

all. That is, not having any former precedent, except in the case of James, in which parliament declared that he had abdicated—whether or not he had was a nice question, but at least they declared that he had—leaving that for the moment, parliament then said: We will construe the act of settlement, because the king has made himself dead, as though it were a demise of the crown.

The next section merely gives effect to the first section. The king is no longer a royal personage and no longer requires any consent by parliament to his marriage. That is all there is about that. And the last section deals with the question of himself and his descendants, because England at one time had some difficulties about pretenders, and in order to obviate any difficulty of that kind the statute makes it perfectly clear that that question should not arise.

There is also the question as to the method by which Canada made known its views upon the matter. The Statute of Westminster provides that no act passed by the parliament at Westminster shall have effect in this dominion without the request and assent of the dominion. That merely means the executive of this country in the absence of any provision to the contrary. So far as the government of the day is concerned, it staked its life upon the action which it took, and under our system of constitutional government, with the administration commanding as it does a majority in the House of Commons, the question becomes nothing but a matter of recording the will of that majority upon the records of this house. The question which arose in South Africa and Australia and New Zealand is entirely different. Section 4 does not apply to those dominions except under certain conditions to which attention need not now be directed, namely, by their acceptance of them. South Africa did accept them, I think, in 1934, and so far as Australia and New Zealand and Newfoundland are concerned, they no longer have any application. The statute itself is clear upon that point. Section 10, subsection 3, states that the dominions to which this section applies are the commonwealths of Australia, New Zealand and Newfoundland, and the first part of the section declares that none of the following sections, that is, sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, shall extend to a dominion to which this section applies as part of the law of that dominion unless adopted. The question whether parliament should antecedently express its opinion is one which I think cannot be successfully raised, having regard to the issue which had to be determined. When

the statute was framed in the form in which it is it was done for the purpose of meeting an emergency which might arise, just as an emergency arose in this case. If this parliament should take an opposite view to that taken by the executive it would of course mean the resignation of the government and an application to the parliament at Westminster to enact a statute which would repeal the provision to which effect had been given by an executive which did not command the support of a majority of the house. I think that is all I can usefully say on the matter, although there may be more that could be said.

The question that arises as to the international situation, which naturally engages the attention of every thoughtful man, is certainly one which you would expect to be dealt with immediately after the reference to the change in the succession to the throne. That the international situation is an unhappy one goes without saying. I saw the other day, from a source which is usually accurate, a statement that the moneys expended for armaments and munitions in 1936, together with the commitments made for that year, which will be afterwards expended, amount to the almost incredible figure of three thousand million pounds. I had no means of checking the accuracy of the statement, but it appeared in a responsible journal as an estimate coming from a usually responsible source. That in itself indicates how serious the situation is. Happily we are not menaced by it as many countries are. Those who have travelled in Europe realize the difficulties there are in crossing boundaries, in connection with the enforcement of customs and other laws at frontiers, in connection with passports and so on. Perhaps those who live in Europe little appreciate what it means to live on this continent; sometimes they express the view that it is impossible for them to understand the conditions under which we live as compared with their own.

I for one, however, do not despair because there has been a breakdown in the instrument that was forged by the wit and wisdom of men, relatively, so few years ago, to preserve the peace of the world and, if possible, to prevent another world war. The League of Nations has failed. No one doubts that. Its failure has filled the hearts of many with great sorrow, but the fact that an institution set up by human hands fails is no reason why the wit and wisdom of men should not upon its ruins build a successful league of nations to effect and impose, by their own act, collective security. A few weeks ago in Sydney,