

England is occupied country. That statement may take a little thinking through. It is true that foreign armies are not there, but I say this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, it is my personal conviction that a foreign way of life is there. I say that one of the things we should be most concerned about is our Christian democratic way of life and the solidifying of the British commonwealth of nations in that one great common tie which has, throughout the ages, characterized the relationship of the peoples of that commonwealth. With that thought, I am going to resume my seat. I say, in conclusion I do not think it would be harmful for me to repeat what I said, that if behind the present resolution the motive is to tear us loose from that commonwealth, then I would be against it. But if the motive behind the resolution is simply to change the title so that His Majesty can be specifically designated as the King of Canada, I see no particular reason to oppose it.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish, at the outset, to compliment the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Marquis) on his courage. The placing of a motion on the order paper entails in itself no difficulty, but to express it in clear terms without trying to disguise one's intention, or to lessen its scope, calls for courage, especially when the wish so expressed can wound feelings which arise from an extreme sentimentality or conjure up in the minds of some people recollections which they do not want to banish.

The honourable member for Kamouraska believes in the future of his country; that is normal for a good Canadian like him. He believes that a nation like ours must grow, assert itself, and take a larger part in world affairs. To do that it must advance and develop along constitutional lines. It must advance, even though the great powers, as they are called, courteously block its way toward the important place it should and will eventually occupy among those whose wisdom in domestic administration should bespeak the valuable part they can take in the drawing up of a peace programme for the whole world.

It is a world-wide psychological fact that wars have often been hatching for a long time before coming to light. They may lie fundamentally in a peace treaty based on temporizing only, which is a palliative, rather than on true principles with no solution of continuity among its essential parts, the union of which makes for permanent operation. They also lie in exclusive commercial agreements endangering the interests of other

countries which have no raw materials; in the delimitation of boundaries which are unacceptable to certain nationalities deeply rooted in the neighbouring country, of boundaries unacceptable to a whole country whose population is often too large and must expand beyond those boundaries in order to breathe and live. By the way, this is the most important problem to be solved by Germany. Prior to the last war, Germany, with a population of 69,600,000 people, had an area of 181,700 square miles; today, with a population of 71 million people, it is enclosed in an area of 137,640 square miles. Let us remember Hitler's cry for raw materials and living space for his people.

Also in the way of preliminary remarks which are necessary, in order to understand the specific object of the motion under discussion, I would add that the causes of wars often lie in the lack of judgment of certain governments which, instead of admitting the legitimate desire, the necessity of an evolution toward a freer, a more autonomous and, I was going to say, a more independent status, effect underhand deals which in most cases, do not proceed directly from them but from certain organizations or so-called key men whose actions and untimely utterings—although they are always in line with the policy laid down by the political parties of the country since centuries—wound the feelings of those rising countries whose inexhaustible resources are their greatest guarantee, especially when they are in a position to enjoy them and prevent them from passing over to strangers.

Policy laid down since centuries: The Canadian Press of April 16 contained a statement made by Viscount Bennett before the Women's Advertising Club of London, England, to the effect that Great Britain is no longer able to assume the defence of the commonwealth. Here are his words:

Which means that we must look to a common defence policy with common objectives. Such a policy will have to be adopted without delay.

Lord Bennett is not satisfied with advocating the eternal policy of the lords of the admiralty, mentioned in earlier days by Laurier, but he adds:

It is evident that one of the dominions is willing to seek the protection of Uncle Sam. As far as we are concerned, he adds, we should see to it that the oldest member of the commonwealth, that is your country, take the initiative in calling an imperial conference.

The eternal fear that Canada be too close to the great republic across the border, the eternal fear of the necessary evolution of a