

"King of Canada"

part which the dominion is playing with respect to other nations are serving to justify and emphasize our status as a nation.

Not being a lawyer or a student of constitutional history, I may be missing some of the significance of this resolution; but, as I see it, it is not a matter of outstanding practical significance. The rank and file of people in Nova Scotia, and in my constituency of Queens-Lunenburg in particular, are pleased with our status as a nation and I am sure they are not too dissatisfied with the king's title as it is at present. If, however, this debate shows that it would be to Canada's advantage in any way, shape, or form, to have the title altered so that the king would be designated separately as the King of Canada, we would find no grounds for opposing the resolution.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to offer to this house one or two personal views with respect to the resolution before us. I am speaking simply as one member and upon my own responsibility.

I am not familiar with all the constitutional intricacies involved in the resolution, which calls for a change in the title of His Majesty to designate him as the King of Canada. I sometimes wonder how much members of parliament regard their responsibilities as members. When I was first elected to the House of Commons I, as I suppose all members did, received from the Clerk of the House Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. As a newly elected member I, of course, began to read through it. Right here may I say I am reading it not because I am raising a point of order; I am reading it only to bring to our attention some of our responsibilities. I discover that in note 21 on page 6 the following appears:

Every member as soon as he is chosen becomes a representative of the whole body of the Commons, without any distinction of the place from whence he is sent to parliament . . . That every member is equally a representative of the whole (within which by our particular constitution is included a representative, not only of those who are electors, but of all other subjects of the crown of Great Britain at home and in every part of the British empire, except the peers of Great Britain) has, as I understand, been the constant notion and language of parliament. Every member, though chosen by one particular district, when elected and returned, serves for the whole realm. For the end of his coming thither is not particular, but general, not barely to advantage his constituents, but the commonwealth.

[Mr. Winters.]

The quotation is taken from "Blackstone", volume 1, page 159. I do not think anyone will question Blackstone's ability as a constitutional lawyer.

I have nothing to say against the discussion of such trivial things as fertilizer for farms, gopher poisons or nails for building purposes. These things are important to some people, but I wonder whether, in the exercise of our duties, we have not forgotten that they go far beyond these matters. I wonder whether we have not been just a little negligent in thinking through the problems respecting the destiny of our commonwealth. If the general idea lying behind the resolution under discussion is to have His Majesty's title read "The King of Canada" I can take no particular or great exception to the change, if the desire is to have His Majesty designated as such. If, however, the idea is to have Canada take any further step which will tear us loose from the British commonwealth, then I personally would take the greatest exception to it.

I rise this afternoon to speak with some feeling and with some emotion. I was born in England of English parentage. My father is buried there. My boy gave his life in sacrifice for the freedoms which the British crown has always stood for. Since the war I have been able to rescue my mother from the old land. I say "rescue" her.

The present title designating His Majesty reads:

His Most Excellent Majesty George VI by the grace of God of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

I call attention particularly to the phrase "dominions beyond the seas, king". I do not wish to be an alarmist; I do not wish to sound a note that should not be sounded. How we have sung with a good deal of exuberance, "There will always be an England". That, Mr. Speaker, is my prayer. I do not say that prayer; I pray that prayer. But I trust that I am not out of line when I say that it is not beyond possibility that the term "dominions beyond the seas" may come to be obsolete. England today is economically bankrupt. The people of England today are going through the greatest hardship that perhaps history has ever recorded. The plight of England is, to some extent, beyond our imagination. I doubt whether the average member of this parliament has been able or could possibly be able really to look behind the scenes, and I cannot believe that a couple of snowstorms is the reason for it all.

I said that I did not want to be an alarmist. I say **with a great deal of emotion** that today