

once they attained independence after World War II, to remain in the family.

Again Canadian leaders built wisely and well, for constructive purposes beyond their own country's immediate needs. And again the French element in Canada was an important factor in our determination to shape the Commonwealth in a way acceptable to peoples of non-Anglo Saxon origin.

Another crucial development which worried some of the constitutional logicians at the time, was the courageous decision of Mr. Nehru that India, when it became a Republic, would like to remain in the Commonwealth: and the equally courageous and by no means obvious decision of the rest of us, in which again Canadians played a key part, that the sovereignty of the crown was not an essential feature of the Commonwealth, and that an independent Republic should be allowed and indeed be encouraged to retain Commonwealth membership when all those involved desired it. By that decision it seems to me that the true majesty of our Queen has been enhanced. Her position as Head of the Commonwealth symbolises and points to a brotherhood which transcends mankind's divisions of sovereignty and race and thereby performs in modern conditions a role subtler but no less creative and I think more durable than tangible empire.

Another key stage in the evolution of the Commonwealth, and here again it was a matter of conscious and agonizing and I think very clear-headed vision, is the firm stand on the principles of racial equality. As my friend John Holmes put it, it has recently come to be recognized that the Commonwealth philosophy