

*Supply—External Affairs*

limitation of our field of sovereign independence as a nation. To that suggestion Peter Fraser, while he was prime minister of New Zealand, used these memorable words:

Membership of the commonwealth is not independence with something taken away: it is independence with something added.

I do not believe the thought could be better expressed. As a completely sovereign nation, in no way subordinate in any manner to any other nation, nevertheless within this fellowship, by the very association we establish, we add something to the strength of our own freedom by this fellowship of people who respect the same institutions, the same traditions and the same concept of the right of the individual under well-stated and well-defined laws.

There are of course those who seem to think that in these wider associations, such as the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other organizations of that kind, we have in effect thrown off something of this older fellowship. We speak of it as though it was some mysterious entity that has no more substance than a Cheshire cat with nothing but the smile remaining. Let us examine it and see what it really means. Certainly no one who was in the great hall of Westminster almost a year ago now, at the time that more than a thousand representatives of fifty-five nations and other political bodies within the commonwealth met there in the presence of their Queen, will ever forget that memorable scene when in that ancient hall that enormous group of nations expressed their loyalty to the Queen and at the same time heard from that Queen her declaration of service to her people.

Fifty-five nations with one concept of freedom, fifty-five nations expressing common ideals, and then only a few days later in the coronation service the heads of those states walked into the abbey and saw the young Queen dedicate herself in that solemn service to the great cause of which we are all a part. Was that only pageantry? Was that merely something that attracted a great crowd to London a year ago or was that something real and lasting, something of great meaning to us and to the rest of mankind? I prefer to believe that this was the beginning of a new hope which may be fulfilled if we recognize all the opportunities presented by what was symbolized on that occasion. I say "hope" advisedly because we should not yet assume that we have achieved the things for which so many of us have been hoping and dreaming for so many years.

We are inclined to speak of the second Elizabethan era as though the mere fact that her name is Elizabeth would of necessity

give to our Queen the same role in revivifying and revitalizing this great fellowship as fell to the lot of an earlier Elizabeth. I think it would be well for us to remember that when the first Elizabeth came to the throne it was in a time of poverty, of diminishing resources and of an economic blockade which threatened even starvation itself in the British Isles. It was not the mere arrival on the throne of a young queen that changed all that. It was the spirit of a people dedicated to a great cause.

The reason that from its early plight Britain assumed a new role and laid the foundations for this commonwealth within the reign of that first Elizabeth was that men and women of vision, boldness and daring were prepared to make decisions which resulted in the wider concept of freedom that has come down to us at this time. We will only know the full freedom of a second Elizabethan era if we are prepared to make bold decisions today and, with the same vision, the same broad prospects for the future, are prepared to go forward together with the possibilities of our own prosperity clearly before our eyes and at the same time the knowledge of what that can mean to all the rest of the world.

This is no simple task that we are called upon to undertake if in fact we do undertake it in the way we should. What a challenge it is to the spirit of every one of us. Just let us visualize the broad picture of what this means. We have heard of the millions in Asia. We have spoken of the hundreds of millions brought under communist domination. I think it is well for us to remember that in this commonwealth today, in this commonwealth represented by those who were in London a year ago, there are at this time 620 million people. That in itself gives some idea of the immense and almost limitless possibilities that are before us if we keep this partnership as a real adventure in friendship between nations with common traditions and common understanding of their past.

Let us look at the numbers embraced in that figure. India has 367 million people, Pakistan 80 million, the United Kingdom 51 million, Canada 15 million, the Union of South Africa 13,153,000, Australia 8,829,000, Ceylon 7,941,000, New Zealand 2,047,000, and in the other territories within this great fellowship there are 75 million people.

I do not think anyone will challenge the statement made earlier that in this great task before us nothing can be more important in the hope of stability in Asia than that we should gain the confidence and support of the government and people of India. When the Prime Minister left on his tour some time ago I expressed the warm support of