otion erial ding erial

subthe tion, Com-

s be **Fhat** nbly , all the ould vies. purld a cost rom tely tion intion rifle l at any nce. eleted , at ere onof)ro-)or-

ace ineging

onous es-

tes ee, ns, rs. m-

In putting together the foregoing views I have purposely avoided the previous perusal of the articles in the Standard series on "The Governance of Empire'', desiring rather to draw my statements directly from my own experiences, such as they may be, of Canadian thought, life and public business. Since writing, I have had the pleasure of reading all the articles and of particularly admiring those of Sir John Quick, Sidney Low, Sanford Evans, and Sir Lewis Tupper. The plan of the first is interesting as a complete scheme; but Canadian opinion would look with some doubt and perhaps suspicion at (1) its foundation upon an Act of the Home Parliament, (2) its sessions only every five years, (3) its method of voting and (4) the election of its members by popular vote throughout the Empire. The latter method would involve all the objections to an Imperial Parliament and insuperable difficulties in election procedure, platforms, parties and political dangers. The keen and learned remarks of Mr. Sidney Low on the Imperial Conference and what may be expected of it strike me as extremely just. Mr. Evans' system of a Council of Ministers of External Affairs might serve as a temporary form of the Conference, although their duties would naturally lie in other directions, seeing that their presence and attention as local Ministers would be required locally. Nearly all the objections to Premiers as members would apply equally to them. One of the most serious of these objections arises from the difference of seasons between the Northern and the Australian climates.

"REASON".

The Name "Imperial Conference"

The origin of the first Conferences was of course accidental, the Prime Ministers having been called together simply for the Jubilee Celebrations. The idea of a formal Conference belongs apparently to Mr. Chamberlain, in 1897. Much credit is due to the body of persons of whom Messrs. Pollock and Drage, and the Hon. Mr. Lyttelton were the mouthpieces, although their actual proposals were not acceptable. Lord Elgin made a sound chairman and contributed not a little to shape the final result. Doubtless these gentlemen and all the actual delegates, with a few other contributors, such as the former Attorney-General of Canada, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and the late Sir Richard Seddon, will take rank in history as the "Fathers of the Imperial

As far as I can learn, the direct origin of the name "Imperial Conference" was a proposal to that effect made by me at the public banquet given on the 28th September. 1905, by the Political Economy Club, of Montreal, to the unofficial envoys on Imperial Constitution, Sir Frederick Pollock and Mr. Geoffrey Drage, ex-M. P. A number of prominent men were present, and the guests and some of the group proceeded to Ottawa immediately afterwards to discuss the constitution of the next Conference with Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government. Their proposals were followed up by an invitation from the Balfour