ence to the draft convention relating to hours of labour per day.

I hope honourable members of this House, and particularly those who have had training and experience in the law, will devote to an intensive study of this subject the time between now and the date which my honourable friend opposite suggests for fuller consideration of it. In the Senate we are favoured in having as members some honourable gentlemen who have long stood in the front ranks of the legal profession in our country. Not only do they possess a great store of learning in the law, but they have had long experience in practice. Here is an opportunity for them to render to our country that service for which they are especially qualified. I hope that they will bring their great powers to bear upon the discussion of these matters, and particularly the two much disputed resolutions.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: May I ask the right honourable gentleman whether his argument is not in favour of an amendment of the Constitution rather than an evasion of what have always been considered its terms?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not intend it to be so at all. I am sure that my right honourable friend, with his long parliamentary experience, will be able to read the decisions in those cases just as intelligently as any lawyer in the House. If he reads them he will find that when we make an agreement, as we do when we adopt a convention, if it is made by Canada as a component part of the Empire—and I emphasize that relationship at the moment—then, undoubtedly, no matter what may have been the jurisdiction on the subject before, the carrying into effect of the obligations so assumed by the country is a purely federal responsibility. That has been held in the aeronautics case, without any question, and in fact it was not subject to dispute before that case was decided.

But there is still another complication. In respect to, say, all matters of radio, Canada made her convention or agreement with other countries on this continent, I think all together, not as a component part of the Empire at all. Therefore she could not come under section 132 of the British North America Act and could not get jurisdiction under it. She acted as an autonomous country, and His Majesty signed the convention on the advice of the ministers of Canada. But the lords of the Privy Council held—and this illustrates the value of that tribunal—that inasmuch as there could be only one body competent practically to carry into effect any agreement made, the subject-matter of that agreement must be considered to come within the peace, order and good government terms of section 92. Such was the pronouncement in the very latest case. It is believed this matter comes under the principles there enunciated and relied upon, and which must be held now to be principles in permanent effect.



But as a practical matter, throwing aside legalistic terms of every sort, I do ask honourable members to consider whether any other course is open to us. Are we not inclined, perhaps with all the plausibility in the world, perhaps being able even to quote in our favour decisions of ten or twenty years ago, to use the provinces as a shield to protect us from criticism because of our evasion of responsibility to implement an engagement which we entered into?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Passing the buck.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: No, stealing the buck.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I have followed the right honourable gentleman's explanation very sympathetically, because he generally knows what he is talking about, but I do not quite agree with him when he says that in the interpretation of our Constitution we must be guided by the principle of evolution. If I understand my right honourable friend aright, evolution according to him would be revolution in the provincial sense.

After Confederation Sir John A. Macdonald and other authorities asserted federal rights in cases where there was invasion of provincial rights according to other great constitutionalists like Edward Blake and Sir Oliver Mowat. The Ontario Streams Bill and the question of licences, among other questions, were brought before the Privy Council, and each time the Privy Council decided in favour of the provinces, on the ground that the British North America Act clearly states to which jurisdiction such and such a matter appertains.

Now, evolution may be a very fine theory, but I adhere strictly to the principles which were advocated forty or fifty years ago by such eminent constitutionalists as Sir John A. Macdonald, Edward Blake and Sir Oliver Mowat. I stand irrevocably for provincial rights, unless it has been demonstrated by the right honourable gentleman's very able argument this afternoon that we are in the wrong, and that we must, so to speak, blast our way through the Constitution. I am ready to study the matter, but it seems to me that the very ingenious theory advanced by