

of the other members of the British commonwealth. It is subordinate to none of them. Under the circumstances, those who reign over it cannot but be actually King and Queen of Canada, for the same reason, to my mind, why the King and Queen of Denmark or the monarchs of Norway or Sweden, are respectively King and Queen of Denmark, Norway or Sweden.

This fact has now been acknowledged by a great many Canadian citizens and even by a large number of our public men.

I well remember the expressions of thanks of the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe at the laying of the corner stone of the new supreme court building in Ottawa by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth in 1939. Addressing the august and charming sovereign, he said:

The royal visit which honours us—a fact of unprecedented historical importance—enables me to address Her Majesty as the first queen of Canada and to convey to her, and to His Majesty the King, the assurance of ever unflinching loyalty and devotion, as well as of sincere and respectful affection from our whole people.

In these words, the late Minister of Justice was simply acknowledging the fact that Their Majesties King George and Queen Elizabeth are King and Queen of Canada.

The fact is also acknowledged by a large number of Canadians. During the royal visit which I just mentioned, Their Majesties were readily designated by the expression King and Queen of Canada.

Some jurists will undoubtedly try to confuse a crystal clear issue and pretend that the British Crown is indivisible. In my opinion, such a theory sprang in the minds of people interested in impeding the achievement of autonomy and sovereignty of the British colonies. They used that theory to postpone the development of the colonies.

One must not, however, take that contention too seriously. The same physical person may hold various offices. For instance, the Prime Minister of a country may well be the chairman of some association. In the same way, the sovereign who rules over the British countries may at the same time be King of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. Such a situation implies no contradiction, and we often see the same physical person holding a plurality of moral attributes.

It would be advisable to have legal documents reflect the situation which exists in fact. Those who would derive the greatest benefit therefrom are the heirs to the British Crown. If Their Majesties were officially called King and Queen of Canada, they would be closer

to the hearts and minds of the Canadian people, who would be more devoted to the Crown, for if the sovereign who rules over Canada were designated as King of Canada, they would regard him more as their own. I cannot see any valid reason to oppose such a change. The only pretence which might be brought up is that by designating Their Majesties as King and Queen of Canada, the bonds which unite the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations might be loosened.

On the contrary, the change proposed by my hon. friend from Kamouraska would have the opposite effect. Indeed, it is the Crown which unites the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and not economic or political bonds, and anything which tends to increase the devotion of the people to the Crown should be encouraged, as it would be an excellent means to rally the British nations round their Sovereign.

I understand that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) stated a moment ago that this motion was out of order. I do not intend to discuss this matter, but I wish to say, interjecting perhaps a sentimental note, that as the years go by the word "Canada" assumes a deeper significance for us; from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we no longer regard Canada as a stopping or trading place, but as the fatherland. Those of us who—though broadminded—are deeply rooted to their native soil, cannot be blamed if they claim to be Canadians first and foremost, if they think as Canadians, if they prefer Canada to any other country, if they want it recognized as their fatherland, with their own King, if they want their country to attain greatness and to go forward in order to play unrestrained her part in the Commonwealth and in the world.

Through implementing the resolution presented by the hon. member for Kamouraska, not only would we contribute to the fostering of patriotic feeling in Canada and to the strengthening of the bonds which unite the various parts of the Commonwealth, but we would add greater weight and lustre to the name of Canada among the nations of the world.

I have no other course left to me, therefore, but to approve of the motion before the house, to congratulate the hon. member for Kamouraska and to suggest that Parliament make the proposed change as soon as possible.

(Text):

Mr. R. H. WINTERS (Queens-Lunenbourg): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to make a few remarks on this resolution may I read briefly from the resolution itself, which requests—