

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out that this meant fifty million dollars a day for three hundred working days, since they knocked off on Sundays to pray for peace, while spending all the rest of the time in preparing to murder each other; and this reduced the standard of living of the people of the world by exactly fifty million dollars a day. For 1933 it was fifty-five million dollars a day.

In his speech the other day the Prime Minister commented on this diversion of capital, material and labour into these destructive channels. He referred to employment as having been a serious problem for nine years, and said that it was a "difficult" and "perplexing" and "baffling" problem because it was a "world" problem, and then he gave this astounding reason. I quote his exact words, on page 60 of *Hansard*:

It is a problem with which every country in the world has been confronted within recent years—and why? Because of the policies that are being made to prevail in certain parts of the world, those policies of economic nationalism which, instead of bringing nations closer together, are putting countries into isolated compartments.

What he utterly fails to see is that our country, the British empire and the United States have been the worst offenders in this very matter. From the *Manchester Guardian* of May 11, 1933, I quote the words of Sir Archibald Sinclair, leader of the Liberal party in Great Britain, and surely he should be a respectable authority in the eyes of the Prime Minister. Speaking at Launceston, Cornwall, on May 12, he said that from the standpoint of peace the most fatal step ever taken by the British government since the war was the adoption in 1932 of the policy of economic imperialism, and the Ottawa agreements. He continued:

It was not until then that the German people abandoned themselves to the frenzy of despair which we call Hitlerism, and the tariffs and quotas of Ottawa, the economic armaments of the British empire, began to breed in other countries, tanks, aeroplanes and warships, the military armaments of nations which were determined not to go on paying tribute to Britain but to acquire territories and raw materials for themselves in Abyssinia, in Spain, in China, in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, and perhaps ultimately in the British empire itself.

The Ottawa agreements are still in operation, and the new treaty is still, in its effect on German exports, a deadly weapon of economic warfare.

I was literally shocked beyond words the other day to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) speak regarding the effect of the new agreement upon our neighbour countries. He hastened to assure

[Mr. P. J. Rowe.]

the house that Italy would not derive much benefit; that Japan would not derive much benefit, and that Germany would not derive much benefit from the agreement. Is that a worthy achievement, or reason for congratulation? That seems to me to typify an attitude of mind which utterly fails to comprehend the underlying fact that there is unity among mankind; that there is such a thing as the equal worth of all peoples and races, the common blood and destiny of mankind; that nations must have raw materials. Six nations in this world to-day control eighty-five per cent of vital natural resources. Sixty-eight other nations have to be content with fifteen per cent. Now then, how do you expect to have peace on earth and good will among men when you erect trade barriers deliberately designed to prevent those people from getting the foreign exchange with which to import vital raw materials? That simply brings on war. I agree with Sir Archibald Sinclair.

I often admire the mastery of the Prime Minister in the art of beautiful expression; but beautiful and eloquent words are meaningless, empty, idle and futile in the presence of facts that contradict the words. What is the use of affirming an idealistic conception of world brotherhood and world peace, while at the same time doing everything in the field of action and public policy to negate your words and make the attainment of those objectives impossible?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Surely my hon. friend would not say that the new agreements were directed in any way against either Germany or Italy or Japan. The remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) were in answer to a criticism from the other side to the effect that these agreements were favouring Italy Germany and Japan.

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): Quite so. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), of course, holds a philosophy that I do not hold. I repeat, competition, strife, conflict arising out of our system, compel the creation of treaties which inevitably prevent nations which are short of vital natural resources from getting the foreign exchange which they must have in order to import the raw materials they need. I know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce holds the same philosophy as the Minister of Justice, but it is certainly not mine, and I think that that philosophy and its fruits constitute the reason why we have war in the world.