

have not altered. Utterly transformed, however, are the circumstances to which they must be applied. Within the Commonwealth the ideological, the structural and racial problems of today are not what they were yesterday.

"Among current problems is the scope of representative democracy in the Commonwealth partnership. And the questions it raises are, in essence, ideological. During the first half of the twentieth century, as oversea countries of the Commonwealth attained equality of status, parliamentary government and civil liberties were deemed its crowning glory.

"Representative democracy cannot be applied in the same manner and degree in all Commonwealth countries. Whatever the changes, the political legacy of the Commonwealth is respected. Despite compromises, it is held up as a criterion. It is still the goal towards which emancipated peoples will strive. The efforts of newly-emancipated peoples to better their lot commands sympathy and support. Some in Commonwealth countries have found it difficult to adapt to their environment the most advanced systems of law and politics. We understand that. We remember, too, how representative democracy has either broken down or failed to gain acceptance in European countries that were economically mature. There may be exceptions from the forms of public life that Commonwealth countries have inherited. It is, therefore, all the more important to reassert the principles that have, on the whole, made the Commonwealth what it is.

REASSERTION OF PRINCIPLES

"This is not ideological imperialism. It is to declare that personal and political liberties are still the most desirable of objectives.

"The Commonwealth is a voluntary grouping of independent states. It follows from this that, if Commonwealth countries meddled in the domestic affairs of fellow members, the Commonwealth would soon dissolve. And, that being so, is there any reason why it should not include every form of government?

"Totalitarian dictatorships have afflicted mankind since World War I. For this militant, crusading type of government there would be no room in the Commonwealth. And what would exclude it from the Commonwealth is what I have conceived to be the Commonwealth's ideology. That ideology may be a tacit one; in any final test it would, all the same, be decisive. No sworn foe of freedom could be a member.

DIFFERS FROM UN

"While sometimes compared to the United Nations, the Commonwealth is a very different kind of association. The United Nations can, does, and must, tolerate foes of freedom. It escapes ideological problems, by having no overriding ideology. An overriding ideology is patent within the Commonwealth. It is inconceivable that any member of the Commonwealth could be fully totalitarian in spirit.

Traditional and accepted values are too strong.

"Immediate problems of the Commonwealth agenda are of a racial and structural nature. I would be the last to discuss the affairs of other nations within the Commonwealth and speak only by way of illustration of a major Commonwealth problem which affects the present and future of the Commonwealth.

POSITION OF SOUTH AFRICA

"In the communiqué issued in May 1960 by the last Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, it was stated that, while Commonwealth Conferences do not discuss the internal affairs of member countries, the Prime Ministers did informally talk over the racial situation in South Africa. The Prime Minister emphasized that the Commonwealth is a multi-racial association and expressed the need to ensure good relations between all member states and peoples of the Commonwealth.

"In connection with the problem of membership I will quote one passage from the communiqué which, with a referendum impending, may have an earlier bearing on Commonwealth affairs than was anticipated:

'In the event of South Africa deciding to become a republic and if the desire was subsequently expressed to remain a member of the Commonwealth, the meeting suggested that the South African Government should then ask for the consent of the other Commonwealth governments.'

These words were accepted by all member states of the Commonwealth and that fact should be emphasized. As consent to membership requires unanimity, these words become significant and important.

"It is true that every member of the Commonwealth prides itself on having achieved independence and a proper and growing place in the wider family of nations. What is essential about the idea of independence is the capacity, and the will and the opportunity, for a people to take responsibilities and to make their own decisions. It is essential that Commonwealth countries should not interfere in the internal affairs of any other Commonwealth country. As Canadians we may still express our view of what is right and just.

"This has been a great and timely Conference. Unity, which denies race, colour or creed, has been the spirit of this meeting since the first day when the Chief Justice of Canada, the Lord High Chancellor, and the Chief Justice of Nigeria, joined in the ceremonies at the Supreme Court Building in common honour to the tradition of respect for law.

RULE OF LAW IN CANADA

"Canada's Bill of Rights exemplifies Canada's abhorrence of racist practices within her territorial boundaries. That enactment was designed to protect, under law, the dignity of man. Under the Bill of Rights it is recognized