not? That, I think, disposes of his statement that there is no Cabinet representation from the Maritime Provinces. But he went farther; he said there was no representation in the Cabinet of the French-Canadians of the province of Quebec. Some hon. gentleman asked him when he had made that remark: "What about the Postmaster General?"—and here is what the leader of the Opposition said: "Well, sir, we will not say that the Postmaster General represents the French-Canadians." His running mate, the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe) frequently, during the speech of the leader of the Opposition, interjected remarks just to call attention to the fact that there were other leaders besides the nominal, recognized one, on that side of the House. The hon. member from Quebec East said that Hon. Mr. Blondin could not get ten votes in any riding in his province. On what does the hon. gentleman base that conclusion? The leader of the Opposition was good enough to point out that Hon. Mr. Blondin, the Postmaster General, was defeated in one constituency in Quebec by 1,247 votes, and in another constituency in which he ran, by 6,623 votes. Those are very telling figures, but the leader of the Opposition might also have added that on the same day that Mr. Blondin was defeated in Laurier-Outremont by 1,247 votes, he himself was defeated in North York by 1,078 votes. While it is true that the Postmaster General was in a minority in the constituency of Champlain of 6,623 votes it is also true that the former great leader of the Liberal party, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was defeated in the city of Ottawa on the same day by 5,258 votes—

Mr. MAROIL: That is not creditable to the city of Ottawa.

Mr. EDWARDS:—and the hon. gentleman might have also said that while the Postmaster General polled 6,196 votes in a certain constituency in the province of Quebec, the leader of the Opposition only polled 2,870 votes in North York, whilst his brilliant side partner (Mr. Lapointe) only polled 3,453 votes. If we are going to take the votes polled by a candidate in an election as an expression of public endorsement, or of public opinion, I have this to say: That even in the province of Quebec, where the