

Beauchamp, of New Zealand; Mr. George Birstall, Sir S. B. Samuel, London, and Mr. E. Parkes, M.P., Birmingham, and was opposed by Mr. A. J. Hobson, Sheffield, and Mr. George O. Wright, of Sunderland.

• • • • •

RESOLUTION PASSED IN FAVOUR OF PREFERENTIAL TRADE.—By an overwhelming majority, the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire adopted the Canadian resolution in favour of preferential trade within the Empire. A show of hands revealed a large individual opinion in favour of closer Imperial trade relations. The vote by the chambers was 105 for and 41 against, and 21 neutral. Those who were neutral included the important chambers of London, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Melbourne and Sydney. The result was received with enthusiastic cheers.

Eighteen of the 41 voters recorded against the resolution represented English chambers, while the remainder of the opposition represented interests scattered over different parts of the Empire.

The discussion throughout was marked by the utmost goodwill toward Canada. Each side claimed the result enthusiastically.

Mr. Hamar Greenwood, of York, opposed the resolution, but was enthusiastic over the agreement of sentiment. He disagreed with the suggestion that the Empire was in danger of breaking up, and objected to colonial kinsmen, unfamiliar with conditions, lecturing the Mother Country.

• • • • •

Mr. J. P. McArthur said the opinions of the Chambers of Commerce of Sydney were divided, but personally he was opposed to the resolution.

Mr. Charles King, of Melbourne, was also opposed to the resolution.

Mr. W. B. Carr, of Adelaide, Australia, said the vote of Australia would show a majority in favour of the resolution.

Mr. R. J. Graham, Belleville, urged that the resolution was a step toward absolute free trade within the Empire.

The Hon. A. J. Tynne had a mandate from the Brisbane Chamber to support the resolution.

General Laurier, in supporting the resolution, defended Canada against the charge of selfishness. He contrasted the present conditions with the time he was in Canada. In the seventies Britain was sending unemployed to a protected country like Canada to get work.

Mr. George Mitchell, of Johannesburg, supported the resolution on behalf of South Africa.

Mr. A. J. Johnson, of Winnipeg, in supporting the resolution, said that in a few years Western Canada would yield more than sufficient cereals to supply the Empire.

Other speeches in support of the resolution were made by Messrs. B. F. Stiebel, Nottingham; the Hon. A. J. Yorke, Madras; W. Brown, Macclesfield.

It was opposed by Messrs. F. W. Cook, Dudley, and G. Dunn, Cork.

Mr. George Drummond, of Montreal, in closing the debate, said if Canada was pressing it was because there was most imminent danger that the colony's growth of United States trade might mean political absorption. He asked for the endorsement of the principle, leaving the details to the Colonial Conference.

AN IMPERIAL COUNCIL.

Again on the initiative of Canada the congress, after luncheon, took up the question of an Imperial Council, a resolution urging the home and colonial governments to appoint such a body being moved by Mr. R. H. Alexander, of Vancouver, B.C., and seconded by Mr. Arthur Bennett, Warrington, who argued that it was time to systematize the affairs of the Empire.

On the suggestion of Mr. F. H. Mathewson, manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, Montreal, the name was changed to the Advisory Imperial Council.

Mr. Leon Garnéau, of Montreal, opposed the motion, on the ground that it was a step toward imperial federation, meaning the limitation of colonial autonomy.

The resolution was adopted, there being only a few dissenters.

On behalf of the Liverpool Chamber, Geoffrey Drage advocated a resolution embodying the Pollock scheme of an Advisory Council and Intelligence Department.

In the course of the discussion, Sir Charles Tupper opposed the resolution, arguing these functions should be performed by the Colonial Office. He thought the Canadian Government wise when it took exception to the term of imperial council instead of colonial conference. He reiterated that the high commissioners make the best imperial council. The resolution was withdrawn, as it was felt the subject had been covered in the previous resolution.

Mr. Drummond moved a resolution re-affirming that the self-governing colonies should participate in the cost of the defence of the Empire. He approved the action of the Canadian Government taking over the entire defence, but regretted it didn't keep one British regiment and send a Canadian regiment to Aldershot. He mentioned several possible plans and said Canada would not be happy until it could do something.

Mr. C. H. Catelli, Montreal, seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

• • • • •

THE SUNDAY OR LORD'S DAY CLOSING ACT.—

This hotly debated Act has at last been passed by both Houses. Some of the oldest parliamentarians declare that, what its provisions really mean, and what effect they will have on the observance of Sunday, they do not pretend to understand. The various clauses have been so amended and patched and qualified by explanatory sub-clauses, that the Bill as a whole seems to be regarded as a mosaic of confused paragraphs.

The Government was divided on the leading sections of the Bill, Sir Wilfrid Laurier voting with Mr. Borden, leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Aylesworth, and other ministers voting the opposite way.