

in beauty of language, in finish, in diction, and in practical sound suggestions and common sense will stand well on the records of Parliament with similar efforts from Confederation to the present day.

Now I must make some comment in a discursive way on the different points that have been raised by the leader of the Opposition, but I do not wish to spend the entire evening in replying to the hon. gentleman, and he will excuse me if, after some more or less extended comments upon what he has said, I take up certain subjects somewhat beyond the line of his criticism. It is said that the wish is father to the thought and I imagine that as my hon. friend expressed the view that the edifice occupied heretofore by the present Government was a crumbling edifice, his observation was prompted by the desire that it should crumble and that he might speedily see it crumble. Well, an edifice may or may not crumble, but there is one structure which will not crumble or decay, and that is the good, efficient, courageous work which this Government has performed since it came into existence. That monument is indestructible.

My hon. friend was not satisfied with the speech from the Throne. In all my political experience I have not known a leader of the Opposition to be other than dissatisfied; it is the business of the leader of the Opposition not to be satisfied with the speech. Nor was my hon. friend satisfied with the gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address; his congratulations to those gentlemen were followed by criticisms of them. My hon. friend declared that one of the gentlemen dealt with matters away in the past and that did not please him, the other gentleman projected himself into the future, and that pleased my hon. friend still less. Evidently the only thing that is secure to my hon. friend is the little bit of the present upon which he stands. Neither his past nor his future has very many charms for him in either retrospect or outlook.

The leader of the Opposition objected to so much of the speech being taken up with allusions to external affairs. My hon. friend is behind the times. Where has he been living this last five years?

An hon. MEMBER: In the States.

Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Where has my hon. friend been living during the time in which Canada has been so very much taken up with external affairs. I observe sitting opposite me one hon. gentleman who passed several years, and

[Sir George Foster.]

under trying circumstances showed his devotion to the cause of Canada and the Empire, in foreign fields. Let me tell my hon. friend that Canada has been largely living abroad during these last five years. It has been living in the hearts of its soldiers, living in its prayers for their success and their welfare, echoing their desire for victory for the cause which they championed and glorying in the reputation and the honour which those brave men conferred upon their country and ultimately brought back unsullied when the cruel war in which they fought was at an end. Why should we disjoin this Canada of ours from the part we have taken in external affairs in the last few years which, may I not hope, is but the beginning of that common world-wide interest which helps to make a people less provincial and directs them into the life movements and currents of the great body of humanity of which they form a part?

My hon. friend found one reference in the speech from the Throne which was sweet to his taste and that was the allusion to the Franchise Bill. The allusion was sweet to his taste because it gave him an opportunity to go back to the warmed-over porridge in the kettle which has already been dealt with, a matter which has been fought out and fought out, with the result that the various theories and imaginative processes of my hon. friend have been exploded over and over again. However, the subject served for a foundation for some criticisms by my hon. friend and seemed to please him. He was very much concerned as to this Government's constitutional way of conducting the affairs of the country, and he based a complaint against the speech from the Throne in that he did not set forth the various changes in the tariff which were to be made during this session of Parliament. Now my hon. friend might very well have known, had he thought for a moment, that it is dangerous work to put a tariff schedule in the King's speech. It has never been done, I believe, in this or any other country. Consequently I think that part of his criticism fell rather short.

He deplored the waste of material, the waste of human life and the waste of moral and religious fibre. No one can deplore that more than myself and gentlemen on this side of the House in common with all other hon. members. War is cruel, and wasteful. Its effects are not confined to the year in which it rages, they remain and burrow deep into human nature, and on the