

The next suggested cause for our troubles is war reparations. There is no doubt that these reparations have been and are now a stupendous load upon debtor nations, stifling and choking the very life blood out of them, but to-day we notice that creditor nations are just about as badly off. The biggest of all creditor nations probably has as great a body of discontent as exists in any other nation in the world, a body which is only a little less obvious than the discontent which obtains in the largest of the debtor nations. Could not Canada set an example and use all her influence towards the cancellation of war debts? Our credit may not be large, but it is possible that our influence might be felt by all other nations. I know there are forceful arguments to be presented against the cancellation of international debts and war reparations, but I firmly believe that even more forceful arguments can be found supporting that action. I have before me an extract which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* last January, which reads as follows:

The members of the Arts and Letters Club were last night privileged to hear an authoritative address on "International Banking and Debt Paying" by Archibald C. Kains, wherein the speaker, from wide knowledge and experience gained when filling the positions of governor of the 12th Federal Reserve Board of the United States and as a member of a banking commission to which he was appointed by the late President Wilson, gave his views on the present international financial crisis.

Mr. Kains expressed the opinion that it would eventually be for the good of both debtor and creditor nations if all war debts were cancelled, and he advanced strong arguments in support of this contention.

The third of the causes which I mentioned is armaments, which no doubt constitute a staggering burden on all the great powers, with immense sums of money being spent both openly and secretly in the endeavour at all times to have forces stronger than those of other nations. But armaments are not a cause of unemployment; they are rather a cause of unprofitable employment. I would ask this house to imagine how many dwellings for the homeless, how much clothing for the ragged and ill-clothed, and what great quantities of the necessities of life might be purchased if the money now devoted to the maintenance of armaments were to be spent for these useful purposes. Again, cannot Canada set an example by saying, "We are at peace with the world and propose to remain so. We have beaten our swords into ploughshares and our spears into pruning hooks." It may be said that this is impractical and visionary, but I would ask hon. members to reconsider and see if it is as impractical as may be supposed.

The next cause to which I referred was the capitalistic system. This afternoon we heard from the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) a very strong indictment of that system, and possibly much that was said by the hon. member is correct. Perhaps it will not be necessary entirely to scrap that system, but who to-day would dare call it perfect; who would say that it is beyond criticism? On both sides of this house can be found men who recognize the weakness and the desperate need of repair of this system. We do not need to go to those whom we call red to find opinions of this kind. I have taken an extract from the *Canadian Bar Review* which I desire to read, and I am sure no lawyer here imagines for a moment that the *Canadian Bar Review* would publish anything of a seditious or communistic nature. The extract is as follows:

Wealth divorced from a recognition of social responsibility offends the quickened sense of justice that has grown out of the unparalleled economic crisis the world is now contending with. This is sufficiently clear from the multiplication of social service clubs on this side of the Atlantic and their comprehensive programs for the relief of the sick and needy. Organized philanthropy is thus showing the way for a larger control by the state of the national wealth. This, of course, can be done without any dislocation of our present constitutional mechanism, and while it undoubtedly would be another and a significant step towards the goal of the socialists it will leave us still some way to go in that direction.

We find countenance for what we have here ventured to say on the subject of state control of wealth in the following passages from an article written shortly after the war by so conservative a thinker as Professor Jethro Brown:

I would ask hon. members to note that this statement is quoted with approval by the *Canadian Bar Review*:

There still exists in all civilized communities the most glaring contrast of riches and poverty. . . . I suppose no one hopes for the realization of an ideal distribution of the national income; but the present distribution is so capricious, so dependent on accidents of birth or circumstance, that it embitters social relations, and threatens the very foundations of society. . . . It is probable that the bulk of the electors in democratic communities of to-day would vote for socialism; but . . . there are great practical difficulties in introducing socialism without an industrial chaos extending over a long period. . . . But, whatever the future may have in store, it appears to me to be indisputable that the increasing control by the state of economic or industrial relations is rendered inevitable.

Taken from *Labour* of April 5, 1932, is an unprecedented example of the truth of this one statement which I have just quoted to you, Mr. Speaker, namely, that the distribution of wealth is so capricious or dependent on the accidents of birth and circumstances