

Let us suppose, for a moment that the motion be agreed to and that the next imperial conference grant our wish: a new step will have been taken and no one could accuse Canadians of a lack of patience. Other countries might, unwarrantably, no doubt, practice this virtue to a lesser extent.

Fruit is good to eat when ripe; independence is a fruit which a nation must pick when it is ripe. The great republic to the south had to endure the frightful war of secession before it could finally pick the ripe fruit of independence.

Are we to believe that Poland, alternately dependent and independent since the glorious dynasty of Ladislases, will never be prepared for the enjoyment of a benefit so jealously prized by less advanced communities?

Judging from what is taking place, according to newscasts, India, which seems to have been promised independence, does not apparently show any greater readiness for it. Moslem and Hindu rivalries, the surgings of hitherto peaceable sects, foreign intrigue readily arousing a still queasy population, all seem to stand in the way of full independence. The British United Press announced last night that the United States of Indonesia who have just been granted independence, were on the brink of civil war. It will then be readily admitted that a maximum of genuine, deep, and not a merely apparent national unity is required within a nation that considers itself ripe for independence.

Our constitutional evolution is as inevitable as that of other countries. No one can stay its progress. It is all the surer for its being slower, more enduring. With each new step we now take, we grow circumspect and watch the next step. With each new war, we seem to hesitate.

Perhaps it is because of circumstances, of necessities arising from our union, from our nearness to a great country, our awareness of being called upon to take a leading part in world affairs. I congratulate the hon. member for Kamouraska for introducing this motion and hope that the people of Canada will keep on showing patience, steadfastness and judgment, and will display even greater confidence, if possible, in the future marked by Providence for a country whose strength and courage compel recognition on the part of the most sceptical, the most timorous and especially the mightiest.

(Text):

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I should like to say a word of appreciation to hon. members who took part in this debate for the

high tone in which the matters have been discussed and for the interesting material which has been brought to the attention of the house. My colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs and I were looking at the terms of this motion when the debate commenced and he supplied me with the words which, I think, properly describe this: one of the signs of the inevitability of gradualness. There is no doubt that the present royal style and title is not in full accord with the constitutional position of the units of the commonwealth and other lands over which His Majesty is king. This title is also the result of gradualness. One part of it, Defender of the Faith, if I am not mistaken, is a memento of a compliment paid to King Henry VIII by the Pope of Rome and has always been maintained in the description of the titular head of the United Kingdom. The form in which the royal style and title now appears is, as hon. gentlemen know, "George VI, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the seas King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India." This wording was established by a royal proclamation issued under the great seal of the realm and published in the London *Gazette* on May 13, 1927, in the exercise by His Majesty of the powers conferred upon him by the Royal and Parliamentary Titles Act of 1927. In it there was retained the expression "Defender of the Faith". There was retained also the expression "Emperor of India", which was first added to the description in 1876. There was also retained the expression "the British dominions beyond the seas", which appears to have been incorporated in the royal title by virtue of a statute of 1901. Though in many documents in which the words "dominion beyond the seas" were used, the word "dominion" commenced with a capital "d"; that was not so originally. In the statute of 1901 power was given to make addition to the style and title of the crown in these terms:

It shall be lawful for His Most Gracious Majesty, with a view to the recognition of His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas—

That is with a small "d", referring to his dominions beyond the seas and the lands over which he exercised royal authority.

—by his royal proclamation under the great seal of the United Kingdom issued within six months after the passing of this act, to make such addition to the style and titles at present appertaining to the imperial crown of the United Kingdom and its dependencies as His Majesty may see fit.

Following that statute, a proclamation was issued setting forth the style and title of