

resolution if we come to that resolution. I am heartily in accord with that resolution, and the Government are heartily in accord with it, because they have agreed to that themselves, and there can certainly be no objection to this House expressing its approval of the action of the Government of the day, which is all we should be doing by passing the resolution which is submitted to us. I believe we should go further, and I for one am prepared to go further; I am prepared to follow the matter to its legitimate conclusion, and in doing so, I believe we should do away with titles altogether, and in doing that, we should only be carrying out the principle laid down by the Prime Minister in his address.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maison-neuve): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great pleasure and interest to the remarkable speech delivered this afternoon by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). After having listened to him and to my good friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), I thought their resolution was not broad enough. I am glad my hon. friend from Springfield has implemented that resolution by the amendment which he has just moved in very eloquent language. I shall give my support to that amendment, and I hope the House will face squarely the issue. Public opinion will be very much disappointed, indeed, if, after the House has spent the day over this question, it should be dropped. My hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) has cited the words of Buffon about the inanity of titles. Might I be allowed to quote a few lines of a French-Canadian poet, which describe the situation in very noble language? The lines run thus:

"Sur cette terre sauvage  
 "Où les titres sont inconnus,  
 "La noblesse est dans le courage  
 "Dans les talents, dans les vertus.

On this barren land where titles are unknown,  
 True nobility resides in courage, talents and  
 virtue.

These are the true sentiments which are embodied in the masterly addresses which have been delivered this afternoon by the mover and by the seconder. Titles in the Old Country have been a source of corruption. They are a source of corruption in Canada to-day. As my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), whom I was so pleased to welcome in this House, after so many years of absence, said a moment ago, titles in the pre-revolutionary days in France, as he will read in Carlyle's history, were the cause of malfeasance in office. Privileges and titles also precipitated

[Mr. Thomson.]

a revolution in England, where, Sir, you must not forget that also a king was le-headed. Let my hon. English-speaking friends, who are so proud of the glories of old England, not forget that if the French once beheaded their king, the English beheaded theirs also.

Mr. RICHARDSON: He deserved it just as much, if not more.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some appointments of late have created a commotion in England. I regret to say that such a commotion was created on the occasion of honours bestowed on a Canadian far more famous for his cement merger than for his accomplishments on behalf of the Empire. I am sorry the name of Canada is to-day being branded in England on account of the bestowal of titles on such an individual. Sir, I cannot forget that during many months before the last election that individual libelled and slandered the province to which I belong, the faith which I profess, and the race from which I come. Sir, aristocracy of that brand is not healthy; it is not congenial to our soil.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the hon. member have any objection to stating how the gentleman to whom he refers libelled his people?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. If my hon. friend will go to the library, and ask for Max Aitken's *Epitome of the War*, one edition published in English and one published in French, the one purporting to be a copy of the other, although it is not, he will see where Sir Max Aitken libelled the province of Quebec.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not believe it.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Read the Daily Express, his newspaper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At all events, thank Heaven, the French Canadians are not alone in gauging the nobility of Lord Beaverbrook. In England to-day, if you read the *Westminster Gazette*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and some of the most influential organs of public opinion, his appointment is very seriously questioned. Aristocracy, I say, is not healthy for this country; it is not congenial to Canada. In the old days we had some nobility during the French domination, but if Canada is what it is to-day, we do not owe it to the French nobility. It is a matter of history that as soon as our ancestors were defeated