

### Toronto Star.

There appears to be very little difference of opinion in the Canadian newspapers about the introduction of hereditary titles in Canada. So far as they speak of it at all the newspapers resent it with more or less energy, as contrary to the whole spirit of the country. Some object strongly to hereditary titles, but not to personal ones if worthily bestowed; most resent the importation of titles altogether.

The Ottawa Citizen is amused on reading the protest of certain journals and individuals just now against hereditary titles, after having successfully concealed their democracy in past time. We gather that the Citizen suspects that some of these objectors regard the conferring of these titles as impolitic and inopportune just now, rather than anything else. Referring to some of the newspapers, the Citizen says:

"But are these very journals not entirely responsible for the condition that they now decry? Are not many of the new democrats among those who fiercely attacked or scoffed at the Citizen when this journal protested against the appointment of a member of the royal family to the Governor-Generalship of the Dominion a few years ago (previous to the coming of the Duke of Connaught) on the ground that such an appointment could not be otherwise than harmful ultimately in a democratic country such as Canada professed to be?"

When word reached Canada that the Duke of Connaught was being spoken of as likely to be the next Governor-General in succession to Earl Grey, the Star objected to it as strongly as the Citizen or any other newspaper, and continued to protest against it until the appointment was actually made, and further objection unavailing. But when the Duke left Canada the Star felt called upon to admit that the fears we had entertained before his coming had been groundless, that he had shown much experience and tact, and been very successful in his office. So far as we know that is the general

opinion, the general impression he left on the people of Canada.

Are we, however, to take from the article in the Citizen the suggestion that the hereditary titles recently bestowed in Canada are an outcome of the Duke of Connaught's residence among us? Were the many knighthoods conferred during the past five years influenced by the same presence? Is so the experiment of having a Royal Court at Ottawa, democratized though it was to conform with the scenery, has not been the success we had supposed it. But as yet we do not quite see that the responsibility can be put upon the Duke of Connaught.

The ambition of some Canadians to be barons probably dates back to a period long before the Duke came here. As for Baron Beaverbrook, we cannot regard this as a hereditary Canadian title at all. Sir Max Aitken left Canada five or six years ago for England, jumped into politics, won a seat in Parliament, a knighthood, and a peerage. That's England's business, not ours in this country.

The statement in the London Times and the Daily Mail that Canada was delighted with the latest batch of hereditary titles has caused much strong protest. The truth is that a Toronto citizen, who is understood to have refused knighthood, has won more popular favor by his refusal than others have by acceptance. But there may, in fact, be some justification for the bitter remark of the Ottawa Citizen that "we have had so much toadyism among the press of the Dominion that the British have mistaken it for the real spirit of the country, and have decided to cater to it."

### London Advertiser.

A surprising protest comes from newspapers of both parties against the bestowal of titles, and especially hereditary titles. Only in one instance has the Advertiser seen amongst its exchanges an article justifying the recent awards made to Sir Max Aitken and Sir Hugh Graham, whereby they become barons. The article appears in the Montreal Standard and relates the good works