

Affairs (the negotiations were carried on with the assistance of His Majesty's Ambassador at Tokio). Another instance is the Reciprocity Agreement between Canada and the United States of 1911, referred to above.

II.

Multilateral Conventions affecting all the Dominions are, as a rule, the result of international conferences or congresses, and the main question arising is that of separate representation of the Dominions at such conferences. It will be convenient to treat separately (a) conventions of a technical character and (b) conventions of a political character:—

(a.) The status of the Dominions as separate countries entitled to send their own representatives to international congresses has long been recognised in the case of the Universal Postal Union. The representatives of the Dominions who attend the periodical congresses of the Union receive their powers from their own Governments, and ratification of conventions concluded by such congresses is effected by formal documents issued by the various Governments represented at the congress and not by means of a ratification by His Majesty.

In connection with the Radiotelegraph Conference of 1912, the question was raised whether, in view of the fact that under the Convention of 1906 this was to be a conference of "plenipotentiaries," the Dominion representatives should not receive Full Powers from His Majesty, and such Full Powers were issued authorising the Dominion representatives to sign for their respective Dominions. A similar procedure was followed in the case of the Conference on Safety of Life at Sea in 1914.

(b.) The first important political conference at which there was a British Empire delegation on which the Dominions were separately represented was the Peace Conference of 1919. The regulations governing the work of this conference provided for separate representation of the British Dominions and India, and the Treaty of Versailles, under which Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa and India became (in addition to the British Empire) original members of the League of Nations, was signed not only by representatives of the British Government, but also for these four Dominions and India by plenipotentiaries representing them. A similar procedure was followed in connection with the other Treaties of Peace negotiated in 1919 and 1920 and a number of other treaties forming part of the peace settlement, even though no representatives of the Dominions and India had taken any part in their preparation.

The Dominion members of the League of Nations have since sent their delegates to the Assembly of the League, and representatives of those Dominions have signed certain international engagements negotiated under the auspices of the League (*e.g.*, the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children and the protocols embodying amendments to the Covenant). The Dominions were also represented at the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921-22 (with the exception of the Union of South Africa), and at the Conference at Genoa in 1922.

It is thus the usual practice, in cases where there is a British Empire delegation at International Conferences on which the Dominions are now separately represented, for any treaties negotiated at the conferences to be signed separately by the Dominion representatives. Cases may, however, arise in which—

1. Some of the Dominions are represented, but others are not; or
2. The Dominions are not represented at all.

As indicated above, the first situation arose in connection with the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921-22, where the Union of South Africa was not represented. As a result of telegraphic correspondence between Mr. Lloyd George and General Smuts, Lord Balfour signed the various treaties as a plenipotentiary for the Union.

The most recent instance in which the second situation arose was in connection with the Lausanne Conference. In this case

it was arranged that the British Empire should be represented at the Conference by two plenipotentiaries only—Lord Curzon and Sir H. Rumbold, and the treaties negotiated there were signed, on the British side, only by Sir H. Rumbold, who had been the sole representative of His Majesty's Government in the later stages of the negotiations.

III.

In the case of certain treaties, no question of signature on behalf of the Dominions arises, as it is the practice to insert in the treaty a provision by which its stipulations will not apply to any of the Dominions, unless notice of accession is given. Such are extradition treaties, general commercial treaties negotiated by His Majesty's Government, and international conventions of a technical character negotiated otherwise than at international conferences.

Extradition treaties are now drawn in a form which safeguards the position of the Dominion Governments. As regards commercial treaties, these are based upon a model draft which has been communicated to the Dominion Governments. It is also the practice of the British Government in all important cases to inform the Dominion Governments of the negotiations with the foreign country concerned, and to ascertain whether there are any Dominion interests which it is desirable to keep in view in the negotiations.

There are also certain classes of international engagements, *e.g.*, arbitration agreements, which apply to the whole of the Empire, but are not signed separately on behalf of the Dominions, though it is the practice to consult the Dominion Governments as to their inclusion within the scope of the arrangements. In some cases, *e.g.*, agreements relating to the tonnage measurement of merchant-ships, such instruments provide for separate termination in respect of the Dominions.

Foreign Office, October 25, 1923.