

That is all that he is asked. He keeps his liberty—not a bit of it is infringed upon. He has his security, he is as safe now, under all the laws of this country, as he was before; he has all his betterments, his prospects, his rights and his privileges. The simple one thing that he is asked to forego for this one war election is, when his own kith and kin are the enemies of this country and blood flows between them in one common vein, to consider that he is in a position where it is better for himself and better for this country that he shall stand aside for the time being. Why, if a jury is being called to try a man for his life, and one of the jurymen on being challenged allows it to become clear that he has a prejudice or has expressed an antipathy to, or an opinion adverse to the case of the man on trial—although he is a citizen, although he has all his rights, he stands aside without question and does not feel that any hardship is inflicted upon him. In this great national trial, when the destinies of this country are being decided, he is asked to do the same thing and to stand aside. He is not asked to fight, he is not asked to be a combatant, he is simply asked to forego one right; and I want to say that, so far as I judge it, it is the best thing possible for the man himself, and that it will in the end conduce more to a feeling of amity and of good will than if he were thrown into the arena of a political contest, to become the object of appeal by both parties. I believe that on that account he is in a position which lends itself more to future amity and good will than if he became a contestant in the political contest as it was going on.

My time is up and I shall take my seat, but before I do so, just one word. While this closure has been going on, I have come to the conclusion that this Parliament and every future Parliament would be wise if it adopted some rule by which we should keep discussion down to about twenty-five or thirty minutes for each member. By that means we should have a better House, we should have better debate, and we should do our work in one-half the time.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (North Renfrew): In regard to the last remarks of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) so far as he is concerned I agree. I am inclined to think that when he is compelled to condense his speech into about twenty-five or twenty-six minutes, he gets at what he wants to say better than when

[Sir George Foster.]

he takes a long time to build a foundation on which he does not base his argument. My right hon. friend has fallen into the habit lately, which has not deserted him in his twenty minute speech, of lecturing. He has not forgotten his old university days when his chief occupation was to lecture students. He looks over at us on this side of the House—and this is not the first time—and says we have lost our sense of proportion, we have not the interest in the war. I want to tell him that he does not know what interest in the war is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the heart of hearts, where the heart strings are torn, he does not know what interest in the war is; and he has no right to lecture us in the House, any of us who have as much interest in the war as he possibly can have. I do not object to him advising, but when he takes on his air of lecturer to men on both sides of the House as to our lack of sense of proportion and not giving this war the prominence it should have, I say he is assuming a role for which he is not qualified.

My right hon. friend says he hates very much an election in war time. He was a party to sending ballots to Europe to have an election in war time, and he sat in the Government and allowed money to be expended, without authority I believe, to print ballots and rush them over to the Old Land to prepare for an election in war time, when we were in the midst of an appeal for recruits.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would remind my hon. friend that that was done in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, and it was my hon. friend's advocacy of the passing of such an Act in the first instance that induced the Government to take it up.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my right hon. friend is not nearer right on most things than he is on this, I am not surprised that some people in his party are crying for leadership. There was no necessity for sending ballots to Europe for an election because there was an Act on the statute book. We have an Election Act on the statute book, but we are not peddling ballots, not having an election always. This Act was put on the statute book to provide for an election if it was called, and the fact that the Government intended to call it was proven by the other fact that they sent the ballots to Europe to be prepared for the election. My right hon. friend lectures us because he tells us that his party is the party to put the punch into efforts for the war.