

In 1878 possibly two words again would have summarized the character of the appeal. In 1896, possibly three words would have covered the character of the appeal. In 1911 one word summarized the great issue, and in 1917 I claim that one single word before the Canadian people from East to West summarized the character and the nature of the issue which the people of Canada were called upon to decide. And, Sir, if it were feasible, even hypothetically considered for a moment, that this Canadian Parliament were dissolved, and an appeal to the country made on one issue, and that issue were summarized in these words "Canadian democracy," and on the obverse side of the shield "Titled aristocracy," and the people of the country voted on that issue, what would be the result? I believe we should have a unique thing in the history of the parliaments of the world—an absolutely united Government. There would not be a man in opposition from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and then, Sir, for once in our life, I believe we would be free in such a contest from all that appeals to race and religion and sectional strife. They would be all set aside, and the people from the East to the West, and from the North to the South would unite solidly, and there would be no words such as some of us deplored having heard in the House of Commons. There would be no disagreement, such as we have listened to in this House, but from East to West we would have a united Canada, and, perhaps, some one might be able to compose a new national anthem that would bring in the strains of "The Maple Leaf," "O, Canada," and "God Save the King," and we would be no longer French Canadians or English Canadians, but Canadians, from North to South and East to West.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne Queens): I regret I had to be absent during part of the evening, having had to attend a committee meeting, and had not the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend, the President of Council (Mr. Rowell), nor the addresses of the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the amendment. I am informed, however, that an amendment has been moved, condemning all titles, and that is the issue upon which we are about to vote. Let me say that while, as most of my friends are aware, I have less appreciation, perhaps, than some others, less enthusiasm as to the value of these titles, I have never gone to the point of saying that all titles in Canada should be put an end to. I think the argument

[Mr. Stacey.]

against hereditary titles is absolutely complete and unanswerable. I am glad that that argument was presented, not only by the hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Brome, but also in the very important Order in Council which the right hon. the Prime Minister brought down. But with respect to titles generally, leaving aside those of an hereditary character, though, as I say I am not as enthusiastic as some others in my admiration of them, I am free to admit that there may be circumstances—it has seemed so in the past—that might justify them. I do not think we should discuss it from a personal point of view. If one cared to do that, we could go over the list of gentlemen honoured with titles, and many of them would be recognized as men who have won eminence in the particular lines in which they are engaged. Some titles have been granted which are open to criticism. In some cases gentlemen who have been a short time in the public service, who might modestly have waited a little longer, have been ready to seize the title when the opportunity came. From one viewpoint if you take the whole list of titles you could find very little ground to take exception to any one of them. One may say that all the recipients are decent, honourable respectable people. But if you take up the list and go over them one by one and say, wherein does this man differ from a hundred men around him, what service has he rendered, what distinction has he in the community, what reason was there for giving him a title any more than giving it to a hundred men around him?—you may fail to get an answer. It is a case in which you might quote the old lines:

The thing itself is neither rich nor rare,
The only wonder is how it got there.

But I am not prepared to go so far as the hon. gentleman who would condemn the titles generally. I think, properly awarded, there is something to be said in favour of the system, and an abuse of a system is never a good reason for abolishing it. While I am not as warm in my admiration for titles as some others, I would be content to-day to adopt the moderate position taken by the hon. member for Kingston and I should be content to vote against hereditary titles, because I think, in that respect, the argument is complete and unanswerable.

A word more—not of any importance. My hon. friend from Victoria-Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes), who is not in his seat now, made some allusion to the conferring of