

The CHAIRMAN: There is a rule which is hard to apply in committee against repetition. I would hope at this stage the hon. member would not go over old ground which has been thoroughly covered many times this session. I believe it is the wish of ninety-nine per cent of the members of this house that we get down to business.

Mr. JAKUES: It says this—

Mr. ILSLEY: I object. I do not base my objection on grounds of repetition but on the ground that on an item for departmental administration he cannot read into the record some fraudulent or forged Jew-baiting documents which are called the Protocols of Zion.

Mr. JAKUES: I have not mentioned the word "Jew", but I am going to read this because it is absolutely pertinent to what I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that I can rule it out of order, but surely no member at this time would wish to overload *Hansard* after the thousands of pages we have had on the general subject. I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but surely there should be a limit somewhere.

Mr. HANSELL: Might I just say on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that you have been most fair to everyone this session. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin has taken less time than almost any other member of the house. He has spoken only occasionally and then forcefully, in my opinion. He has been waiting for many weeks for this item to come up. This is the last speech he will make this session. He lives and moves and has his being in this particular subject and pays little attention to anything else that goes on in the house. I trust that the committee will bear with him for the remainder of the time at his disposal, perhaps only twenty minutes, and then we can go right on with the item.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is an appeal to sympathy or something of the kind.

Mr. HANSELL: It is the truth.

Mr. ILSLEY: I would be disposed to meet the hon. gentleman along those lines, but we must not get too far away from the rules of the house even on grounds of mercy. We must stay within shooting distance of them. The hon. gentleman apparently was attacked by some paper or editor for some remark he had made in the house and he wants to make a reply to that attack.

[Mr. Ilesley.]

Mr. JAKUES: Nothing of the kind. If I like to make myself ridiculous, I do not see why anybody else should worry about it.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not mind that.

Mr. JAKUES: Then what is the minister worrying about?

Mr. ILSLEY: I am worrying about the infringement of the rules of the house.

Mr. JAKUES: I am not, I believe, in the habit of breaking the rules. I quote:

We shall replace the free market with stabilized control of foreign exchange by which we can fix industrial values to suit ourselves.

All industry will come to depend upon us, bringing stupendous power to us.

In our hands is the greatest power in the world—gold: in a few days we can procure from our vaults any quantity we may please.

Having said that, perhaps I may be allowed to quote from a speech which was made in the congress of the United States by Mr. Smith, one of the congressmen from Ohio. Speaking on Monday, April 12, 1943, on this United States plan for stabilization of currency, he said:

We are apt to be led to believe from the newspaper, radio and other reports that this scheme emanates from a few individuals. Mr. Harry D. White, special assistant to the secretary of the treasury, is being credited as the prime mover of the United States contribution to the plan. Professor Maynard Keynes is being credited as the prime mover of the British contribution to this plan. Now, of course, we would be naive indeed if we were to believe that the officials of our treasury had undertaken this task on their own initiative, or that Professor Keynes, and perhaps a few of his associates, had inaugurated their part of the scheme on their own accord. We may rest assured that back of this move are the most powerful international moneyed interests and financiers of the world. Furthermore, we may be certain that world power politics are playing a prominent role in promoting this movement.

Upon first sight the Keynes plan and that of Mr. Morgenthau may appear to be quite different from each other. It would not be surprising if this impression had been received by many from reading the brief news dispatches describing the two proposals. . . .

Both drafts embrace the idea of a completely politically managed international currency.

Both contemplate the surrender by the individual countries to the international monetary power of a large part, if not all, of the very heart of national sovereignty, that is mastership over monetary and credit resources.

Section 8 of the constitution provides that Congress shall coin money and regulate the value thereof. . . . If Mr. Morgenthau and the forces back of him should be able to get around this provision of the constitution, then the last vestige of our great charter of liberty will have disappeared. All hope of restoring it would be gone, and the totalitarian state would be complete.