

attention is paid to it. I do not blame them for that; far from it. These academic matters, like this resolution, are not worth discussing at the present time, particularly when we have more important matters with which to deal. Here we are wasting a whole day on these academic matters. Last night the budget was delivered and it may be days before it is discussed. The same thing happened last year and the year before. We had discussions on the flag, the anthem, appeals to the privy council, and on many matters such as status, sovereignty, autonomy and so forth. All these things involve a change in the status of Canada. This motion is based on the status of Canada, on our autonomy and sovereignty. The resolution is based on that. Our status and autonomy were good enough for a million men in the first world war. They went overseas voluntarily under that status; 130,000 of them fell on the field of battle, and what they did changed the whole history of the world. In the second world war five times as many went, and at ten times the cost. If our status, autonomy and sovereignty were good enough for these men it should be good enough for those who stayed at home.

I wish to point out that the present gracious sovereign and his gracious queen paid a visit to the hon. member's constituency, Kamouraska, and to the constituency next door in his province, Temiscouata, at Riviere du Loup. No part of Canada gave a finer welcome to the king and queen than did the loyal people of Quebec. These people have done a lot for the country and for confederation.

This matter of king of Canada came up at the time Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power, but it did not get very far. The resolution is not properly worded. No part of Canada gave a better welcome to the king than did the counties of Kamouraska and Temiscouata. The school children with flags marched around the park five or six times. The stay which was supposed to take about half an hour took an hour and a half. The gentleman who is now chief justice of New Brunswick, Hon. Joseph E. Michaud, but who was a minister of the crown at that time, was in charge of the visit. The king asked him if all the school children of Quebec were at the gathering at Riviere du Loup. All the people of Quebec acted in the same way, of giving the king and queen a wonderful welcome.

I should like to refer to the visit of the king and queen and the gracious Princess Elizabeth to South Africa. The princess made a speech which appealed to me, as I am sure it appealed to other hon. members. It was

made to the youth of twenty-one years of age and under, in the whole empire. I hope it will be read for many days in this country and in the schools; her solemn declaration and dedication of a lifelong service to the empire by a girl of twenty-one years, in her appeal to all youth, which reached the hearts and minds of all the youth of our glorious empire.

I am not going to say much more about this motion, because there are others who no doubt wish to take part in the discussion. But there seems to me to be a wave of separatism passing over this country at the present time. We have thirty-six representatives here from foreign countries whereas we used to have none. We have twenty-six ambassadors abroad on the seven seas representing Canada. A list was given the other day; compare that with Great Britain. Great Britain is represented in foreign countries by no more than fourteen ambassadors. France has fewer representatives abroad than the Dominion of Canada. We have more than Russia or the United States. I cannot help thinking that there is a deliberate attempt to scuttle the empire, liquidating parts of it here and there.

I wish to point out the law in regard to this matter. I submit that the motion is out of order because the object sought can be attained only by means of an address from both houses of parliament to the parliament of Great Britain to change the British North America Act. It cannot be done by resolution. The only procedure that we can adopt is an address by this House of Commons and the other place. An address to whom? To the king and the parliament of the mother country—an address to amend the British North America Act. After all, is not His Majesty at the present time the king of Canada, and always has been, and also king of all the dominions overseas? In this connection I would like to read from the "Statute of Westminster and Dominion Status". I recommend this book to hon. members. They will find it well worth their attention. The author is K. C. Wheare, London, England. I quote:

It has seemed necessary at the outset first to distinguish constitutional rules of strict law, as exemplified by the Statute of Westminster, from non-legal constitutional rules, as exemplified by the conventions declared in the Imperial Conference Reports, and immediately thereafter to assert the interrelation and interaction of these two classes of rule, as exemplified in the term "dominion status," because there is a tendency, in the discussion of British constitutional development to underestimate the importance of rules of strict law, and in particular of statute, in that development; to overestimate the import-