

failed to find a single man who tried to put Canada and the sister states in that position. Now, I do not grudge my right hon. friend the foremost position that, in one way, he took at that conference. It was Canada's right, and I was proud to see him stand for the premier colony. But there is no need for pretense and posing. From the time the conference opened until it closed, there was not a single aggression made upon the rights of the daughter states—such a thing cannot be pointed to in the record.

What was the discussion about? It revolved around the two questions of the name that should be given to what was known before as the Colonial Conference, and about the functions of the secretariat that was to make the doings and the work of that conference more effective and more consecutive. Now I challenge my right hon. friend. Will he take that record and point out from any statement or any member of that conference where any one of them took a position of that kind? It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deakin was there, Sir Joseph Ward was there, Dr. Jamieson was there, Mr. Moor was there, General Botha was there, and these were the chief men of that conference. Every one of them stood on exactly the same high plane as did my right hon. friend. They declared they were simply discussing a title, that they thought Imperial Council would be a better title for the old Colonial Conference, but they were unalterably opposed to any change at all in the functions of that council. Is not that true? I think my right hon. friend will bear me out in that. But lest there should be some doubting Thomases, I propose to call his attention to the matter, where it is set out in the record when the discussion commenced on the second day of the conference. After some remarks from the chairman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposed that Mr. Deakin should give his views with reference to this change of name and change of function, if there was to be any. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

Canada has made no suggestions upon this point. I may say that in our country, as we have stated in our despatch, we do not view it with much favour—

That was the stand my right hon. friend took.

—but we approach it with open mind. I would at this moment observe relative to the suggestion of Mr. Deakin that he should take up at once the first proposal of the Commonwealth of Australia. 'That it is desirable to establish an imperial council to consist of representatives of Great Britain and the self-governing colonies chosen ex-officio from their existing administrations,' and that the title should be the last thing to be determined.

My right hon. friend properly argued: first, let us know what you are going to have, the functions, the constitution, the powers, and then let us put a name to that

Mr. FOSTER.

after we know what it is going to do. Here is what Mr. Deakin said about it:

We found in the despatch from the previous imperial government a proposal to adopt the title 'Imperial Council.' This we understood was intended to be conferred upon the existing conferences without any substantial alteration in their powers, or in the principle of their constitution. We were prepared to mark our appreciation of the intention by the adoption of that title. It appeared to us a fitting cognomen for such a body, and if its constitution were elaborated to some slight degree, it might have been a judicious thing to accept it, even at this stage; but the intention of this general resolution of ours was to retain these conferences precisely as they have existed—this conference as it now exists—unaltered in personnel or in procedure, except so far as we might with advantage connect its several meetings during the intervals of the assembling, and provide for a more efficient means of keeping its members in touch with one another and with the government of Great Britain. Our idea was not to endow the new body under whatever title it was known, with any legislative or executive power.

The body we had in view was a conference that was to have no such power as, according to the government of Canada, are associated in their minds and in the minds probably of those whom they represent, with the name 'Imperial Council,' which to us would not have meant more than 'Imperial Conference.' We are perfectly prepared to accept that title. I do not need at this stage to detain the conference further. Our object is to retain the conferences as they at present are, in respect to their authority, to their constitution and to their periodical meetings.

I could read statement after statement from Mr. Deakin in the same line. Now let us see what Sir Joseph Ward said, as I find it on page 30:

Whether the organization is termed a council or a conference, to my mind is not of very great importance, so long as the position and duties of the council are defined, and speaking for my colony, I lay it down as one of the cardinal principles of such an organization, that there should be no interference with the present rights and powers of the governments of those self-governing countries; and in that respect if we are safeguarded, as I am perfectly sure every one is desirous of doing, what we term the meeting of the Prime Ministers does not matter. If it is covered by the term 'Conference,' in deference to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's wish, I have not the slightest objection, and I should be only too glad to fall into line with it. Why I preferred the word 'Council' is because it indicates a permanency, and it is with the object of having a permanent institution established that I think we ought, if we can, to arrive at some decision of a definite nature in dealing with this matter.

He went further, and asked that the Crown colonies should be disassociated from the self-governing dominions, so anxious was he that the status of the self-governing dominions should not be compromised or