

tended that Canada had the fullest rights of self-government in all particulars; that there was equality of status with the Mother Country so far as this Dominion was concerned. He contended also that Sir Robert Borden had taken that position; at any rate I think Sir Robert Borden would wish to have it known that he had so held. The whole argument of my hon. friend at the beginning was to the effect that, after all, statements made with respect to equality of status constituted simply an affirmation of a position which Canada had maintained as already established. In the last part of his address the hon. gentleman's effort seemed to be directed to showing that there was no such thing as equality of status. The position he took was that there could not be equality of status inasmuch as England was very much larger, more powerful, and much more influential than the Dominion of Canada. In his view, therefore, the talk about equality of status was all nonsense.

With all due respect to my hon. friend I suggest that he has confused in his own mind the terms "status" and "stature." Status and stature are not the same thing. Bigness, extent of power, and the like are all matters of stature and not of status, for status has nothing whatever to do with size. Status has to do with rights enjoyed within certain limits. Perhaps I might offer an illustration. Every hon. member of this House, whether he be the youngest member and one who has entered parliament for the first time or the oldest parliamentarian like yourself, Mr. Speaker, enjoys equality of status with every other member. There is not one member of parliament who as member has any rights greater than any other. Some, it is true, may perform different functions, may for the time being fill one position or another; one may be exercising the function of a minister of the crown, and another the function of the leader of the opposition; but each is, so far as his status goes, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, representing the people of the particular constituency which has returned him here, and each constituency is entitled to the same measure of representation in this House of Commons. Every constituency has the same right to representation in this parliament, quite regardless of the individual stature or importance in other particulars of its representative. That is precisely the view the Imperial conference has taken with respect to Great Britain and the self-governing dominions; it is not a question of size; it is not a question of power or of might, but a question of the rights of each of the self-governing com-

munities with respect to the control of their own domestic and external affairs. With regard to the domestic and external affairs of this Dominion, the Imperial conference has said that in the opinion of its members, those rights of control are just as full and complete with respect to Canadian affairs as are the rights of the British government in respect of the domestic or external affairs of Great Britain. Now I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, is there any hon. member of this House who would have the position any different? Does my hon. friend wish us to be in a position of subordination?

Before I come to that, in order quickly to reassure my hon. friend and any other timid souls as to how far they are being involved in virtue of anything that has been done, I would like to recall what my hon. friend said as to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's attitude. Sir Wilfrid took the position that he was attending a conference and not a cabinet. Let me say that that was the position which my colleague and myself took very firmly from first to last throughout this conference, and that was the position I took at the previous conference. I recall very well at the conference of 1923 urging strongly that in the report of the conference itself, it should be made quite clear that the conference was not a cabinet laying down policies of government for the empire, but that it was simply what from its name it purported to be, namely a body of gentlemen representing different governments, who had met to confer together, to come as far as possible to a consensus of opinion and then report the result of their joint deliberations together with their recommendations, back to the governments and parliaments which they had been sent to represent. Expression is given in the summary of proceedings of the Imperial conference of 1923 to that position. It will be found on page 13 of the printed proceedings, Canadian edition, as follows:

This conference is a conference of representatives of the several governments of the empire; its views and conclusions on foreign policy, as reported above, are necessarily subject to the action of the governments and parliaments of the various portions of the empire, and it trusts that the results of its deliberations will meet with their approval.

That was the position taken in 1923 and that position was again taken at the recent conference. It was a conference of representatives of the different governments, and everything the conference did, before it begins to bind a single part of the empire, is subject to the approval of not only the governments but also the parliaments of the