

should be a levy on wealth. In the Old Country they are talking about a capital levy for the reduction or abolition of the war debt; I should like to advocate a capital levy in this country for the abolition of the war debt. That would mean at least something like equality of sacrifice.

One more point ought to be brought to the attention of the House from the labour standpoint. The Government proposes to institute a Department of Defence. I have no doubt that from the standpoint of military efficiency that is a move in the right direction, but there are other considerations than those of military efficiency. A study of the budget for the past year reveals the fact that we are paying something like \$25 per head in Canada for wars past and for prospective wars. That is, according to our estimate of a family of five, \$125 per family for the burden entailed by the wars of the past and the burden of preparation for wars to come. The people of this country were asked to go into this past war on the promise that it would be a war to end war. Is war ended, when now we are proposing to create a Defence Department? I think the time has come to get away from all the high-sounding phrases that we had during the war. Let us get down to business. Let us ask ourselves against whom we propose to defend ourselves. We have a large country toward the south of us—friendly neighbors; we have boasted that along that extensive front we have not had a single fort and that on those Great Lakes we have not had a single battleship. Do we propose to defend ourselves against our American cousins? If this country ever becomes a part of the United States it will not be in my judgment because the United States invades us with a military force. The Americans are buying up the country, and possibly it may come in that way. But I do not think we can say seriously that it is a practical thing for us to propose to defend ourselves against an incursion from the United States. Do we propose to defend ourselves against possible attack from Europe? To-day the enemies of Great Britain lie prostrate. I tell you there is a very real danger that having conquered militarism among certain of the peoples of Europe we should at this time be militarized. Speaking as a Canadian of some three or four generations, I say that my forefathers did not come across to this country in order that we should set up here a new feudalism or a new militarism. Are we proposing to defend ourselves against the

peoples of the Orient? I had hoped that Pacific questions had been at least temporarily settled at the time of the Washington Conference. Surely we cannot in cold blood, now that the fever of war has died down, contemplate with equanimity the preparation for another war. I want to read a paragraph from an issue of the Manitoba Free Press published in my own city of Winnipeg on the 15th of October, 1921. It is not very often that the Free Press quotes me; I shall do it the honour of quoting it:

All the information in those vast collections of war books is of the same character. It tells of loss of life, loss of health, lost of property; of unbridled violence, of premeditated and deliberate destruction of wealth. Go into any public library; go to the "war-section," and the books you pull out will tell you about "crashing shells", about "gross mutilations", about regiments being "annihilated", about cities destroyed by artillery fire, about refugee women, about homeless and starving old people and children, about forced military service, about "industrial dislocation", about financial disturbance, about war taxation, about unemployment, hunger and national destitution. As a comprehensive narration of ruin, misery and disaster, the contents of the war departments of the world's libraries are easily the greatest within human knowledge.

To talk about the war being a forgotten thing of the past is to talk foolishly. The millions of unemployed on both sides of the Atlantic are one powerful reminder of the war; there are very few people who are not injured somewhere or other in their lives, and the injury comes from the war—either very obviously, as in the loss of relations, or of health, or less obviously in the increased price of commodities, or in lack of employment. Looking at it dispassionately—

And I hope that we are now able to do so.

Looking at it dispassionately, at the miserable legacies of the war everywhere around us, at the records of the four years of battle preserved in the literature of the war, war on the very face of it is so calamitous, ruinous, and cruel, that it becomes difficult to understand how anyone would be in favour of it, it seems difficult to imagine anyone wanting to have another great war.

There is no profit in war; the loser loses, the victor loses, the neutral loses, everybody loses. The last war exposed and exploded all the arguments urged on behalf of war—they were all seen to be false. Nobody gained, everybody suffered, vast numbers are suffering still; war was a failure, total and ghastly; it was left without argument or apology, something which is demonstrably a total loss to the human species.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that after the experience of those dread years of war, we should surely be looking forward to some other method of settling our international disputes than by the resort to physical