

It is international slavery and nothing else, and I say that is the main purpose of this idea of federal union or "union now."

I can speak for this group and for social crediters all over the world, that we stand absolutely on the sovereignty of the British commonwealth of nations, because we know that the crown is the symbol of individual liberty and justice. Instead of surrendering our sovereignty to international racketeers, international money-lenders, we should strengthen the sovereignty not only of Canada but of every nation comprising the British empire, by restoring to it the absolute control of the issue of currency and credit, so that it shall be impossible in future to make the statements as to the real control which I read when I started my address.

Finally, I should like to quote from a speech made by His Highness the Aga Khan. I do not think anybody could put it better, or improve on the time and place in which he made his remarks. Speaking at the Nelson Day dinner of the navy league in London, England, in 1934, the Aga Khan said, in regard to the question of arming the League of Nations with a police force:

There are innumerable technical objections to the creation of an international force under the orders of the League of Nations, with which I need not weary you to-night. But behind all these, I see two fundamental difficulties. One is, that the league itself includes too many wolves in sheep's clothing—or, shall I say, watch-dogs with an occasional hankering after a bit of mutton for themselves—to be likely ever to show an effective unanimity in suppression of the meat-eating habit. The other difficulty, and that to my mind goes even deeper, is that no mechanical scheme, even if constructed for such a desirable object as maintaining the peace of the world, can command those deep-rooted instinctive loyalties for which nations are prepared to risk their fate, or individuals their lives. These loyalties are, for us, centred not in Geneva, but in that British crown which is the symbol of our ordered freedom and of those institutions and traditions which are of the very essence of our being. More than that, our loyalty to the Crown is no narrow local or racial emotion; it has grown with the expansion of England to be the common and mutual loyalty of a world-wide empire which is, in fact, a league of nations, but one that has grown and not been artificially put together. It is a league based on the enlargement, not on the suppression of patriotism. It is a league that in the hour of danger showed that it could summon a million men from the ends of the earth with the appeal: "Who dies if England lives?" It is a league, in fact, that is capable of action.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not intend to wander far from the item under discussion, but I do feel that, as one who has always believed and believes more firmly to-day than ever, that the only form of security for a nation like Canada, and for other nations small or great, will ultimately be found to

[Mr. Jaques.]

be in the realm of collective security, I could not sit here to-night and hear the hon. member for Broadview and the hon. member who has just taken his seat express the opinions they have expressed without rising in my place and saying something on the other side.

We are witnessing to-day as a matter of fact the results of the break-down of collective security, and ever since the Polish boundaries were guaranteed in March, 1939, feverish attempts have been made by our own great commonwealth to rebuild some form of collective security. We have sought allies and have failed to find them. One by one we have seen nations who, had they stuck together, might have withstood Hitler ere he rose to power, fall under his domination.

It is all very well to say that we must get more decentralization. I listened to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin. He said that we needed more decentralization, and then he spoke of the sovereign power of the British Commonwealth and the sovereign power of Canada. I am wondering just what he means by decentralization. Where is the decentralization to lie? In the nation?

Mr. JAKES: No, in the people.

Mr. COLDWELL: In the province? In the town, in the village, or, as he suggests, in the people?

Mr. JAKES: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: What does he mean by the people?

Mr. JAKES: The individuals.

Mr. COLDWELL: Then I say that we shall go back to the days when duelling and murder were rampant, because the individual has achieved security in his community by reason of the fact that he has achieved a measure of collective security through the community of individuals. It seems to me that in this war which we are fighting we are learning the lesson that, had we been able to maintain a league of nations backed by the proper authority and the proper amount of power to enforce its will, we might not to-day be where we are. I want to say to my hon. friend and others who think like him that, when this war is over, we shall again attempt to build some form of collective security, otherwise we shall witness recurrent wars in the days to come.

I should like to ask these gentlemen who talk about decentralization and who oppose the idea of collective security, what is their alternative? What alternative do they offer? None whatever. I quite agree that behind