

be expressed without sacrificing the principle of non-interference, which is one of the elements of the Commonwealth association. I took the view that notwithstanding the depth of feeling on this racial issue—my views throughout the years and now are a matter of record—I believed it would be wrong and damaging to the spirit and fabric of the Commonwealth partnership if a majority of the Commonwealth governments, finding themselves allied in condemnation of one or more of their number, were to constitute themselves as a court of judgment. I saw, as I said a moment ago, in that trend an end of the association as we know it. The seed of mutual recrimination would threaten the partnership whose essence has always been tolerance, restraint and free co-operation.

. . . Strong feelings were held in the informal meetings. Men like the President of Pakistan, the Prime Ministers of India, of Malaya and of Ghana, accepted this view as essential to the preservation and maintenance of our relationship. There was unanimous acceptance of the principle that internal affairs of free states are not to be the subject of formal discussion, and that any action in that regard would damage the strength and ultimately the preservation of the institution itself.

I cannot reveal . . . in the tradition of those meetings, the substance of the talks. They were at times bilateral, at times in small groups, and at other times all the representatives took part in an informal and private exchange of views. For my part, I had two lengthy and private personal conversations with Mr. Louw; I participated in other informal discussions. I left Mr. Louw in no doubt that in Canada there is no sympathy for policies of racial discrimination, on whatever grounds they may be explained, and that such policies are basically incompatible with the multiracial nature of the Commonwealth association. I made it clear to him that the policy of South Africa was a denial of the principle that human dignity and the worth of the individual, whatever his race and colour, must be respected, and that there could be no doubt as to our views in that connection. Indeed, those views are being generally expressed now.

A few weeks ago there were those who felt that what we required was condemnation by various parliaments. I think the events during the days of the Conference were an answer to that contention. Our views, the views of all of us in other parts of the Commonwealth, or most of the people in other parts of the Commonwealth, were set out only a few days ago by the Archbishop of Canterbury when he said:

But the tragedy is that so far they (South Africa) have seemed to pay little or no regard to the burdens they are imposing on the hearts and consciences and political principles of those who are their brethren in the Commonwealth, in culture, in Christian faith and in common humanity.

Only in the last 24 hours I have received from the Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada the declaration of that Church, which represents the views expressed at the 1958 Lambeth Conference:

The Conference affirms its belief in the natural dignity and value of every man of whatever colour or race as created in the image of God. In the light of this belief the Con-