

world vagabondage of our diplomats and statesmen today, it is interesting to recall that in going to that conference where Mr. Meighen was to oppose the greatest minds in England at that time—Lloyd George, Churchill, Curzon, Birkenhead and, last but not least, that famous character from Australia, Mr. Hughes—he took along with him but one assistant from the External Affairs Department, Mr. Loring Christie, his private secretary Mr. Charles Armstrong, and another gentleman who acted as his stenographer, three in all. Yet in that month in London, as I said, when he was opposing the cream of British statesmanship, he fought single-handed until he won his point which resulted in the calling in that same year of the Washington Disarmament Conference.

The point I want to make about that meeting is this: Here you had the old Commonwealth of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India and South Africa. Now, in that conference when they were discussing the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, with all its implications of world policy, naturally there had to be a tremendous amount of discussion concerning security of the most delicate kind. What I put to you today, gentlemen, is this: Could a conference of that kind take place in the Commonwealth as it exists today?

Another question which must occur to all of us in considering the Commonwealth is this: What tests today apply for membership of the Commonwealth? In the case of the United Nations the test used—observed rather loosely, I admit—is that a nation shall be a peace-loving nation. Do we say that the test for membership in the Commonwealth shall be that a nation has regard for human freedom, for liberty, for civil justice, for civil liberty, for the right of free assembly and for the freedom of the press? I ask you to look at Ghana where Mr. Nkrumah dismissed his own Minister of Justice out of hand, suppressed his Parliament, created a one-party state, and took the image of Her Majesty the Queen off his coins.

I ask you to look at Mr. Ian Smith's record in Southern Rhodesia. What there do you find now of regard for justice? They had an election there last week, a sort of double-barrelled election, one in two categories. Certain people were allowed to vote for 65 seats in the assembly and certain people for 15 seats. Mr. Ian Smith, having got his majority by these means, now says that if this is not acceptable to the United Kingdom he will

declare Rhodesia's independence. Well, Rhodesia is not a full-fledged member of the Commonwealth, but would be welcomed there, and I think if we are going to deal with the Commonwealth in this proposed committee, a fair question to be asked is: What about countries like Ghana? What about countries like Rhodesia? What about countries like Kenya?—and so on down the line. Honourable senators, I am convinced that you are weakening, you are diminishing the affection, the respect, the love which people have for the Commonwealth when you have a membership of that kind.

I know there are answers to what I am saying, and one is: Well, why not keep them in the Commonwealth? Mr. Nkrumah will not always be with us, and maybe his successors will be of a different state of mind. That is one argument, but I do not think it is a convincing one. What is more, I know that in Britain today there is steadily declining respect for the position of the Commonwealth. In fact, the first time I had the honour of speaking in this chamber I had to point out what I think was true, that members of Mr. Macmillan's ministry in London, supported by a wing of the Conservative party but not by the British people, were engaged in downgrading the Commonwealth as a trade potential. And last night my distinguished friend Senator Roebuck said this was one of the things we might discuss in this committee, the trade potential of the Commonwealth. The trade potential of the Commonwealth was not too readily accepted or supported in this country two years ago, and that at a time when Mr. Heath and his accomplices were selling the Commonwealth down the river.

I come now to Cyprus. When it was decided a year ago to send Canadian troops to Cyprus, the Leader of the Government in this house, Senator Connolly (Ottawa West), made an announcement on the position taken by the Government. I think that was in line with his wish, which he has carried out fairly and with distinction, of enhancing the prestige of this chamber. But, honourable senators, what have we heard about Cyprus since? On the night the Leader of the Government made his announcement I ventured to ask him whether any other countries, and if so how many, were joining with Canada in this peace-keeping mission. He answered, and quite properly, that the matter was then a subject of confidential negotiations and he could not answer at that