

America Act. The setting up of the committee will build up fond hopes; and if no action is taken on its recommendations there will be a feeling of resentment among the people if, when all the nations are building for the new world, this parliament intends only to set up a committee but does not intend to carry its recommendations into legislation.

Mr. J. A. MARSHALL (Camrose): Mr. Speaker, last year I was a member of two very important committees, one the committee on reconstruction and the other set up to investigate canteen funds. To a certain extent the work of those two committees clashed. Feeling I could not do justice to both I made an agreement with my colleague, the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) that he should take one committee and I the other. He devoted his time entirely to the work of the reconstruction committee, and I went on with the work of the canteen funds committee. That accounts for the fact that I was unable to give as much time to the committee on reconstruction as I should have liked.

My remarks this afternoon perhaps should have been given on the resolution sponsored by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). I intended to speak on that resolution, but on account of the lateness of the hour, and the desire of the minister to close the discussion I considered it would be unfair to hold up the formation of the committee any longer, because had I spoken it would have meant carrying the debate into another day. Therefore I waved my right on that occasion, with the result that the remarks I intended to make then I shall make now.

Speaking in the debate to set up the committee on reconstruction, the hon. member for Acadia placed his finger on the cancer which has been eating at the heart of the economic life of Canada.

I have been prompted to enter this debate by reason of a trend of thought I felt I sensed throughout a number of the speeches on the resolution to set up the committee on reconstruction, and in some of the speeches on the resolution at present under discussion. Under the guise of social security measures there seems to be a tendency to centralize power in a central authority, thereby taking away some of the rights and privileges of lesser governments. Not only is that taking place in single nations, but there is the trend to tie all nations of the world together, place them under one central authority, the enforcement of law in that central body being placed in the hands of an international police force.

The type of individual who desires such conditions is to my mind a dangerous one.

We are setting up bureaucracies which I believe will be very difficult to do away with at the close of the war. It would be interesting to know the source from which this trend of thought emanates. I believe the idea of the world planner or bureaucrat originated in an institution in Great Britain known as the London school of economics. This institution was set up a number of years ago by an influential and rich man named Sir Ernest Cassel. He endowed it with an immense amount of money, and its avowed purpose, in his own words was—and still is—that of training bureaucrats for future socialist states.

One of the research committees operating under this school of economics issues a publication known as "PEP," the three letters standing for the three words Political and Economic Planning. Early in the war there appeared in this publication an article from which I should like to quote one sentence, because I believe it reveals the tactics being followed at the present time:

Only in war or under the threat of war will a British government embark on large-scale planning.

I suggest to the house that this is a most subtle utterance. Herein I believe lies the reason for the undue haste, shall I say, of trying to saddle upon the shoulders of the Canadian people, who at this time are most anxious about the prosecution of the war, schemes and plans which could not possibly be saddled upon them in peace time.

Let me first of all deal with world planning. There are those who believe that success can be achieved to-day only by tying all the nations together under a central authority. They believe that international trade is a solution of the problem. They believe that the amalgamation rather than the cooperation of countries is one of the factors tending toward a new day. I believe those good people are misguided. They seem to hold that what is national is inherently bad, but what is international is positively good. They wish to establish once again institutions which have been more or less discredited in the past. I refer to the institutions of the Bank of International Settlements, and the League of Nations. The Bank of International Settlements is a pro-axis organization. The chief shareholder in that bank is Germany, and the majority of the shares are controlled by axis countries. If anyone cares to have proof of that he has only to read the British *Hansard* of the last few months of 1942. It will be found that that institution was the subject of many questions as well as discussion.