

Opposition has borne testimony more than once to the way in which he represented us. He is a gentleman, he is a man of culture, he is a fine orator, and he represented us well in those respects. I have seen a letter written by a lady high in society in England, commenting on the Premier, and she said that the reason the Canadian Premier was thought so much of was that, compared with the other Premiers, he was a much more refined man. Well, we all know that, and I have always borne testimony to the fact. I was glad to see what Mr. Willison said in his account in the "Globe," although he probably exaggerated a little, for the London papers did not say that our Premier was the most prominent figure. The "Spectator" made out that the six most prominent individuals, after Her Majesty, were all soldiers, mentioning us first amongst them. But I have no doubt whatever that my right hon. friend behaved himself in such a way as to ask for no allowances—to quote my own language of last session—to be made for him. I was glad to see that he attracted so much of Imperial public attention, and if my patriotic pride received a dash at all, it was in this: It pained me for a moment to observe that this Imperial public attention was divided to some extent with my right hon. friend by the South Australian kangaroo. Now, Sir, the kangaroo has to some extent the best of it, for he has remained under the royal roof, and has become a royal institution; and although I am glad to see that the right hon. gentleman has come back with a title, if that was necessary to happiness, honored by Her Majesty, still the Atlantic rolls between him and the eyes of royalty, whereas the eyes of royalty rests on the South Australian interesting importation. But there is one other advantage the kangaroo has. The cries of the kangaroo are the same today as they were then, and they have always been the same, and he jumps in precisely the same way. (Laughter). But I am afraid, Sir, the cries of my right hon. friend will continue to vary, and that he will jump

and box the compass in the same eccentric fashion that he has done in the past. As to these titles, I want to say something more about them. The right hon. gentlemen went to Renfrew and there a clergyman addressed him and said: "Sir Wilfrid Laurier." The right hon. gentleman said: "No, not Sir Wilfrid, plain Mr. Laurier. I am a democrat to the hilt." Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the meaning of that? Did the right hon. gentleman mean that he was a social democrat or a political democrat? He cannot have meant exactly that he was a political democrat, because that would mean favoring an undivided government of the people, and would show that he was anti-monarchic, and I believe that he is loyal to our constitution. So he must have meant that he was a social democrat, and did not want those factitious distinctions to separate him from his fellow-men. I am with the right hon. gentleman in that. A man may be loyal to the British Empire, a man may be thoroughly devoted, as I am, to the British Empire and yet may feel that with us here in Canada, where after all we are a great democratic community, titles are a mistake. For instance, there is one title that we cannot wear without being ridiculous. The moment you make a man a lord in Canada he flies from Canada, because in Canada he is a lord without a slave. For instance, Lord Mount-Stephen, when he received that title intended to live in Montreal, but he found that somehow it would not do, there was something ridiculous about it. When he would go into the St. James Club, and they "my-lorded" him, they were ready to laugh in his face. It does not suit. The only thing that seems to go down is just the title of Sir, a knighthood or a baronetcy. So I assume that the hon. gentleman meant that, because here was a pledge to that portion of the people throughout Canada who feel strongly on that question. You will find them amongst the farmers, you will find them in cities, and you will find them in Toronto and elsewhere, men who believe that it