

question is one for whom it may intervene, that he is its national. In the absence of a law defining Australian nationality it will be difficult to decide this question.

- (iv) Now that each Dominion is free to follow its own external policy and to enter into international agreements affecting it alone, it obviously becomes necessary to establish a criterion by which to decide the question, which British subjects will enjoy the benefits or have to submit to the burdens, of such an agreement. The obvious test is that of nationality which must be capable of clear definition.
- (v) In regard to the right of any Dominion to intervene on behalf of its own nationals, if maltreated in foreign countries, there can be no doubt as to its desirability. Neither can anyone reasonably dispute it now. But the Dominion concerned should know which persons are its nationals for this purpose. Whenever diplomatic representatives of several Dominions are accredited to one country, it becomes desirable, also between them, to know, on behalf of which British subjects each is entitled to intervene. The same question arises where there are separate consular officers of several Dominions in any country. In these cases, also nationality would be the proper test.
- (vi) With regard to the question of the extraterritorial operation of a country's legislation, the Dominions now have the power to legislate with extraterritorial effect. Now, what persons must obey these laws? Surely not all British subjects! To what utter