

and issue currency, and, third, the right to establish free trade within the union to regulate interstate commerce, to establish and direct foreign trade and communications, and, obviously, to raise revenue. Moreover, a federal union assembly would need to be able to grant citizenship, although it should be understood that the conferment of citizenship by the union would not conflict with the national citizenship of any delegate or of any immigrant.

At this point, if I may be allowed a citation, I should like to quote the words of William L. Clayton, former Under-Secretary of State for the United States, who, speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May 1949, said:

Billions of private capital and the creative genius and activity of its owners remain in hiding because of the danger of war and the fear of the integrity of certain European currencies . . . Governments have thus been compelled to undertake the greater part of the job of recovery . . . Private enterprise will operate freely in Europe only when there is peace and confidence in currencies . . .

Total costs to the democracies are taxing their economies excessively. In our own case—

He is speaking of the United States.

—the burden may get too heavy, even for our own strong back. But we dare not lay it down.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. David: Abandonment of certain elements of sovereignty, abandonment of direction of foreign affairs, abandonment of the right to regulate interstate trade—certainly, these would be a very great sacrifice to ask of nations: may I say, a tremendous sacrifice on the part of Canada. But do you not believe that it is better at times to sacrifice a little of our pride, a little of our liberty, a little of our sovereignty, than one day to lose, not a part, but the whole, of our freedom and all our liberty?

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. David: This idea of a world government was not born yesterday. If my memory serves me—and there are here university professors who can correct me if I am wrong—as long ago as Charles the Fifth of Spain, Holland, Italy, part of France, and Germany, the idea of a world government existed. Later on, Louis the Fourteenth had in his mind the establishment of a world government. From 1919 to 1922 or 1923 Aristide Briand was the apostle of such an idea. Winston Churchill, in his famous speech at Fulton, although he did not go so far as to propose federal union, pleaded for the union of all English-speaking peoples—and this, if I may say so, as a bait to get other nations into the federation.

In 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville, an able writer and a great diplomat, the author of the book "Democracy in America", wrote as follows:

The name "federal" has been given to the type of government made when several nations form a permanent league and establish a supreme authority which, without operating on citizens, as a national government can, acts on each confederated people as a body. Thereafter, men discovered another form of society in which several peoples really merge into one as regards certain common interests but remain separated and merely confederated in all other regards . . . Clearly this is no longer a federal government, but an incomplete national government.

Thus men found a form of government that was not precisely either national or federal; but there they stopped, and the new word that should express this new thing does not yet exist.

Since the beginning of 1948 a word—or perhaps it would be better to say a term—to express this new thing has come into existence. It is either Atlantic union, world government or world federation.

John Foster Dulles, in an address before the American Political Science Association, said:

Towards the beginning of World War II, Mr. Clement Attlee exclaimed, "Europe must federate or perish."

He was right. Then he went on to say:

But independent states are socialized to such a degree that they dare not voluntarily expose their economies to new external influences that would upset present governmental planning.

Take England. There the government is trying out many measures of socialization. That experiment requires building a wall around England which can be penetrated only as planned by the English government. English economy cannot face the impact of external forces or natural competition. We have the strange result that the Attlee government is a major obstacle to that federation of Europe which Mr. Attlee recognized was imperative if Europe were not to perish.

Mr. Livingstone Hartley, head of the Washington Union Committee, after mentioning the Atlantic Pact, declared:

In the first place, the union would be far stronger than any alliance. It would have one foreign policy instead of twelve. For defence, it would have the vast advantages of unified command, unified forces, standardization of weapons, avoidance of wasteful duplication, and a pooling of specialized skills and aptitudes. Under the pact some progress will be made toward all these ends. In the union, they would be completely achieved and a comparable effort would consequently bring far greater defence power.

In the second place, union could avert a number of potential dangers to the future success of the pact. For example, another serious depression might result in communist domination of the governments of some of our European allies. This would be impossible in the union, in which communists would be at most a feeble minority.

Ambassador Warren R. Austin, chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations, had this to say:

All of us today need the near look and the far vision in world affairs. With the near look we