

of Commons were honoured by being made Knights Commanders of St. Gregory the Great. Those who will look at the reports of the Supreme Court of Canada will find the indication of that honour after the name of the late chief justice. These are facts that are known to all of us, as well as within the British Empire, the recognition by the sovereign of those who have rendered signal service—legal, military or naval service, or perhaps for the establishment of a great art building, of which an illustration I have in mind is the Tate gallery in London. You will find many instances in an old country of people who have been ennobled by the sovereign for such services rendered. Whether or not there should be created a claim that is satisfied only by wealth is another matter altogether. Most people believe that any effort to recognize the services only of wealthy persons and to make material positions the criterion of the determination of merit and service to the state is wrong. I am one of them. I believe that every citizen of the British Empire has of right a claim to separate recognition from the crown of services that may have been rendered in any walk of life; I have never hesitated to say so, and I offer no apologies for expressing that view in this chamber. On the other hand, there are those who honestly differ from that view. But it will be borne in mind that no man and no woman receives recognition from the state unless he or she is ready and willing to accept the recognition offered. The right hon. leader of the opposition in 1906 was honoured by his sovereign by being made a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. There was no reason why the Deputy Minister of Labour, who had rendered signal service with respect to matters of great importance, should not thus have been recognized. Other deputy ministers had been recognized. It would be idle for me to say that I did not believe that one who had served the state for forty-five years and had finally attained to the position of Deputy Minister of the Interior should not upon retirement be recognized by being made a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. There are other instances that I shall not name. It has been the custom in this country generally and broadly that those who had served the state in positions, shall I say, of great importance, but not in a legislative capacity nor where they had ministerial rank, should be recognized. I think that the late Sir Joseph Pope was one of the most striking instances of that, and there are others of the same kind.

However, there was the view expressed in this country prior to 1919, that the appointments, shall I say, were not such as to commend themselves in all instances to the judgment of the Canadian people. That at least was alleged, and it was of course long believed in this country that there was no place in a new soil such as this for hereditary honours which are largely, if not wholly, indigenous to countries where the law of primogeniture prevails. That has been the experience of the world. Only a few days ago I was reading the debates of the British House of Lords in which the Marquess of Salisbury was dealing with a measure looking to the reform of that body. He pointed out what the hereditary principle had meant, and in addition he said:

None of us is defending our privileges. But what we do claim is the opportunity to render service to the country in which we live, and the atmosphere that has been created by centuries of tradition, in consequence of the hereditary principle being followed, has enabled this house to exercise a jurisdiction and power and authority denied to any other chamber presently in the world.

That is very true. But the principle should not end there, as he pointed out, and he went on to discuss the matter at further length.

I desire to submit to this chamber a few propositions. The first one is this, that the granting or conferring of honours or distinctions is a prerogative of the crown. One would think it unnecessary to argue the matter, that it might be taken for granted by all, but since doubts are sometimes expressed with respect to that, I shall relieve them all by quoting from Halsbury's Laws of England, second edition, that the crown is the fountain of justice and the source of all honours. That principle has been acted upon for a long, long time; it has been acted upon in theory from the very beginning of our institutions. I quote from Halsbury's Laws of England:

As all public offices are derived either mediately or immediately from the crown, so the sovereign enjoys the sole right of conferring all titles of honour, dignities, and precedence, and no subject can acquire a new title or dignity except by grant from the crown, unless it be conferred by act of parliament, or acquired by marriage (in case of a female), or obtained by prescription, which, however, presupposes a lost grant.

Titles of honour are conferred either by express grant in the form of letters patent, or by writ of summons in the case of peerages, or by direct corporeal investiture, as in the case of knights.

That being so, we have established I think beyond peradventure that the granting or