

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

and others echo the words. I want to say I refuse to accept that point of view; I refuse to accept it. If I believed it I presume I would join the communists.

An hon. MEMBER: Why do you talk about it?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have refused to accept that point of view. I have the firm conviction that in international affairs war does not bring peace. I have held that view for some years, and still believe in it. I believe further that in these days when our delegation is at Geneva at the disarmament conference this country ought not to wait until somebody else takes the lead, but that we ought to be in the very forefront in urging disarmament, and ourselves setting the example by giving up armaments. I do not believe international affairs can be settled by war, that war brings peace or that armaments are in any way an assurance against war.

So in national affairs, I do not believe repressive measures develop respect for law. In England most of the constables are armed with bludgeons; they are not allowed to carry guns. In the United States they carry guns, and there is much less respect for law and order in that country than there is in old England. It seems to me we are in danger of following the lead of the United States, and I believe honestly—and that is the reason I am bringing this matter up—that if we adopt repressive measures we are bound to reap results in a saturnalia of lawlessness throughout the country. If people think they can bring about reforms only by riots, and if they are refused opportunities to parade or to hold public meetings, if they are hounded, and if they are spied upon the inevitable result will be that the movement will be driven underground, and we will see in Canada the same conditions that resulted in Russia when the Czar undertook to keep his people under.

I believe economic justice is the only basis of permanent stability in society. In my judgment we have not that justice. Before I sit down I should like to read an article I came across a few days ago which appeared in *The Nation*—I believe it is the *Irish Nation*—under date of May 2, 1931. I call this article particularly to the attention of some of my Roman Catholic friends who are inclined to be very much afraid of anything in the shape of communism, because they fear it will in some way interfere with private property.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: From what is the hon. member quoting?

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: *The Nation* of May 2, 1931. It is as follows:

Recently Reverend Doctor P. Coffey of Maynooth writing in *The Clergy Review* stated a discovery he had made. It was that the present economic organization of humanity committed that moral wrong so long charged against communism, namely the denial of the right of private property. For that doctrine communism has been condemned as the enemy of the natural as well as the divine law. And capitalism has for centuries called the churches to its defence on the grounds that it not only admitted but was based on this right of private property. Doctor Coffey finds it to be based on the very opposite:

"This grave discovery," he says, "has been made and demonstrated in recent years by scientific analysis of the policy which actually directs the financing of industry. . . . The proletariat (are) kept in propertyless dependence on a money wage that intermittently provides them with a bare subsistence. . . ."

The fact that the system prevails in Christian countries does not make it Christian. The fact that it automatically deprives the preponderating majority of the adult citizens of all real opportunity of ever becoming private owners of productive property proves it not to be a system of private capital ownership, but a system of enforced propertyless wage serfdom."

I commend those words of Father Coffey to the members of this house. What situation do we find in Canada? We are told that we have nearly 500,000 unemployed. I understand that before very long a measure is to be brought down giving authority to the government to deal with this matter. It is significant however that at the time we are bringing down relief measures we are also asking for increased police powers. I do not like it; I am afraid of it, because I say that in extending repressive measures the house would be adopting a method which sooner or later is bound to bring about serious reaction. Let us consider a few illustrations of the last few days. Only this morning I received a telegram from the west stating that certain men had been apprehended by the Royal Canadian Mounted police, and were being summarily deported. I am trying to get the details from the Department of Immigration. If however we are to adopt the method of simply picking up people and deporting them after merely departmental trial, what is going to be the effect upon hundreds of people who themselves are essentially in similar positions? A few weeks ago a representative of the returned men, a representative of the men employed by the Canadian National Railways in my own city, and a representative of the management, went through a list of employees of the road to pick out those who were not yet naturalized in order that they should be dismissed, and that Canadian born