

trouble, and we will be ruled by the most irresponsible autocracy.

I have no intention of saying a word in this debate, but the unfortunate rejoinder of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who probably feels hurt that he was ignored by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the days when he was securing titles for everybody, and who was smarting under that disappointment, evidently caused him to speak as he did.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the hon. gentleman be willing to throw his title on the bonfire in the market-place?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not have to depend on titles. The people know I am one of the boys, and that I am always ready to deliver the goods.

Mr. BUREAU: If they do not, then you tell them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, never mind. Let me repeat: Lord Beaverbrook has been attacked most maliciously in this country. I tell the hon. gentlemen, and those who have been attacking him here, and the irresponsibles in England, who are not fit to black his shoes, that I know the man himself as I know the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I am speaking of what I know.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Flavelle?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I say to him here to-night that the meanest transaction which Max Aitken has ever been connected with is clean compared with some of the deals that the hon. member has been associated with. Some one asks me: What about Flavelle? He is a gentleman who has caused all this turmoil. Talk of the water in stocks—what about the water in pork?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My good friend, the President of the Privy Council is supposed to be his right hand man, and he is a "democrat to the hilt"; and the other runs the pork end of it. I shall not here enter into a discussion of anything in that connection to-night, but I am taking the liberty of informing the House, that possibly at no distant date, should opportunity arise in the House, I am prepared for a very interesting and lengthy discussion in connection with many institutions with which that gentleman is connected. There are old things to be uncovered, and a true statement of affairs on many matters of interest to the public in the past two or three years may yet come out fairly and squarely, and

will prove very interesting. Let me tell the hon. member for Maisonneuve that I shall not tolerate the making of wrong charges or the slandering of a gentleman as he has slandered Max Aitken here to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) who has just sat down is a splendid illustration of the desirability of doing away with titles. We are too close to judge of men's honour here, we have to see them in perspective, and coming down from our province by the sea, with the straits of Northumberland between us and the mainland, we can view this gentleman's virtues better than those in other parts of the Dominion. I want to say of my hon. friend who has just sat down, with all his idiosyncrasies and peculiarities, with all his humour, that, in my judgment, notwithstanding all these, and all the mistakes he has made, he will occupy a niche in the hall of fame in future history because of his great performance in connection with this war. But simply for that probably, and nothing more. With regard to another titled gentleman here, whom I see beside me, his title is a rag compared with the glorious position that he will occupy in the history of his time and of his country—I refer to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that grand, lone figure, who during the last five or six months has stood out and led his people out of the land of Egypt and the house of bondage alone, with the men who ought to be supporting him heaping vituperation and abuse upon him! In the future, when the history of these times is written, his name will stand out as the greatest star of these times. The greatest Imperial statesman of our great Empire. Imperial in the best sense of that word.

There are two kinds of imperialism. There is the kind that stands for the integrity of the great British Empire, not as a solidified nation, but as a great federal body, in each part of which autonomy, home rule, obtains. The only way that this great Empire can be united is, as the poet Willie said, by the "chains of liberty." That is Laurier imperialism!

Some hon. gentlemen have referred to Robbie Burns. They do not seem to realize that Robbie Burns was a prophet. The following are the concluding words of that famous poem of his to which hon. gentlemen opposite have referred:

"Then let us pray that come it may,  
As come it will for a' that;  
That sense and worth o'er all the earth  
May bear the gree and a' that.