

*German Reparations*

the name of patriotism, the blood of Canada in the scales and place on the other side the German mark is to my mind beneath the Canadian parliament, it is unworthy of the sacrifice our men made, and I certainly wish to dissociate myself from the sentiments that were expressed by the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in this regard. The latter gentleman indulged in a good deal of animosity which was entirely uncalled for. I believe, Sir, that there are certain rules in this House which prohibit a member from using certain words, but there does not seem to be any rule which prohibits a man from making certain inferences which, if expressed in words of a certain character, would be quite out of order. It seems to me that a great deal of animosity bubbled out from beneath the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, and he seems to think that the resolution as proposed by the leader of the Labour party (Mr. Woodsworth) could only come from a gentleman who was the victim of an economic freak. Did the hon. member for Vancouver Centre give us an exhibition of economics that would warrant us in the view that he has got enough of economics to constitute even a freak? I do not think he did. There was no evidence of any economic wisdom in his pronouncement. I think I can, perhaps, answer the verbosity of that hon. gentleman by a quotation from Emerson and thus save myself a good deal of mental effort. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre put out the historic argument of the Conservative which Emerson states so forcibly in the following words:

The conservative alone remains the only evidence of his own faith, and we are compelled to discount even him. While his mind remains fixed it is compelled to defend different things.

Conservatism took its original stand in favour of a primeval taboo, but since then it has defended the utterances of the Delphic Oracle, the Athanasian Creed, the inquisition, the geocentric theory, monarchy by the grace of God, witchcraft, slavery, war, capitalism, private property, imperialism.

That is the noble history of Conservatism, and I think the House will agree with me that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre upheld the traditions of his noble party last night in his tirade of implications against the leader of the Labour party, and in his decided opposition to the "new world" policy which substitutes reason and goodwill for blood.

Now, the resolution is really, after all, a most harmless resolution stating it negatively, and positively stated it might lead to a very great deal that would be desirable not only on the part of Canada but on the part of the world. I am not certain that I agree with the

[Mr. Irvine.]

leader of the Labour party's method of introducing it. Personally for the moment I do not care who started the war, we are dealing now with the results of it; and I imagine if we dug down to find out who started it we would have just about as much trouble as we have in deciding who won it, and that seems to be causing the world a great deal of speculation. We have in the causes of war, of this and other wars, a circle a century or two in circumference, and within that circle we have a veritable polyglot of influences which it is impossible to trace to their sources and all of which have a bearing upon the causes of war. I am not going to deal with that; I repeat that I care not for the moment who caused it; I am dealing with the actual situation with which we are confronted at the present time. And what is the question before us? The question before us is that Canada's sons, as was pointed out by the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, died that the world might have peace, died in a war that was going to end all wars. The question is, then, shall we help the cause for which they died the better by the forswearing of our claims upon any indemnity from Germany, or shall we help that aim forward by insisting that she pay to the last farthing whether by force of arms or by force of economic pressure? That is the question we are considering, and while I have a good deal of sympathy with the expressions of the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke), just now, yet I think, perhaps he is missing an opportunity here, for we must not allow any sentiment which we may have against any member of the House to interfere with our intelligent and reasonable analysis of the resolution itself. Which course will lead toward world peace is the crux of the question. Taking the thing on its highest possible ground we do not wish to haggle over marks when the world peace is in the balance. The resolution may be considered from two angles. First, it is economic. I refer you to the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), with regard to the economic side of the question. The other phase of the resolution has to do with obtaining the aim for which we fought in the last war. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada could see her way clear, regardless of carrying out the doctrine of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, burying as deep as hell the animosity that seemed to spurt from the Minister of Labour, and could see her way clear to be magnanimous in the interest of world peace, we should be