that even though I may seem to, I am not wandering from the subject. This is a world proposal, and one cannot very well discuss a world proposal unless he uses a world wide approach. I should like to go back a few months to April 1, when an article was published in the Ottawa *Citizen* headed, "New authority to guide affairs." It went on to state:

> A supranational authority with power to settle questions of immigration, natural resources, treatment of minorities, repudiation of debts, finance and other questions was predicted by B. K. Sandwell of Toronto in an address before the Ottawa branch of the league of nations society.

At that time I brought to the attention of this house and of the government those remarks and I asked if they were not seditious in the opinion of the government. At once I was assailed in the press as a fascist, as a moron, as a Jew-baiter, as one who filled his mind with such rubbish as the protocols of Zion and the A plus B theorem of Major Douglas, and they even went so far as to couple the two together. I was surprised at the notoriety which I had achieved, shall I say so easily, on that occasion, until a few days later when the following was published in the Ottawa *Citizen*. The dispatch is dated "Washington" and says in part:

> Secretary Henry Morgenthau disclosed to-day comprehensive administration plans to stabilize post-war currencies and fix their value in terms of gold. The plans involve:
>
> 1. Creation of an international stabilization fund by the united nations and their associates.
> 2. Fixing the value of currencies in terms of gold.
> 3. An agreement among participating countries not to devalue their currencies without consulting other members of the stabilization funds.
>
> Both plans entail the establishment of a stabilization fund to be managed by an international bank, vitally important because it would mean that participating countries would lose control over the value of their currencies for world trade purposes. This control would be vested in the bank, not in a parliament or a congress, and if a country wanted the rate lowered or increased it could only appeal to the bank, not take action itself.

When we speak in terms of gold it is well perhaps to ask ourselves who are the owners of these gold reserves the greater part of which are piled up underground at Fort Knox. I suppose the vast majority of the people of this country and perhaps of the members of this house fondly imagine that that gold belongs to the people or, if you like, to the government of the United States, but I am informed on the highest authority that eighty-five per cent of that gold is owned and controlled by private interests. I will go farther and say that it is those interests that are behind this scheme to stabilize world finance in terms of gold.

Mr. ILSLEY: May I ask who is the highest authority?

Mr. JAQUES: I am not going to give names. I make that statement and I stand by it.

Mr. ISNOR: That is no good.

Mr. JAQUES: I am told by well-informed Americans that anybody in the United States who understands finance understands that as well as they understand anything.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am informed that the gold at Fort Knox is all owned by the United States and is shown in the treasury statements. That is why I asked my hon. friend for his authority for his statement to the contrary.

Mr. JAQUES: I am perfectly willing to stand by that statement, and if it can be proved otherwise, that is all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. BLACKMORE: You have your chance to disprove it. Come along with your proof.

Mr. JAQUES: I am perfectly willing to let my reputation stand by that statement. The federal reserve system in the United States no more belongs to the government of the United States than the Bank of England belongs to the government of Britain. I say that both governments are run respectively by those banks.

Mr. ILSLEY: I did not say that the gold was owned by the federal reserve board.

Mr. JAQUES: By the federal reserve system.

Mr. ILSLEY: No, nor by the federal reserve system. I said it was owned by the treasury.

Mr. JAQUES: When I brought to the attention of the house this policy of encouraging Canadians to surrender their loyalty to the crown and give it to this supranational authority, at once I was accused of indulging in such foolishness as reading the Protocols of Zion, which were described as absolute nonsense. I am going to read two of them to see how far they are absurd when applied to this matter under discussion.

Mr. ILSLEY: I must rise to a point of order. When an hon. member gets so far afield as to read the Protocols of Zion I must take exception. That is more than latitude allows.