

ording to the Queen's instructions. Moreover, there was a persistent attempt made in both Ontario and Quebec, to confer upon the Lieutenant Governors the title of 'Excellency,' in direct opposition to the royal instructions. Although there is no order of knighthood in the United States, there is no country in the world where titles of distinction are more generally used. The writer in the CANADIAN MONTHLY asks—'are we to understand that Her Majesty, recognising the pre-eminent merits and public services of these gentlemen, has singled them out for this mark of her favour?' The answer to this question will be found in the statute cited above. As to the reference to 'the creation of a titled aristocracy in Canada,' a moment's reflection would have convinced the writer that such a description of the admission of a few distinguished Canadians to an Imperial order of merit, limited in its number by statute, was wholly inapplicable. It would hardly be possible to criticize the article on 'titles' in detail without using language as offensive as that which the writer has employed towards gentlemen who, without solicitation on their part, have been recommended to their Sovereign as associates in an order to which it is impossible to obtain admission except by rendering valuable services to the Crown, in relation to some one of the colonies of the Empire.

M. G.

REJOINDER TO M. G.

M. G., I cannot help thinking, has taken up the subject to which his remarks refer in a manner scarcely suited to the occasion. 'Round the Table' we are supposed to speak with a good deal of freedom, and as unconventionally as possible. We do not fire 'articles' at one another's heads; we make no personal references to present company, and if our remarks chance to hit the absent friend of any *convive*, they are taken in as good

part as possible, on the understanding that at least no offence to any person present was intended. And so we rattle on, in a more irresponsible fashion, perhaps, than if we were composing set essays, destined to be, as far as possible, proof against criticism. M. G. does not, however, take this view of the matter at all, and he mars the harmony of a friendly gathering by visibly losing his temper. I do not see that he sheds any new light on the subject of which he pronounces me ignorant. We all know, I think, the theoretical constitution of the 'most distinguished order' of St. Michael and St. George; but what is there in that to prevent a Canadian who seriously thinks that titles in general have a bad effect from saying so? The theory in regard to all titles, I imagine, is that they are conferred for eminent services; but the question which I should like to see fairly met is,—what is the moral and social effect of their bestowal? Are men thereby rendered, or supposed to be rendered, more high minded, more severely honourable, more purely patriotic? If anyone is inclined to answer in the affirmative, let him recall the fact that the most untoward episode in modern Canadian history was the work of two knights and a baronet. Are they supposed to act as incentives to a pure ambition? That cannot be unless they are bestowed otherwise than as party rewards are commonly bestowed. If a title is simply an additional honour or advantage that the party to which a man belongs has in its power to bestow upon him—working of course through recognized channels—it is surely open to any citizen to enquire whether this extension of the attributes of party, is a desirable one. In my humble opinion it is not. If, on the other hand, the choice is otherwise directed, it is of the utmost interest to know how it is directed. Will the Sovereign reward merits that party has failed to recognize? That might be satisfactory in certain cases, but I