

C 276024

January 27 and I propose to quote him again. He was speaking of the effect of the Ottawa agreements on the international situation. As reported in the *Manchester Guardian* of May 11, 1938, he said that from the point of view of peace the most fatal step ever taken by the British government was the adoption in 1932 of the policy of economic imperialism and the Ottawa agreements. And 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 war ships, 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. The new treaty is, in its effect on German exports, a deadly weapon of economic warfare.

This is an inter-dependent world, not only culturally but economically. The great German race has through the centuries so enriched civilization with its religion, science, art, music and philosophy, and emigrants from its shores have produced such worthy citizens in agriculture, industry and public life in every country to which they have gone, that I refuse to adjudge them guilty or hold them responsible for the actions of some of their present leaders. It was they who gave us the Protestant religion and the printing press, the immortal sonatas of Beethoven and the epoch-making discoveries of Einstein. Are we to treat these people like mad dogs merely because they are reacting in the way in which they are to the abnormal conditions and handicaps imposed upon them by nature and by our own mistaken policies?

Let me quote an outstanding present-day religious leader in England as reported in the London paper, *Peace News*, of March 10, 1939. This is Doctor F. W. Norwood of the City Temple of London, speaking to the national council of the evangelical free churches at Bradford. He said that:

Whenever he felt inclined to rail against Germany he asked himself, "Who made her go mad like that? We had the most absolute victory in our hands in 1918 that any nation could ever dream of having, and if, twenty years afterwards, we are facing what is possibly another Armageddon, whose fault is it?"

We should not get anywhere by merely slanging one another and telling Hitler to be a nice little English gentleman.

If it had not been for that man, dangerous as he is, mad as he may be, we would have kept that nation under our feet to the crack of doom," Doctor Norwood declared.

[Mr. Rowe (Athabaska).]

To show that the views I am expressing are widely held, particularly in western Canada, I quote from a letter which appeared in the *Edmonton Bulletin* early in March, over the signature of Mrs. W. A. McConkey, president of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Edmonton:

Throughout those centuries when Britain was extending her empire over one-quarter of the globe, it was the boast of her statesmen that wherever the British flag flew there was freedom for the trade of the world.

But we said good-bye to all that! In 1932 by the Ottawa agreements we established preferential treatment for our own trade within empire borders and erected barriers against other nations which were to their disadvantage.

Germany, Italy and Japan, all short of raw materials for their factories, teeming with a population they could with difficulty support, were not slow to draw a conclusion from our action—surely a justified conclusion. If empire was the key to trade then they too must have empires: and so—the adventuring imperialism that shakes the world to-day. I am aware that the blame is not wholly on our shoulders; yet our no doubt well intentioned trade agreements bore bitter fruit in the international field, and the results are on our doorstep.

If our scientists tell us that there is no shortage of wealth in the world to satisfy the needs of all, the trouble being that it is not evenly distributed by nature; and if an examination of our methods of distribution, tariffs, exchange quotas, et cetera, discloses the causes of war and strife in the world, why should we compete with each other for things which may be had in abundance without competition? Why should we go to war and kill each other when there is nothing to fight about, when, according to the scientists, there is more in the world than we can possibly use for many years to come?

Mr. REID: Tell that to Hitler.

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): A recent article in the *New York Nation* by Erika Mann, daughter of the famous German writer Thomas Mann, now in exile, describes dramatically the epic underground struggle now going on in Germany against the present regime. Men and women are daily risking death, and some of them are meeting it, in their determined efforts to free their country from tyranny. One young leader, who was recently beheaded when caught by the Gestapo, shortly before his death managed to get out of Germany, and he told his friends that in the factory where he worked between sixty and seventy per cent of the workers were opposed to the government. A concealed movable radio was constantly denouncing the government and urging the people not to despair, because freedom could not be killed by dictators but would finally live triumphant.

Can we not do something to help these brave and wonderful people? Why not publicly recognize the existence of the just grievances and abnormalities out of which their present situation has arisen: the injustices of the treaty of Versailles, the strangulation of discriminatory tariffs, the poverty of raw materials? Why not, as suggested by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) call a world economic conference to which the "have-not" countries would be invited with all others? This is the way of reason and common sense. Every one of the causes of the present situation could be sympathetically examined in the light of world discussion and world opinion, and a new milestone in human history might be reached. War gives not security, but insecurity. War does not preserve, but destroys. To deal with an aggressor state by means of collective force means to use more effectively than he all the inhuman and destructive methods of modern war to massacre ruthlessly men, women and children and to destroy the cultural achievements of centuries. What kind of security is this which, even if successful, would reduce vast areas, probably including those which were being "protected" to a state of barbarism and waste in which it would hardly be possible for civilization to survive?

What is needed is a policy of international justice and cooperation, the ending of imperialism, not a struggle to determine which group of nations is to be its main beneficiaries; a system under which the natural resources of the world shall be made available for the benefit of all, not monopolies of private individuals or particular national groups, to be exploited in their own interests. In such a world dictators could not flourish and aggressors would cease to be.

May I now deal for a moment with those people who in the name of what they call "realism" attack the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation on the ground that it is purely visionary, idealistic and utopian. These so-called realists, who pride themselves on their practical politics, who rail at goodwill and what they scornfully call the sloppy sentimentality of pacifism, appear to overlook the fact that when they reject the way of peace and goodwill, which affirms the underlying unity of the race, the equal worth of all peoples and races, and the common blood and destiny of mankind, they reject not only all reason and common sense but also the Christianity in which they profess to believe. Is it realistic statecraft to try to change the temperature by tinkering with the thermometer; to try to rearrange the consequences without examining the causes? Is it practical politics to advocate force and murder as a

solution of problems which arise out of ignorance, greed and stupidity? Is this realism or practical statecraft? On the contrary, it seems to me that it is a retreat from reason, a denial of all logic. Is it realistic statecraft to send a whole generation of innocent youth out to die because we have a defective economic system? On the contrary, it seems to me more like spiritual blindness, mental confusion, business incompetence and political stupidity.

President Wilson, speaking in St. Louis just before his death, gave a definition of the causes of war which ever since I have accepted. He said:

Is there a man or woman, nay, is there a child in this audience, who does not know that the seeds of war are sown in hot, successful, commercial rivalry?

These people say that we are dreamers. On the contrary, it seems to me that the advocacy of such policies, the proposal that our affairs, matters which can be settled properly only by law, reason and justice, be settled by war, is more like spiritual blindness, mental confusion, business incompetence and political stupidity. These people say this is an unruly world, that ill-will and violence are dominant and that all we can expect from goodwill is that it shall be an occasional lovely decoration on a bad business, like flowers growing in a swamp. To this I reply that the world is not unruly but law-abiding morally as it is physically, and that what is unruly here is not the structure of the world, which is secure enough, but people who, transgressing the basic laws of life, plunge themselves, their friends and their neighbours into an earthly hell and then foolishly talk about goodwill and kindred virtues as visionary ideals. Since when has goodwill been merely a beautiful ideal? It is not so in the home. Goodwill is the foundation and essential structure of a home. No goodwill, no home. It is no mere ideal in school. Effective education in an atmosphere of ill-will is a psychological impossibility. No goodwill, no school. As for international and inter-racial relationships, this has been said so often that I fail to see how anyone can mistake the truth. Is goodwill a superficial decoration on international relationships, when, because of its lack, we saw millions of young men slaughtered in a single war? Is goodwill merely a beautiful ideal when, because we transgressed it, we have lived for twenty years in a shaken world? Ours is a world of moral law; the foundations of the earth are laid in truth and justice, and no nation or civilization can survive disobedience to the structural conditions of its peace.