

which failed them when the time came, and the Entente Powers, Russia, France and Great Britain, on the other. What appeals to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the lesson for humanity which we derive from seeing this war in its operation, seeing what led to it, and seeing its consequences, is the utter futility for mankind to try to protect itself against violence by military preparation. Surely that is a lesson of the war which has been driven home to all of us. What I would ask this House to consider is, not men who have been our enemies, not men who have been our friends, but suffering humanity, the victims rather than the authors of what has happened to them. That seems to me the frame of mind in which we should approach this question.

I have little more to say. I believe that the great cause of the war was the conflicting imperialisms of Europe, nations striving to extend the ambit of their power, particularly in parts of the world which were only semi-civilized or not civilized at all. The conflicts of imperialisms in Africa and other parts of the world were, I think, the cause of the war which has its roots far in the past.

I do not know what the mover (Mr. Woodsworth) proposes to do. I hope that he will withdraw this resolution, not because the resolution is wrong in essence, but because it is liable to be misunderstood. Why should we be willing to give up any part of our reparations? Not because we think that France should give up reparation, for I think we are all convinced that Germany which devastated northern France owes by every rule of ethics, law and justice, the obligation of restoring those devastated portions of France, and it is but fair to say that the German trade unions have offered to restore northern France, and that that offer has not been accepted.

I have little more to say on this occasion. What I do wish to protest against in all good spirit is the attacks that have been made against a man who has tried to say what he thought right and what he thought in the interests of peace. We may agree with him or we may not agree with him, but let us be charitable one to another. I think that in the last ten years what has happened in this world has shown the truth of what John Bright said fifty years ago in connection with the Irish question, that force is no remedy, and this old world will not have peace and concord until force as an ultimate solution is abandoned and men will rely upon good will and justice to settle their disputes.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I wish to associate myself with the hon. member for

Brome (Mr. McMaster) in requesting the mover of the resolution (Mr. Woodsworth) to withdraw his motion. Personally I find myself in very large agreement with his point of view, but I would find it very difficult under the circumstances to vote for his resolution, for various reasons which have already been outlined, particularly by the Prime Minister. I think that a vote taken under the circumstances would not be a vote on the merits of the question which the mover has in mind, and therefore I think it would be unfortunate to call for a vote.

I wish also to protest, as did the hon. member for Brome, against the spirit of hostility displayed, and against the sneers and jeers that have been uttered in this House, in this debate. I know that this is a question which it is almost impossible to discuss without heat, animosity and prejudice, and sometimes it is wise, although not always perhaps, not to risk arousing prejudices when you are pretty sure that what may be said will only result in inflaming feeling.

I do not think I have anything further to say. I do believe that we ought to remember the old truth that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword. That is something that we ought to take to heart nationally, but I am not going to discuss that question. I would once more request that the mover of the resolution do not press for a vote upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the mover closes the debate, the Chair must give its ruling, which I thought was awaited with considerable anxiety. The point was raised last night by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) that this resolution, under rule 78, was out of order and could not be proceeded with. The resolution is couched in vague language. It reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interest of world peace that Canada should withdraw all claims on Germany for reparations.

As I stated last night, Canada here means the Crown and the Crown has claims against Germany. The rights of Canada are clearly stated in the Treaty of Versailles. Canada was represented at the making of that treaty, Canada's representatives signed the treaty, and the reparations which Germany was condemned to make are set forth in Articles 231 to 244. Annex I enumerates claims that could arise out of those reparations. For instance:

Annex I

Compensation may be claimed from Germany under Article 232 above in respect of the total damage under the following categories:

(1) Damage to injured persons and to surviving dependents by personal injury to or death of civilians