

That is also something which is now working out in this Commonwealth of free peoples. I think it is a solid foundation upon which there can develop and rest equal pride of all of us in our allegiance to a common sovereign. There are those of us who recognize the Sovereign of the United Kingdom as our own Sovereign. There is a common loyalty between us and the group of which that Sovereign is the head only as the head of the Commonwealth because in their countries the situation that exists does not make it convenient to have a monarchical form of constitutional set-up.

I believe firmly that what we are doing here today and what others are doing in their respective parliaments will further that ideal of unity of purpose and desire to co-operate that characterizes us at this time and which was so touchingly evident at the meeting of prime ministers which it was my privilege to attend a month and a half ago in the city of London.

During the debate that followed, the Secretary of State for External Affairs rose to add the following remarks to those of the Prime Minister:

...The bill before the House deals with the Royal style and titles, and I should like to say a few words about it ... against the background of our constitutional development. It is a long time between the date when King Egbert, in the ninth century proclaimed himself as King of the English--and 1953 when we are by this bill approving of a Royal style and title for Her Majesty as Queen of Canada and Head of the Commonwealth--head indeed of the peoples of the Commonwealth. During that long interval there have been very many changes in the Royal style and titles.

...By 1926 the Royal style and titles had become one of the subjects for discussion at the periodic Commonwealth conferences which were held in London, and the title has changed since then, as has been pointed out this afternoon, as a result of decisions reached at those conferences. After the Statute of Westminster, ... not only were the members of the Commonwealth consulted on proposed changes but subsequent assent of their parliaments was required to make such changes effective.

The bill before the House, which is one of such importance, in a sense fulfils the ambition of Sir John A. Macdonald that Canada should be recognized as a Kingdom. Students of Canadian history are familiar with his efforts at the London Conference of 1866-67 to persuade the British Government of that day to agree that the country, to be formed by the union of the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, should bear the title "Kingdom of Canada." At that time relations between the United States and the United Kingdom were not as solidly based on good understanding and co-operation as they are at the present time. Because of the strong tide of republicanism in the United States, born I suppose of the struggle for independence against a monarchy, the view in London and of the home government was that it would not be wise unnecessarily to offend that feeling by allowing the new Canadian federation to call itself a kingdom, a designation which it was thought, and possibly with some justice, might have stirred up deep antagonism in the United States. Nevertheless, it is interesting to recall that Sir John A. Macdonald, who did not