

upon it as they pleased. Had this view been taken of the matter by the government, I think there is no doubt that the amendment in favour of the abolition of all titular distinctions would have carried. Sir Robert Borden, however, took the ground that as his government had already passed an order-in-council upon the subject, which order had been communicated to the British government, with the understanding, which he had communicated to the House, that its representations would be taken up with the British government by Members of the Canadian Ministry at an Imperial Conference to be held in Great Britain that year, and that pending further consideration of the matter by parliament at the next session, no titular distinctions would be recommended or conferred, he would regard the defeat of his resolution as a vote of want of confidence in the Administration, which would occasion the resignation of the government - the then Union government. In these circumstances, many of those who expressed themselves as in favour of abolishing all titles, among the number, the present honourable Minister of Railways and Canals, supported the motion as amended by the government, and it carried by a vote of 104 to 71.

At the session of 1919, when Sir Robert Borden was in England, the matter was again introduced on motion of the honourable Member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), ~~seconded by~~
It urged the abolition of all titles, and read as follows:

Exhibit