

of recognition; they were proud of that service, proud of this woman as representing that great class of women whose magnificent efforts on behalf of humanity had thus been recognized.

Mr. DUFF: But is it only one of thousands. Why not recognize them all?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: That need not be further discussed. I have only to point out that I am informed that in one part of this country at one time there was an effort on the part of the provinces themselves to give such recognition. And in 1927 when we were celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of confederation the right hon. gentleman himself passed an order in council conferring the title of "Honourable" upon all who had been lieutenant governors in any part of Canada and who were then living. What is the difference between conferring the title of "Honourable" on every man who may have been a lieutenant governor, *ex post facto*, retroactive legislation, and giving recognition to women who toil in remote outposts for the benefit of their kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: Here are the words of that order in council, passed on June 30, 1927:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated the 29th June, 1927, from the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, submitting that at present it is provided that the lieutenant-governor of each province is to be styled "His Honour" during his term of office only, and it appears that it would be more consistent with the dignity of the representative of the crown in the province that he should be accorded a designation which, once received, he may retain, not only during his term of office, but for life.

The Prime Minister further submits that at this time, when the position of the Governor General has come to be definitely accepted as that of the personal representative of His Majesty the King in the Dominion of Canada, it would be fitting on the occasion of the diamond jubilee of confederation—

Birth-day honours, you see.

—for His Majesty's government in Canada to recognize more appropriately the important place held by the provinces in the Canadian federal system by according to the representatives of the crown in the provinces the designation of "Honourable" for life.

The committee, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, therefore advise that hereafter upon assuming office a lieutenant-governor of a province of Canada shall be entitled to the designation "Honourable" and shall be permitted to retain it after his term of office.

[Mr. Bennett.]

The committee, on the same recommendation further advise that lieutenant-governors at present in office or persons who have held the office of lieutenant-governor and are still living, shall, as from July first of this year, be entitled to the designation of "Honourable" for life.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I point out that that order in council was in no way contrary either to the letter or to the spirit of the 1919 resolution of this house.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the right hon. gentleman is not serious. It confers the title of "Honourable" upon those who have been lieutenant governors.

Mr. DUFF: Without any reduction in salary!

Mr. BENNETT: It confers the title of "Honourable" upon those who were then in office and upon those thereafter appointed, yet the right hon. gentleman says it does not conflict. He means, I suppose, that it does not give a titular distinction, but it gives the title of "Honourable", or says it does at any rate. The old title, "His Honour", which is referred to as having been abolished, is now superseded by the title for life of "Honourable" with respect to those, past, present and future, who may fill the office of lieutenant governor.

One question more, and it is this: The right hon. gentleman referred to two cases as having some bearing upon this subject. I did not think my memory played me false. One of them was a case in which Mr. Gladstone in 1870 had introduced a bill to abolish purchase in the army, when the bill went to the House of Lords it was opposed and it looked as though it might be defeated, whereupon Mr. Gladstone asked the Queen to sign a warrant abolishing purchase in the army. In other words, in the exercise of her powers, whether as a commander-in-chief or in the exercise of her prerogative, she signed that order, and the acquisition of places in the army by purchase passed out of existence. If anyone can tell me just what relation that has to the present circumstances I shall certainly be obliged. It was a case in which, fearing legislation would not pass, recourse was had to the prerogative. The other case in 1890 had to do with Heligoland. Lord Salisbury was of the opinion that when a part of the British Empire was to be ceded to a foreign power it was desirable to pass a statute so to do. When it reached the House of Commons from the Lords and was up for second reading, the position taken by Mr. Gladstone, was, "This is not the way this business has always been done; it has always been done by treaty, by the prerogative of the sovereign being invoked,