

not easy to draw the dividing line between what it should be possible for a majority to do, because it is the majority, and what a minority should have the right to prevent because it would deprive it of some essential element of its minority rights. We are all conscious that we are growing up and this is a problem we will have to face, but despite several conferences about it, we have not yet been able to agree upon a satisfactory solution.

FISHER: Does this mean that in legal matters, too, you must refer to the United Kingdom?

ST. LAURENT: It's similar. The final court of appeal for Canadians is not the Supreme Court of Canada but the judicial committee of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom.

FISHER: I thought you had introduced a bill in your Parliament, Mr. St. Laurent, to make the Canadian Supreme Court the final court?

ST. LAURENT: We did. An appeal was taken to the Privy Council in London. But it was delayed by the war.

FISHER: And, I understand, it's opinion has just come down?

ST. LAURENT: Yes. And the opinion, in effect, rules that it would be entirely legal for the Canadian Parliament to make our Supreme Court the final court of appeal.

FISHER: What does that mean? That your bill abolishing appeal to the Privy Council will have to go through your Parliament again?

ST. LAURENT: Yes. When we decide we do finally want to abolish that appeal.

FISHER: I take it, Mr. St. Laurent, that decision has not yet been taken?

ST. LAURENT: No. We have not yet decided whether or not the bill shall be introduced in this Session. As you know, Mr. Fisher our Parliament reconvened only the day before yesterday.

FISHER: Summing up, then, the question of your constitutional ties, Mr. St. Laurent?

ST. LAURENT: I can say that the effective ties are first, the form of our constitution is that of a constitutional monarchy which works in a manner similar to that of the other constitutional monarchies of the Commonwealth and which has tradition and experience behind it and with which our people are well satisfied; those constitutional monarchies all have the same King and if with all due respect I may put it this way, we are all very well satisfied with him; then there is the practice of intimate consultation between the several autonomous governments of the Commonwealth and the consciousness of the real mutual benefits we have all derived from this practice. It is difficult to put a good way of living into words but when it is a good way you don't have to have precise formulae to realize its worth.

FISHER: Next on my list of questions, Mr. Claxton, is one which concerns you personally as Minister of National Defence. I think I said earlier that I wanted to ask you about unification of the armed forces under one Minister. I would like to learn the reasons which led Canada to take this step. As you know, it has been the subject of much discussion in the United States.

CLAXTON: Well, in the first place, Mr. Fisher, it seems to us plain commonsense to achieve the maximum co-ordination between the services. They fought together in war: we thought they should work together in