

agreement on sound and advantageous lines. It did not follow, however, that similar procedure would necessarily be applicable in the case of negotiations for another air line, or that there should necessarily, to quote paragraph (iv), "be consultation between the respective Governments concerned before facilities are granted".

MR. SAVAGE saw no advantage in depriving oneself of an agreed guiding principle.

MR. NASH thought that the Resolution was very much in the interests of a small Dominion such as New Zealand. New Zealand could negotiate for an air line in conjunction with other Members of the Commonwealth but could hardly negotiate on her own.

MR. CRERAR said that the Canadian Government was not opposed to co-operation and consultation. It was only averse from laying down the principle of compulsory consultation and advertising it to the world.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN thought that the discussion showed that it would be a great pity if paragraphs (iv) and (v) were struck out from the Resolution. The two sides to the discussion were very close to agreement. Probably a consultation in private would suffice to bring them together.

The Report of the Committee on Civil Air Communications (E. (37) 34) was referred back in the light of the discussion for further consideration of the outstanding points.

The discussion in the Meeting of Principal Delegates had resulted in Resolution A paragraphs (i) to (iii) being approved, subject to the amendment of one passage in paragraph (iii); and in the deletion of Resolution B.

It remained for the Committee to attempt to discover a basis for agreement as regards Resolution A paragraphs (iv) and (v); and to consider whether any consequential changes in the Report were necessary.