

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Wednesday March 1, the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Golding for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. Athanase David: Honourable senators, as I have said before, the task of rising and speaking in this house is not an easy one, and the fact that today I make use of the English language rather than French, so that I may not impose too much on the patience of my hearers, does not make that task any easier. In the past when I have risen here to speak I have tried without success to recall something that I read many years ago—something which I found only recently among some old faded papers. It is to the effect that the human brain is a marvellous thing; it starts to work the moment one is born and never stops until one stands up to speak in public.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. David: In my twenty years as a member of the Legislature of Quebec, where I used my native tongue without imposing on anyone's patience, I experienced difficulty enough in speaking before that body. But what is one to do when one has to address the Senate? There comes to my mind a statement made by Sidney Smith, who said: "In composing, as a general rule run your pen through every other word you have written: you have no idea what vigour it will give your style." I am very much afraid that when I am through honourable members will reproach me and ask me why I did not follow this advice.

The speeches made in this house are usually of great interest to Canada at large. Congratulations have already been offered to both the proposer and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech. Much may be learned not only in listening to but in reading these speeches. Other honourable senators who followed these gentlemen also placed before us facts of great importance concerning the problems we have to face.

Today, perhaps with an excess of audacity or temerity, I shall ask this house to consider what I believe with all my heart and mind and soul to be one of the greatest problems that has ever confronted the world. Looking at conditions as they are today we feel inclined to repeat the words of Figaro, that creation of

Beaumarchais, some time before the French Revolution: "Why are things as they are, and not otherwise?" Yes: "why are things as they are?" Two world wars have been fought to establish peace, tranquility of soul and mind, and full freedom for the individual. Have they attained their purpose: has that goal been reached? Merely to put the question is to know the answer. The world today is in the throes of the greatest revolution it has known since the downfall of the Roman Empire. This revolution has three aspects: social, political and religious. Needless to say, an upheaval having all these elements goes very far to unstabilize nations, great and small, and therefore the world as a whole. Centuries ago it was possible for two countries to be at war, or even for a country to be subject to revolution, without hindering the progress of the world at large towards prosperity and general well-being. Today, wherever in any small state there is unrest, dissatisfaction, fright or fear, the repercussions are felt immediately in the world as a whole.

Consider for a moment the state of affairs before the two great wars; let us say, at the end of the nineteenth century. At that time, six great nations—Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States—were the main influence in world affairs. Today, two strong nations—Russia and the United States—alone influence through their power the whole world.

Strange as it may seem, what is happening was foreseen as far back as 1842 by a German writer—who might also, having lived in Paris the greater part of his life, be called one of the greatest of Parisians—Heinrich Heine. He wrote:

As always, the revolution awaits a parliamentary initiative. Then, the fearful wheel would start to move again, and this time we should see an antagonist appear who might well be the most terrible of all who have yet entered the lists with the existing order. This antagonist is still preserving his terrible incognito; he resides like a needy pretender in the *sous-terrain* of official society, in those catacombs where among death and decay new life is sprouting and budding.

Communism is the secret name of the dread antagonist setting proletariat rule with all its consequences against the present bourgeois regime. It will be a frightful duel. How will it end? . . . We know only this much: Communism, though little discussed now and loitering in hidden garrets on miserable straw pallets, is the dark hero destined for a great, if temporary, role in the modern tragedy and who only waits for his cue to make his entrance.

In 1869 a Swiss-German by the name of Bachofen, a cultured historian and pioneer sociologist, wrote what I claim to be a real prophecy:

I believe the historian of the twentieth century will have to speak of but two countries, United