

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. SANDFORD FLEMING, C. M. G. IN MOVING THE  
ADOPTION OF THE FOREGOING REPORT.

GENTLEMEN,—In accordance with the practice followed in England it is customary for the chairman in moving the adoption of the annual report to submit some explanatory observations. I ask your permission, therefore, to offer the following remarks. I must further ask you to hold the Managing Committee in no way responsible for the opinions I express. I simply submit my own views as an individual member. I believe that they will be found in no way incompatible with the report submitted, and it will be highly gratifying to me if they should harmonize with the views and opinions of the other members of the League. In considering the question from the Canadian, indeed generally from the colonial standpoint, the impression has been forced upon me, that the name taken by our association is, in some respects, not well chosen. It had its origin in England, where no doubt it was considered in all respects to be fit and appropriate. It is scarcely, however, possible for a fellow-subject in the Mother Country to look at the political aspect of a question precisely as we do, as would be the case in the sister colonies of Australia, South Africa and elsewhere. The term Imperial Federation is sufficiently comprehensive, and is in no way defective in meaning or purpose. But it appears to me that to some minds it is suggestive of a great deal too much, certainly much more than is warranted by the aims and objects of the League. By one class the word "Imperial" is objected to; the word "Federation" finds its opponents in another class. The words combined have equal disfavor. In the minds of many the term "Imperial" is associated with "Imperialism," and awakens the dread of despotism, of absolutism, and of what in modern times has been called "Caesarism," the exercise of power and arbitrary authority in a manner offensive and painful to the whole community. The word "Federation," especially when in combination with the first, is also considered to be little less objectionable. It is associated in the minds of many with an affirmation of the principle of centralization of the powers of government in one arbitrary executive; to exercise despotic sway, regardless of the rights, wishes and opinions of the governed.