

## Christian Guardian.

We would like to second, with all the emphasis we may, the remarks made last week in the Ontario Legislature by Mr. N. W. Rowell, leader of the Opposition, relative to the granting of Canadian peerages. Mr. Rowell expressed the hope that as Sir Hugh Graham was the first native-born Canadian to receive an hereditary title from the Crown, he might be the last to be so honored. With that wish we would express our hearty and most earnest accord.

To some this matter might seem to be of rather trifling importance, but we cannot at all share the views of those who feel that way about it. At any time the making of a Canadian peer would be an important matter, but it is especially so at this time in the history of our nation and Empire. The atmosphere at the present time is just right for the cultivation of an artificial and spurious type of imperialism, with which the nation might have to reckon seriously in the years that are to come. A Canadian peer looks like both a bad symptom and a bad omen.

Of course there would be some who would consider that this was a poor time to make a criticism of the aristocracy of the Empire when its members are everywhere rendering it such conspicuous and splendid service. But it is not a matter of individuals at all, but of a system. The system has stood, and still stands, directly in the way of democracy and progress. And it is only the existence of a saving quality in the British race that has prevented the aristocracy of Britain from working the havoc that the Junkerism of Germany has wrought in the life of that nation.

Of course we like to see our Canadians honored by our beloved Sovereign. So far as we know, every one who has been so honored recently has well deserved all that has come to him. We have rejoiced specially in the honors of some. But we want no hereditary titles in Canada. And it will be an evil day for us when we begin to build up a Canadian peerage.

## Brantford Courier.

A few Dominion papers, since the recent announcement of King's birthday honors, have taken occasion to criticize the bestowal of titles upon Canadians. They take the view that the acceptance of them is undemocratic, and J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, has been accorded all kinds of kudos because he refused a knighthood. He may have had some valid personal reasons; if not, in the opinion of a very great many people, he is chargeable with an ungracious act. All of us who have the privilege of living under the Union Jack are concerned in the business of the British Empire, and honors bestowed with regard to some outstanding service in connection with the administration of that enterprise should be held in high honor, and not lightly rejected. In connection with all other undertakings, men value marks of distinction. Why not equally so with regard to state or philanthropic service?

A great many big Canadians have in the past accepted titles and have taken legitimate pride in them, as they should. Empire recognition is not a thing to be spurned, but to be valued. Critics in this regard do not cheapen honors thus bestowed, but themselves.

---

 Victoria (B.C.) Times.

We hope the proprietor of the Montreal Star will be able to select as euphonious a title as Baron Beaverback—we mean Beaverbrook. We would suggest Lord Lachine, or Baron Notre Dame. Now that we have started choosing titles, we rather regret sturdy old democratic John Ross Robertson turned that offer down. Ontario certainly should have a Lord Muskoka, a Viscount Penetanguishene, or a Baron Sault Ste. Marie. In this connection British Columbia could make some very striking contributions to Burke's or Debrett's. Lord Cowichan, or Baron Sooke, or Viscount Saanich—not to overlook the possibilities of Clayoquot, Kyuquot, Nuchatlitz and other sonorous aboriginal names—would be quite impressive.