

politically a unitary state instead of a group of individual international entities; and

- (b) that a Member, on occasion, in dealing with a foreign country, should bargain diplomatically on behalf of other Members and stipulate for rights in their favour; for example, that New Zealand may bargain with the United States for rights in favour of Canada and, vice versa, Canada might be expected to stipulate in Washington for rights in favour of New Zealand.

The Canadian Delegation considered that these conceptions, as well as other examples that might be adduced, opened up such far-reaching implications, and presented such possibilities of friction both as between Members of the Commonwealth and as between them severally and foreign countries, that they were unable to endorse them. They did not feel that such declarations would constitute a useful contribution to the amelioration of the existing international tension.

At the same time they felt confident that, under the terms of their reservation recorded in Committee, all proper cases could in practice be handled effectively without attempting to prejudge the event, or to commit individual Members to far-reaching principles.

It might be added that the position of the Canadian Government in this sense was made known in advance of the Conference.

SIR ARCHDALE PARKHILL did not see what objection there could be to bargaining for ^{one another} / on such points as securing landing places in foreign countries. Surely no Dominion which was going to benefit from the bargain would see any harm in it.

MR. MACKENZIE KING said that it almost seemed as if they had different ideas of the British Commonwealth. If it was to become anything like a political unity, that would be a great change from the present conception of the