

Sir Donald Somervell said that the deliberations of the Experts had gone far enough to show that while there was room for differences of opinion regarding the inconveniences to which the Union Delegation referred, there was at any rate a problem in existence which would have to be examined.

The examination, however, could not take place in vacuo. Three Members of the Commonwealth, namely, Canada, the Union of South Africa and the Irish Free State had already passed legislation defining who were entitled to the privileges of local nationality and how such nationality might be acquired. The Canadian legislation was based on different principles from those followed by the Union. The Irish Free State was not represented at the Meeting.

The next important fact to be noted was that other Members of the Commonwealth were unwilling to legislate to define their nationalities.

It by no means followed from this that it was undesirable to consider the principles on which such legislation ought to be based, if and when it was thought desirable. For example, a country which did not wish to legislate might nevertheless stand in need of principles on which to base its administrative acts.

The Union Experts had made it clear that one of their objects in raising this topic at the Conference was to obtain ^{benefit} the/ of the opinions of the other Members of the Commonwealth, in view of the fact that further legislation dealing with nationality might be required in the Union itself.

It was desirable therefore to consider the principles of distinct nationality and common status from three points of view:-