

opinion one of those people dominated by fear. He is so afraid that a resolution passed by the synod of his own church seemed to disturb him greatly. I have before me an excerpt from a news item appearing in the Ottawa Journal of September 23, which reads as follows:

Nicholson, M.P. urges resolution toned down lest they be misquoted on communist platforms.

Toronto, Sept. 22.—Anglican Synod—A demand for condemnation of "capitalistic methods" and of financial scheming which takes millions from the many, to put into the hands of the few, was made by the Very Rev. Archdeacon F. G. Scott of Quebec, at the general synod of the church of England to-day.

On motion of Canon A. P. Gower Rees of Montreal, the synod committed itself to the principle that "the nation is primarily responsible for the support of any citizen who, through no fault of his own, is deprived of his right to secure his own means of livelihood and the maintenance of his dependents."

Moving that the resolutions be referred to the special committee G. B. Nicholson, M.P. of East Algoma urged that they be toned down "lest they be misquoted on communist platforms all across the country."

When the hon. member is actually afraid of the resolution passed by the Anglican synod, one cannot wonder that he would literally quake with fear at the resolutions which come from this corner of the house.

Mr. ERNST: Were both resolutions passed?

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, so far as I can learn from the report, both passed. So I say it is not surprising that one who for pathological or personal reasons is afraid of a resolution of the Anglican synod should be perturbed by a resolution coming from this corner of the house.

Mr. MORAND: He was afraid of being misquoted.

Mr. IRVINE: Well the fear of misquotation is not expressed in the report which I read, and I have never heard any such fears expressed by the hon. gentleman here. It was always the reality of his imaginings he was afraid of, not of being misquoted. Now it appears to me that he and a few others in this house are suffering from Russiaphobia, and being in that condition they seem to be entirely unconscious that they are following Russian methods themselves. The attitude of the government in retaining section 98 and in arresting and imprisoning people under that section is undoubtedly that of the czar. That is the course the czar followed prior to the revolution. No matter how intelligent a man was, if he opposed the czar he was clubbed or murdered or sent to Siberia under laws similar to this that we are opposing. So that

[Mr. Irvine.]

while hon. members opposite charge us with being bolshevists, I feel very much prouder of that than if I were on the other side following in the footsteps of the czar across the sands of political time. And that is what they are doing. I say I would far rather be charged in this house or anywhere else with being a follower of Lenin than of the czar, though I am a follower of neither. Supporters of section 98 are followers of the czar. He who practises what the czar practised is a follower of the czar. This section 98 if it had been drawn by the czar would not have been any more rigorous than it is. Its method, its spirit, the political philosophy behind it, are those that were characteristic of the czar and led to the revolution which hon. gentlemen so much deplore and fear will be repeated. Economic slavery and persecution were the seeds of communism. Whatever associations hon. gentlemen may try to establish between the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, for instance, and groups associated with it, and the communistic groups, whatever success they can make of that they are welcome to, but I repeat, I would much rather be associated with communism than with the group to which they belong, namely the czaristic group. Section 98 is certainly not British, it is certainly not Canadian, it is a weapon of prerevolutionary Russia, and I do not marvel that those who advocate it are afraid. They are certainly taking a course which would give them cause for fear if they only realized it.

There is a third type that seem to desire to retain this legislation, namely those who honestly believe that ideas can be and should be put down by force. Those of us who want to see section 98 repealed believe that the widest possible latitude should be given to all thought, and that thoughts, whoever may express them, should be allowed to be uttered unhampered. I would not go so far with action; I quite realize that a government that cannot retain power ceases to be a government, and if force is exercised against the government then the government has to exercise force to maintain itself. In other words, if any group in Canada made forcible attacks upon government or upon the institutions necessary to law and order, then I do not doubt that the government should take action, but for the government to begin to take action by force before any action has been taken against it is undoubtedly persecution. Let the government wait until the action has been taken against it; then it is time enough for the government to act. I suppose most of us have noticed that those who, like this parliament for instance, do a lot of talk-