

is no conference of the nations of the commonwealth at the present time. No, but the motion speaks of the next conference of the nations of the commonwealth, and surely there will be a "next" conference one of these days, as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow.

This is an important matter, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Broadview thinks it is not. He thinks we are wasting the time of the house at great cost, but I do not see any force in that contention. We are discussing item No. 4, which is to be found under notices of motions, and since this is private members' day we are free to discuss such motions until six o'clock. If we dispose of the present motion we can go on to Nos. 5 and 6, so that we are not losing any time, particularly when we are dealing with so important a subject.

The hon. member does not always speak in the name of the opposition, but as usual he recalls the days—and it is well that they should be recalled from time to time—when the empire did much for Canada. I think, however, that we should sometimes recall—it is done more often on this side than on the other side of the house—what Canada has done for the empire.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration provides for the recommendation to the next conference of the nations of the commonwealth that the royal style and titles of His Majesty the King include the specific designation of His Majesty as the King of Canada. May I compliment highly and sincerely the sponsor of this resolution, the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Marquis) who, in the circumstances, has not only demonstrated the great progress he has made, since his election to this parliament, in the way of mastering the English language, but shown for himself, for his constituency and for the population of this country which is of French extraction, his and our great devotion to His Majesty the King of Canada; his and our love for this country of ours which is called Canada. The hon. member for Kamouraska has quoted the Balfour declaration, which dates back to 1926 and which stipulates that all nations of the British commonwealth are autonomous and equal in status. He also quoted excerpts from "Problems of Canadian Sovereignty", written by our distinguished and, I was going to say, genial and outstanding law clerk of the House of Commons, Doctor Maurice Ollivier, indicating that to alter the royal style and title of His Majesty requires the consent of the parliaments of all the nations of the commonwealth. Therefore I feel that this is an ex-

ceptional occasion when the voice of this nation should be heard in support of a resolution which is specifically and categorically Canadian and which at the same time is designed to augment, if it can be done, our respectful and loyal devotion, and our common allegiance to the crown.

As hon. members have probably noticed, I have purposely used the word "nation" instead of "dominion". I am sure the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) will not agree with me in that. I will further add that "dominion" is a word which should be used as seldom as possible in this house. I will go farther and say that the word "dominion" is a remnant of colonialism which should be banished as soon as possible from our official texts. I will go even farther and say that the word "dominion" is a word which offends the sentiments of a substantial part of the population of this country, is a word which is largely responsible for the legitimate doubts which we deliberately implant in the minds of statesmen of other friendly nations as to the accuracy of the evidence of the legal and constitutional status of this free parliament and sovereign state. For example, what would hon. members think of countries such as France, Holland, Belgium and even Italy or Germany if they bore the official designations of the dominion of France, the dominion of Holland, the dominion of Belgium, the dominion of Italy or the dominion of Germany and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, claimed equal status with the greatest powers of the world either at the peace conference table or at the united nations meetings? Hon. members would say that those nations may be right; nevertheless they act as if they were wrong, having regard to the designation of their official status, especially if none of those countries which I have just mentioned had a national flag representative of their traditions or aspirations, or a national anthem; but had a dominion day to celebrate. I would say that if there is a place in this world where the word "dominion" should disappear, as used to designate our country, Canada, it is in the wording of the royal style and titles of His Majesty the King.

How much more deeply, Mr. Speaker, Canadians of all creeds, of all races, of all extractions and of different languages, would feel in their hearts and souls their loyalty to the crown on the day they heard and could legally say, "George the Sixth, by the Grace of God King of Canada".

Let us be realistic about this matter. With all the respect we owe to the Balfour declaration or to the provisions of the Statute of