

subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office." It is interesting to note that, in the case of the proposed grant of a peerage by the British Government to a distinguished citizen of the Union of South Africa for war services, the Lord Chancellor of England has stated that it is "realized that no British citizen or subject primarily belonging to a Dominion ought ever to be recommended for honour in Great Britain, except with the assent and approval of his Government."

General Conclusion.—While it can hardly be maintained that the Dominions have as yet secured an adequate voice and influence in the direction of the Empire's foreign policy, it is to be observed that the powers of the Dominions have hitherto developed as the need for more extended powers has arisen. Without any violent break with the past, the Dominions have secured through the League of Nations a voice in international affairs as least as powerful as that of such independent nations as Argentina and Brazil. Ten years ago this would have been considered unthinkable without a total separation from the Empire, yet it has actually occurred, and there does not seem to be any reason why the process of evolution should not continue until we have the continuance of the British Empire secured upon a "basis of absolute out-and-out equal partnership between the United Kingdom and the Dominions."

The progress of the Dominions in international status in the past decade is thus set forth by Oppenheim, in the third edition of his *International Law*, Vol. 1, secs. 94a and 94b:

"94a. Formerly the position of self-governing Dominions, such as Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, did not, in International Law, present any difficulties. Then they had no International position whatever, because they were, from the point of view of International Law, mere colonial portions of the Mother Country. It did not matter that some of them, as, for example, Canada, and Australia, flew as their own flag the modified flag of the Mother Country, or that they had their own coinage, their own postage stamps, and the like. Nor did they become subjects of International Law (although the position was somewhat anomalous) when they were admitted, side by side with the Mother Country, as parties to the administrative unions, such as the Universal Postal Union. Even when they were empowered by the Mother Country to enter into certain treaty arrangements of minor importance with foreign States, they still did not thereby become subjects of International Law, but simply exercised for the matters in question the treaty-making power of the Mother Country which had been to that extent delegated to them."

"94b. But the position of self-governing Dominions underwent a fundamental change at the end of the World War. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and also India, were not only separately represented within the British Empire delegation at the Peace Conference, but also became, side by side with Great Britain, original members of the League of Nations. Separately represented in the Assembly of the League, they may, of course, vote there independently of Great Britain. Now the League of Nations is not a mere administrative union like the Universal Postal Union, but the organized Family of Nations. Without doubt, therefore, the admission of these four self-governing Dominions and of India to membership gives them a position in International Law. But the place of the self-governing Dominions within the Family of Nations at present defies exact definition, since they enjoy a special position