

ambassadors. You can simply call the Dominion representatives H.B.M. Canadian Minister; or H.B.M. Commissioner for Canada. In that case, I lose interest in the whole idea. I maintain that it is a further confusing of the situation, because the label is not true. You and everyone admit that the British Commonwealth can only have one set of foreign relations, though different parts of it may have many interests abroad arising out of different internal conditions which may require separate expert handling. Such matters are not, however, of the first importance. They can be handled perfectly well by trade commissioners or technical representatives, and we all hope that as a result of the formation of the League of Nations these special matters will more and more tend to be dealt with in permanent international commissions and bureaux on which each part of the British Commonwealth will be separately represented. Consequently, it is not true to say that the Canadian representative will be H.B.M. High Commissioner for Canada. He would be H.B.M. High Commissioner for such Canadian questions as are not part of the general foreign relations of the British Commonwealth, and are, therefore, not handled by H.B.M. ambassador. H.B.M. cannot have five representatives at the same capital. In these circumstances, I should, personally, be strongly in favour of saying that Canada might by all means appoint a High Commissioner anywhere she pleased, call him a minister or anything else she liked, but that there is no necessity for giving him a commission from His Majesty. If you really want to express the co-operation of all parts of the British Commonwealth in foreign policy, I would present you with an alternative scheme. It is quite obvious that the previous scheme we have been discussing has broken down.

“The true way of expressing the co-operation between them is that there should be formed at the Foreign Office in London a Council on foreign affairs for the whole Empire, consisting of representatives of the Dominions *and a representative of Great Britain*. This Council should have the same kind of relation to the Imperial Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (who might or might not be an Englishman) as the India Council has to the Secretary of State for India, that is to say, it should be a mainly advisory body, but a statutory one with defined powers. Its rights should be safeguarded by some such arrangement as that employed in the case of the India Council, i.e. that the Secretary of State for India may not override the contrary opinion of the India Council unless he minutes his reasons for disagreement — which in practice is a real deterrent to disagreement and very rarely happens. As a counterpart to this Council in London, every Embassy of sufficient importance at the foreign capitals should be provided with Dominion representatives, who would both be able to act in an advisory capacity to the British Ambassador (who might or might not be an Englishman) and would be able to undertake themselves the settlement of technical questions particularly affecting their respective Dominions. Such a system would give a new meaning to the word ‘counsellor’, which, by an alteration in spelling, might become a satisfactory title for Dominion representatives — e.g. H.B.M. Councillor for Canada.