

Our Queen, who bears the Crown, is the monarch of several nations, each "in no way subordinate one to the other". It is true that it is the Queen of the United Kingdom who is also the Queen of Canada. That, however, is a result of our past history, which the people of Canada gladly accept of their own free will.

In Canada the Queen is represented by a Governor General, who, incidentally and to make matters more confusing to outsiders, is not a general and does not govern. The present Governor General is a distinguished Canadian for whom we have deep respect, and who was the first Canadian diplomatic representative to the United States.

The Queen will shortly proclaim for use in Canada a Royal Style and Title chosen and approved by the Parliament of Canada, and she will do the same for each Commonwealth country which recognizes her as Queen, using the styles and titles desired by the parliament of those countries. One title, which will be used by all, however, is "Head of the Commonwealth". This is because India, which is a republic and has a President as head of state, recognizes the Queen simply as Head of the Commonwealth. The presence at the coronation of June 2, of representatives from all the nations of the Commonwealth, whether monarchy or republic, will be a striking demonstration of that free association of states of which she is the symbol; as well as another indication of the adaptability of the Commonwealth to new political ideas.

At times the idea of the Commonwealth is a puzzling and difficult one for people outside it - and even some inside it - to grasp. Some time ago, I read in an American publication an article entitled "The Commonwealth Cult - What Really Binds Britain and the Dominions". In this article the author says with some cynicism:

"The Commonwealth appears in fact to be no more than an alumni association without an executive committee, by-laws or a programme of concerted action whose individual spirited, self-willed members, presided over by their former headmaster, recognize no other obligations towards one another than may be prompted by the heart or by considerations of far-sighted self-interest."

In another publication (this time a British one) I have seen the Commonwealth described in even more critical terms:

"A sprawling collection of nations with no common obligations, with no co-ordinated line of action in world affairs and at odds with each other, make up an international system which is a travesty of the word 'Commonwealth'".

What these authors have failed to do is to distinguish sufficiently between form and substance. Yet this distinction lies at the root of an understanding of the Commonwealth. This elastic and adaptable association has weathered many storms, and has in the past proved its vigour and usefulness, not only to its own members, but to the world, by its remarkable capacity for meeting and dealing with practical situations; and for altering its outward