

*Titles of honor +
nobility*

TITLES IN CANADA

IN

1917



CANADIAN PRESS COMMENT ON THE ACCEPTANCE OR REFUSAL OF HEREDITARY AND OTHER NON-CANADIAN HONOURS



On February 13, 1917, there appeared in Toronto newspapers a despatch from Ottawa to the effect that "among those to whom New Year's honors of knighthood had been offered was Mr. J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Evening Telegram, Toronto, but he had declined the honor. He was also offered a senatorship and again declined."

The correctness of the statements contained in the despatch was confirmed.

On February 13, 1917, there appeared in Toronto newspapers a despatch from Ottawa to the effect that "among those to whom New Year's honors of knighthood had been offered was Mr. J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Evening Telegram, Toronto, but he had declined the honor. He was also offered a senatorship and again declined."

The correctness of the statements contained in the despatch was confirmed.

TITLES IN CANADA IN 1917.

Canadian Press Comment on the Acceptance or Refusal of Hereditary and Other Non-Canadian Honours.

Toronto Globe, Feb. 15, 1917.

While the acceptance of a British title, knighthood or other, for services rendered to the people of Canada, is sanctioned by custom as well as by law, it is quite refreshing to hear, even at long intervals that it has been declined by someone to whom it had been offered in good faith. J. Ross Robertson's fellow-citizens will think none the less of him, perhaps they will think all the more, because he preferred to be known to and by them without any factitious distinction purporting to be conferred by the addition of a title to his name. No one of all the individuals in the rapidly lengthening list of Canadian knights was better entitled to any such distinction than he is, but he preferred to be enrolled in the very much shorter list of those who declined the honor, along with such distinguished Canadians as George Brown and Edward Blake.

It is equally to Mr. Robertson's credit that he declined a Canadian senatorship. He was years ago a useful member of the House of Commons for Toronto, and from this really distinguished position he retired voluntarily when he might have held the seat indefinitely. He knows how much more useful a member of the House can make himself than a member of the Senate can possibly do, and he is fortunately no more in need of a life pension than he is of factitious distinction. Even the Canadian Senate would be a more efficient legislative chamber than it now is if there were fewer veteran valetudinarians in its membership.

London Advertiser.

The report that John Ross Robertson, owner of The Toronto Evening Telegram, has declined a title will be reassuring to the newspaper fraternity, which, when it gets away from its particular policy, is essentially democratic.

Mr. Robertson is a pretty good kind of Canadian. His actions are of the heart rather than of the mind. He keeps Toronto solidly Orange, and he talks Canada all the time. He also goes heavy on intense Imperialism at times. But his kindness to all, especially to the little children with ill-shaped legs, makes him stand out as a personality that Canada may treasure.

His newspaper has been notoriously scornful of the barons, the knights and the honorary colonels, and it may have been that Sir Robert Borden presented the silver platter of royal favor in a whimsical mood. This great Toronto man had talked with a sniff about titles—but would he turn one down if it came his way? Well, he did. Mr. Robertson's stock will go up in the barometer of public opinion.

Titles given for meritorious public service may be all right. There is a big emphasis on the "may," because great service is its own reward, but those who in the past received merited honor must be a trifle tired of the endless bestowal of baronetcies, etc. Soon there will be an hereditary nobility in this country, and that is about the last thing Canada wants. We have sufficient "flunkeyism" at Ottawa and every-

where else to disgust the average Canadian. "The grand old gardener and his dame" are not smiling; they are flashing with a touch of indignation.

Hamilton Herald.

In declining an Imperial title John Ross Robertson puts himself in the same class as Pitt, Gladstone, Chamberlain, Bright, George Brown, Edward Blake, Alexander Mackenzie, to name only a few. Not bad company.

Guelph Mercury.

It is apparent that Mr. J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, has declined a knighthood. By so doing he has gained distinction, and has endeared himself to the public of Canada. His many benefactions, his well-directed philanthropy and his great love for deformed and bent children, have earned for him a place higher than knighthood. It is gratifying to know that such a man is content to be known as Mr. John Ross Robertson.

Toronto News.

It is stated that Mr. John Ross Robertson has declined knighthood and also a senatorship. The rumor he confirms in an admission to one of the morning papers. While Mr. Robertson has been active in the Masonic Order, and has held the office of Grand Master and other such positions, he has never sought political recognition. During the short time that he was a member of the House of Commons for East Toronto he was very restless, and got out of Parliament as quickly as he could. He has helped to make many Mayors, but himself has never been a candidate for Council. No one doubts, however, that he could be easily elected to the office of Mayor if it ever entered his head to be a candidate. But nothing is more improbable than that he would be a candidate for the Mayoralty or any other office."

Prince Albert (Sask.) Herald.

There is a despatch from Ottawa which says that Sir Robert Borden offered a peerage and a senatorship to John Ross Robertson, editor of The Toronto Telegram, but that this gentleman gratefully declined the honors.

If Sir Robert Borden is absolutely stuck for a candidate upon whom to plant these decorations we would respectfully submit that he should consult our old friend Bill Gallon, the Conservative organizer at Regina, who has a flourishing herd of honor-seekers of the Laird brand who would dearly appreciate being cut loose among a bunch of senatorships or peerages.

Moose Jaw News.

"A true Democrat," John Ross Robertson declining a knighthood is an example to every red-blooded and truly democratic Canadian. Because of his position as owner of The Toronto Telegram, one of the most forceful and independent journals in the Dominion, he occupies a dominating place in Canadian public life. As those who know Toronto and Ontario politics well know, he holds the fate of many public men in the hollow of his hand, a nod from him being quite sufficient to effect their undoing.

For these reasons one may say without exaggeration that there are few honors in Canadian public life that could not be his. Indeed, we have evidence that a knighthood could have been his for the mere consenting. But John Ross Robertson has long been known as a genuine democrat, and it is pleasing to have such good evidence that in his seventy-sixth year he has not forgotten his old principles.

Toronto Globe.

"To the Editor of the Globe: Your comments in yesterday's issue and timely editorial in to-day's paper regarding Mr. John Ross Robertson declining to accept a knighthood and senatorship are refreshing, to say the least, and I would say hats off,

three cheers and a tiger for Mr. Robertson, who, by his gracious, yet firm, refusal of these distinctions (now viewed more in the light of a joke than an honor), has achieved a far greater distinction than a title could bestow.

"The fact that one who has refused what beyond all question he so truly deserved proves he is a bigger man than many of those who have aspired to wake up some fine morning and see their names in the papers prefixed by a little word of three letters; and I have reason to believe that the sentiments briefly expressed in this letter will be shared and endorsed by many democratic Canadians, who will, in this case, consider it a privilege and an honor to take off their hats to Mr. John Ross Robertson.

"William J. Helm.
"Port Hope, Feb. 15."

Newmarket Era.

Referring to the recent refusal of Mr. J. Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, to accept the honor of knighthood recently tendered him, the Guelph Mercury remarks: "By so doing he has gained distinction and has endeared himself to the public of Canada. His many home benefactions and his well-directed philanthropy have earned for him a place higher than knighthood."

Sydney (Cape Breton) Record.

We think better of John Ross Robertson than we ever did before. His mind is not of the broadest, but he has had the good sense to decline one of these wooden-sword and tin-helmet knighthoods which are getting so cheap and so common. We see no particular objection to recognizing, by such means, real merit and real service; but when a Max Aitken gets one for political services, and a John Willison for services which, to whomsoever they have been given (and they have been given in opposite directions), are not such as justify honor at the King's hands, the thing begins to get a shabby look. If his Majesty really picked the new knights, no doubt he would make a

good job of it; but it is the Government at Ottawa that picks them for Canada. But Mr John Ross Robertson has declined. He will be the more respected for it.

Stirling (Ont.) Leader.

Among those to whom the late New Year honors of knighthood were offered was Mr. John Ross Robertson, editor of The Toronto Evening Telegram, but he declined the honor.

On the same day, it seems, Mr. Robertson declined a senatorship, which the Borden Government offered him, and, in the words of a well known politician, "It is the first time in the history of Canada that anyone declined a knighthood and a senatorship on the same day."

"There is no reason to give, beyond that I exercised the same right as the others who have accepted, and I declined—I hope graciously and gracefully," remarked Mr. Robertson.

Milton (Ont.) Champion.

John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, has declined a knighthood and a senatorship, in which he showed self respect and good sense. Knighthoods have become too common in Canada, too often the reward of wealth rather than merit. Though Mr. Robertson is no spring chicken, he is far from senility, the usual qualification for the Senate.

Ottawa Journal.

It is understood that Sir Robert Borden offered to recommend J. Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Evening Telegram, for knighthood and a senatorship, but Mr. Robertson gratefully declined both honors.

Calgary Albertan.

If knighthood was really a reward of merit, John Ross Robertson would have been knighted years ago. At this late date he has the offer, and to his credit, not because he was displeased, but merely on principle, he declined it. A "Sir" at the front of the name would really weaken the name John Ross Robertson.

Winnipeg Tribune.

If this knighthood business doesn't stop, the knee-pants brigade will be as numerous in Canada as colonels down in Old Kentucky.

The importation of all these empty titles into Canada is merely foisting upon a democratic people a form of snobbery, wholly and nauseatingly objectionable to level-headed, sane-minded men and women who value manhood and womanhood at true worth, and not by the frilling and attachments having origin in an age when civilization was at a more or less low ebb.

The veteran publisher of The Toronto Telegram has, a Toronto despatch says, refused a knighthood. All honor to him. He is a big Canadian and a man who has done a great work for his city and country. We shall say nothing of the men who have now accepted titles. The acceptance is an evidence that they are subject to flattery. If they have any satisfaction in toying with ribbons, garters, and fitting themselves out in a garb that would tickle the fancy of the chief of the Blackfeet tribe, let them alone. There is sometimes a strong resemblance between old age and childhood. Little things frequently please in both cases.

Toronto Globe.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Evening Telegram, and well known for his public benevolences, has declined a knighthood, which, it seemed, was proffered to him among the delayed New Year honors. "There is no reason to give, beyond that I exercised the same right as the others who have accepted, and I declined—I hope graciously and gracefully," remarked Mr. Robertson in reply to a query from the Globe.

On the same day, it seems, Mr. John Ross Robertson declined a senatorship, which the Borden Government offered him, and, in the words of a well-known politician, "it is the first time in the history of Canada that anyone declined a knighthood and a senatorship on the same day."

The first Canadian to decline that

honor was the late Sir J. B. Robinson, in 1838, when both he and Sir Allan Macnab were recommended for knighthood. Sir Allan accepted. Mr. Robinson declined, but was knighted many years later.

Kenora (Ont.) Miner and News.

It is understood that Sir Robert Borden offered John Ross Robertson, publisher of The Toronto Evening Telegram, a knighthood and a senatorship, but Mr. Robertson gratefully declined both honors.

Ottawa Citizen.

The peerage was not elevated to Mr. John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram.

Belleville Intelligencer.

The Toronto Telegram of the 19th inst. copies thirteen approval paragraphs of John Ross Robertson's declining a knighthood (an unlucky number), all of which are from Liberal newspapers. Not one of these uttered even a whisper against Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when he accepted honors more distinguished than a mere K.C.M.G., though he had previously denounced such honors as "Tin Pot Titles." Such is Liberal party politics.

Though Mr. Robertson, for reasons of his own, declined the honor, he evidently does not disapprove entirely, for the first item under the editorial head of The Telegram appears the following:—

"A Well-Earned Title."—"Title conferred on Sir Edward Kemp was better earned and represents more genuine work in the service of the fathers and mothers of Canada's soldiers than the knighthoods conferred on less deserving public men than Canada's Minister of Militia."

Sidney (C.B.) Record.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Evening Telegram, is an old-line Tory, who has talked frankly to Premier Borden about the sins and follies of his Government. It is now said that he has been offered knighthood and a

senatorship and has refused both. We are glad of this; and yet—and yet—is Cape Breton to be passed over always? Why did they not suggest to Mr. Robertson that he could be senator for Cape Breton, and come down here with Senator Crosby in the summer time, when the fishing is good and the scenery is at its best? Mr. Robertson might have taken pity on our unrepresented condition as Mr. Crosby did.

Tweed News.

J. Ross Robertson, of Toronto, was offered knighthood by the King but refused the honor. On the same day he was offered a senatorship, which he also refused. This certainly constitutes a record.

St. Thomas Journal.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, has refused a knighthood and a senatorship, thereby putting himself on the same plane as that well-known enemy of the Hohenzollerns, Col. Henry Watterson, of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

St. Thomas Times.
DECLINES HONORS.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Evening Telegram, whose philanthropy is well known, is said to have declined both a knighthood and a senatorship. We commend Mr. Robertson's decision as to the knighthood. That honor would not add to the fine distinction he now possesses, but Mr. Robertson in the Senate would do much to increase the usefulness of that chamber.

Brantford Expositor.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, who has declined knighthood, finds himself in the same company as Asquith and Lloyd George, and therefore need not begrudge "Baron" Graham the hereditary title which, for some unexplained and unexplainable reason, has been bestowed upon that ambitious gentleman.

Stratford Beacon.

John Ross Robertson, in declining a knighthood, is in a class with many

good men. Gladstone in Britain and Alexander MacKenzie in Canada are among the number. Gladstone was just as great as if he had been made a peer. Alexander MacKenzie's ability and honesty of character were just as great as if he had been Sir Alexander MacKenzie. John Ross Robertson may display some strange features in politics, but he has many good points about him, which, if knighthood were to be a reward, he deserves more than some others who have received it in the past. The work he has done through the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto should cause his name to live in grateful remembrance.

Guelph Herald.

It is reported that John Ross Robertson, owner of The Toronto Telegram, declined knighthood or a seat in the Senate. We honor him for his sturdy independence. Than J. R. Robertson there is no man more worthy of honor in Canada; his work, especially amongst the sick children, is a living monument to his large-heartedness. He remains unspoiled, however, and his paper will no doubt continue to the end to be scornful of those who are apt to forget the people because they occupy the high seats in royal favor.

Peterborough Review.

John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, could not be tempted by the offer of a handful of silver or a ribbon to stick in his coat.

Lethbridge (Alberta) Herald.

J. Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, refused a knighthood. Probably he thought that as Sam Hughes had one, he didn't care to travel in the same class.

Guelph Herald.

Many editors are complimenting John Ross Robertson on his refusal of a baronetcy who wouldn't be able to resist such an offer themselves if they crossed both fingers and sang "Yield Not to Temptation."

Woodstock Sentinel-Review.

Some men look for titles, others have titles thrust upon them, and others still refuse to accept them. It is currently reported that John Ross Robertson, of Toronto, was one of those to decline on the occasion of the recent distribution of these favors in this country. This may be numbered among the many big things John Ross Robertson has done.

Brantford Expositor.

Following the announcement that Sir Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, has been made a baron, comes the intimation that Mr. John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, has refused both a senatorship and a knighthood. It is possible a conviction on his part that Sir Hugh had no special claims to a baronetcy has led Mr. Robertson to the conclusion that any minor honors would be "barren" for him.

Brockville Recorder.

The Toronto Telegram intimates that of all the jokes Hon. Geo. P. Graham has allowed to be perpetrated on or in his name, that of creating Sir Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, a baronet, is the most unpardonable. Correct! But the name may still be all right notwithstanding one of this tribe has allowed such dignity to be thrust (?) upon him.

Hamilton Herald.

Have you noticed that all three of the new Canadian lords are Montreal men? Can there be any idea of restoring the old French seignorial system in Quebec?

Orangeville Sun.

Three more Canadians have been knighted by King George. The new knights are Premier Hearst, Hon. A. E. Kemp, and Mr. Justice Cassels. Sir Hugh Graham, owner of the Montreal Star, has been advanced to the status of a baron. We suppose the knights got theirs f.o.b., but we would like to know what the Montreal newspaperman paid for his. Of course, on this occasion, as on all

similar occasions, farmers did not get a look in. King George should not overlook the men who feed his fighters.

Peterboro Review.

Hon. George P. Graham says that Canada is flattered because Sir Hugh Graham goes to the House of Lords. That House is an estate of the British realm divested of its last vestige of authority, but if Mr. Graham feels that way—

Edmonton Bulletin.

Sir Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, has been made a baron. Baron what is not stated; perhaps not yet decided. In hope that it is not too late, may it be suggested that Baron Zandrak of Tramways Limited and the Campaign Fund, would fittingly perpetuate the public recognition of Sir Hugh's outstanding achievements?

Owen Sound Sun.

Hon. Albert Edward Kemp, undoubtedly called after Edward the Peacemaker, has been knighted by King George. He asked to be called Sir Edward, as his illustrious namesake chose that name at his coronation. We suppose his family will still call him "dad" and his wife will call him "Ab."

Stratford Beacon.

Hereditary titles should not be conferred on Canadians. We have now two barons, Lord Shaughnessy, of the C.P.R., and Lord Graham, of the Montreal Star. Why should the successors of these men be singled out for Imperial honors over those of other Canadians? There is nothing to warrant such a preference. This engrafting on Canada of the effete system of hereditary titles is most reprehensible and should be discontinued by all Canadians. Lord Beaverbrook, nee Sir Max Aitken, Bart, is another Canadian, but as he has practically severed his connection with his home land and taken up permanent residence in England, he does not count.

Toronto Globe.

Canadians can be made hereditary legislators in Britain, but not in Canada. We must lead the Mother Country in the opposite direction.

Vancouver World.

Canadian peerages are becoming common. Sir Hugh Graham, proprietor of the Montreal Star, is the latest Canadian to secure the right to don a coronet, sit in the Gilded Chamber at St. Stephen's, and in the unhappy event of being sentenced to death, to be allotted a silken cord for the occasion.

Victoria, B.C., Times.

In his remarks in the Ontario Legislature yesterday N. W. Rowell, K.C., leader of the Ontario Opposition, made the following reference to the subject of titles in Canada:—

"I venture to think that in the free democracy of Canada we are not improving conditions by importing hereditary titles passing from father to son. I hope it may be the last. I think when we are fighting the battles of democracy the world over, the tendency should be for the Old Country to bring themselves into harmony with our spirit of democracy rather than us transplanting part of the old feudal system into Canada."

On a referendum this observation of Mr. Rowell's would be endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the people of the Dominion. Canada does not want an hereditary aristocracy, and it would be a mistake to interpret the eagerness with which a few people here reach out for titles as a fair expression of the attitude of the public as a whole.

Woodstock Sentinel-Review.

The Sentinel-Review has received a marked copy of the Montreal Weekly Standard containing an article on the subject: "Sir Hugh Graham—Did He Deserve a Peerage?" The article is from the pen of Henry Dalby, a well-known jour-

nalist. It is important to note at the very outset that the Montreal Standard is one of Sir Hugh Graham's publications, and that Mr. Dalby was for many years in Sir Hugh Graham's employ. Under the circumstances it would be easy enough to guess the answer to the question proposed without going to the trouble of reading the article. It is not to be expected that Sir Hugh Graham's publication does not believe that Sir Hugh Graham was entitled to a peerage.

From the point of view of those who look upon Imperial titles, and especially hereditary titles, as wholly out of place in Canada, no argument based on service can be regarded as satisfactory. And what is true of hereditary titles is true of titles generally. They can serve no good purpose in a country like Canada. For the most part they have lost their meaning in the old country. They never had any meaning in this country. They confer no real honor, for they are often bestowed on the unworthy as well as on the worthy. Sometimes, as a very shrewd observer has pointed out, they may even serve to gild dishonor. It is not very long ago since a knight was hanged in England for treason and rebellion.

The best service that Canada can render the Motherland and the Empire, as well as herself, is to strive for the realization of her own ideals. If we must have titles let them belong by right to certain offices. Let all Premiers, say, have knighthoods conferred upon them by virtue of their office; but let it be understood that the title, like the office, is the gift of the bearer's own people. Let there be titles of honor, too, if necessary, for men who render distinguished public service in one connection or another; but let it be understood that such titles are Canadian and that they are conferred for public service to Canada. Imperial titles are not merely meaningless but mischievous, in so far as they serve to divert attention from Canadian ideals. The first duty of a Canadian is to Canada. If he desires encouragement or reward he should look to Canada for it.

Toronto Star.

There appears to be very little difference of opinion in the Canadian newspapers about the introduction of hereditary titles in Canada. So far as they speak of it at all the newspapers resent it with more or less energy, as contrary to the whole spirit of the country. Some object strongly to hereditary titles, but not to personal ones if worthily bestowed; most resent the importation of titles altogether.

The Ottawa Citizen is amused on reading the protest of certain journals and individuals just now against hereditary titles, after having successfully concealed their democracy in past time. We gather that the Citizen suspects that some of these objectors regard the conferring of these titles as impolitic and inopportune just now, rather than anything else. Referring to some of the newspapers, the Citizen says:

"But are these very journals not entirely responsible for the condition that they now decry? Are not many of the new democrats among those who fiercely attacked or scoffed at the Citizen when this journal protested against the appointment of a member of the royal family to the Governor-Generalship of the Dominion a few years ago (previous to the coming of the Duke of Connaught) on the ground that such an appointment could not be otherwise than harmful ultimately in a democratic country such as Canada professed to be?"

When word reached Canada that the Duke of Connaught was being spoken of as likely to be the next Governor-General in succession to Earl Grey, the Star objected to it as strongly as the Citizen or any other newspaper, and continued to protest against it until the appointment was actually made, and further objection unavailing. But when the Duke left Canada the Star felt called upon to admit that the fears we had entertained before his coming had been groundless, that he had shown much experience and tact, and been very successful in his office. So far as we know that is the general

opinion, the general impression he left on the people of Canada.

Are we, however, to take from the article in the Citizen the suggestion that the hereditary titles recently bestowed in Canada are an outcome of the Duke of Connaught's residence among us? Were the many knighthoods conferred during the past five years influenced by the same presence? Is so the experiment of having a Royal Court at Ottawa, democratized though it was to conform with the scenery, has not been the success we had supposed it. But as yet we do not quite see that the responsibility can be put upon the Duke of Connaught.

The ambition of some Canadians to be barons probably dates back to a period long before the Duke came here. As for Baron Beaverbrook, we cannot regard this as a hereditary Canadian title at all. Sir Max Aitken left Canada five or six years ago for England, jumped into politics, won a seat in Parliament, a knighthood, and a peerage. That's England's business, not ours in this country.

The statement in the London Times and the Daily Mail that Canada was delighted with the latest batch of hereditary titles has caused much strong protest. The truth is that a Toronto citizen, who is understood to have refused knighthood, has won more popular favor by his refusal than others have by acceptance. But there may, in fact, be some justification for the bitter remark of the Ottawa Citizen that "we have had so much toadyism among the press of the Dominion that the British have mistaken it for the real spirit of the country, and have decided to cater to it."

London Advertiser.

A surprising protest comes from newspapers of both parties against the bestowal of titles, and especially hereditary titles. Only in one instance has the Advertiser seen amongst its exchanges an article justifying the recent awards made to Sir Max Aitken and Sir Hugh Graham, whereby they become barons. The article appears in the Montreal Standard and relates the good works

of Sir Hugh Graham for Montreal, his fight to check the smallpox plague, his efforts to clean the filthy streets of the city, and his imperial service through his newspaper, the Montreal Star. In an eulogy of many columns it describes his rise from humble beginnings and his immeasurable energy in the works of charity. The Standard makes out a most convincing case for Sir Hugh, as a type of Scottish-Canadian, who has given this country its reputation for virility and enterprise.

In Canada, however, Jack is supposed to be as good as his master. Achievement is certain to bring distinction of a high order, and to those who cling to democratic ideals the man who does not seek the honors is a "bigger" man than he who has accepted a baronetcy. Canada has no titles to bestow, and when a man is honored by monarchical favor, we very much doubt if in a sentimental sense, at any rate, he does not relinquish his Canadianism. Who can now think of Baron Beaverbrook as a Canadian? He left Canada many years ago and only as he served himself in his methodical career to a title has he survived as a Canadian. Other barons will take up residence in England. And while the bond of being British is great, the rejection of one's native land for residence, even in England, is not altogether calculated to raise these titled gentlemen in public esteem. They will issue their calls, as Baron Shaughnessy has issued his, calling on Canadians to stay in their native land, but they have practically ceased to be Canadian citizens.

Allston Herald.

Knighthoods have recently been conferred by the King on three eminent and worthy Canadians. No doubt they all could have retained the respect of their fellows to just as high a degree and done just as efficient public service without the knighthoods as with them. No one has criticized the selection of the representative Canadians for knighthood, but no doubt thousands of Canadians have wondered why three men of Ontario were so signally honored when there are many other outstand-

ing Canadians just as worthy the honor who have not received it. Canada is a democratic country, and conferring titles has always been looked on with more or less disapproval. Lately, however, resentment has been engendered. There are so many worthy and so few selected for the honor that the people generally are voicing a vigorous protest.

Ottawa Citizen.

Perhaps Sir Robert Borden is taking Mr. Rogers over to London to have him knighted? Imagine the touching scene at Buckingham Palace. How every true Canadian heart will burn as Mr. Rogers is introduced to the King as a representative Canadian statesman! Doubtless, in a florescent speech from Sir Robert Borden, the King will be reminded of the way Mr. Rogers' co-partner in political contract letting, Sir Rodmond Roblin, has graced the title.

But, of course, his Majesty will be told that though Sir Rodmond's talents have been known for several years, not until this year has Mr. Rogers' ability been fully appreciated; it has, in fact, taken a provincial commission, presided over by a justice of the Supreme Court of Manitoba, to bring it out.

With swelling pride the Canadian Prime Minister will tell his Majesty what Mr. Rogers has done for the country, and what he has done for the country for. He will tell of the occasion in Sir Robert's own political fortunes when Mr. Rogers, while Minister of Public Works in Manitoba, helped him through in the following manner, according to the finding of Justice Galt:

" . . . he gratuitously offered Mr. Carter the privilege of increasing his tender, and Carter acted accordingly. As a result Carter's tender was increased \$8,700."

Sir Robert may be expected, at this point, to explain to the King just how the political Tammany is worked in this Dominion, and what an important position Mr. Rogers occupies as Minister of Elections. He might then go on to read from Justice Galt's report as follows:

"The circumstances attending these transactions led to an irresist-

ible inference that the increased tender allowed by Mr. Rogers and the unusual contributions to the campaign fund, amounting to \$7,500 made by the Carter Company, was directly connected, whereby the fund was augmented and the Carter Company received the benefit of \$1,200, while the province lost the entire sum of \$8,700.

"I find that the Carter Company contributed in all the sum of \$22,500 to the Conservative campaign funds during the currency of his contracts."

As his Majesty may not have read "Widowers' Houses," or "Mrs. Warren's Profession," he may not appreciate the delicate position held by Sir Robert Borden to Mr. Rogers—as the principal political beneficiary of the secret traffic in campaign funds from Government contractors.

In an eloquent peroration, however, Sir Robert can tell the King how Mr. Rogers' veracity has been called in question by the Manitoba Supreme Court, and how Justice Galt found Mr. Rogers out in the unlawful passing of an order-in-Council containing an untruthful statement regarding the amount of Carter's original tender. The King cannot fail to be moved when he hears with what dignity Mr. Rogers has replied by bearing false witness against a Canadian newspaper, for printing the judge's finding and protesting against Mr. Rogers being allowed longer to degrade the Crown as Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Rogers may thereupon interdoce himself by telling his Majesty that he also called the judge a grafter. With this overwhelming evidence in favor of Mr. Rogers' fitness for high honors, the least the King could do would be to tap him on the shoulder with a 9.2 high explosive and say, "Rise, Sir Rober!"

Toronto Globe, Feb. 16, 1917.

Mr. Rowell's speech in the debate on the address was a valuable and highly interesting review of the recent political history of the province and an instructive exposition of the present outlook and pressing duties in every field of activity and development. The world problems, so closely linked with many features of

provincial administration by the participation of the Empire in the great world struggle for liberty, were handled with keen insight and statesmanlike breadth of understanding, and their relationship was traced to the practical problems of industrial and agricultural production, personal thrift, domestic as well as public finance, and all the intricate duties devolving on the directors of public affairs. There was an interesting light thrown on the coming struggle of Liberalism in an introductory congratulation extended to the Prime Minister on the honor conferred by the Crown. That the Premier of the province, so long as such honors and titles were conferred by his Majesty for distinguished public service, should be among the recipients, was freely acknowledged. Toward the creation of the first Canadian baron, a legislator with authority that would pass to his descendants, there was suggestive deprecation.

The immediate struggle of Liberalism will be against hereditary legislative authority, and all the caste and class privileges with which it is associated. The blight of economic parasitism is tenacious, although its trail of evils is so wide and sweeping that it is one of the most deteriorating influences in the modern world. Many other evils receiving special consideration and inspiring much special reformatory work can be traced to the surrender of those who live by their own labor to those who live by the labor of others. This hydra-headed evil is closely linked with the hereditary legislator, and the influences through which he is tolerated. There is hope in Mr. Rowell's prediction that, in the clearer vision of the public after the war, the tendency will be not toward the extension of hereditary legislating authority from the old land to Canada, but toward the lessening of such privileges in Britain. His wish that the first resident Canadian baron would be also the last will be shared by all who realize the magnitude of the struggle that democracy will be made to face when war's necessary centralization of authority is to be ended.

Guelph Herald.

There will be no lack of persons to tell Lord Graham when his coronet is not on straight or his garter slips down.

Hamilton Times.

The Ottawa Journal-Press supports Mr. N. W. Rowell's protest against creating hereditary titles in Canada. No doubt if the Imperial Government understood the true feeling of Canada on this question there would be no more Lord Beaverbrooks or Baron Grahams.

Ottawa Citizen.

It is really amusing to read the fussy protests of certain journals and individuals in Canada just now against the introduction of hereditary titles. The number of newspapers which have successfully concealed their democracy until the present time is astonishing. But there can be little doubt of their sincerity now; they are against the whole toadyish practice. Some, indeed, are apparently out to wipe the whole business from our scheme of things.

Particularly bitter is the comment regarding the alleged reception of these honors in the Dominion. The statement in the London Times and the Daily Mail that Canada was delighted with the last batch of hereditary titles is scornfully repudiated. The new-found democrats are almost speechless at the implied condescension of our British cousins.

But are these very journals not entirely responsible for the condition that they now decry? Are not many of the new democrats among those who fiercely attacked or scoffed at the Citizen when this journal protested against the appointment of a member of the royal family to the Governor-Generalship of the Dominion a few years ago (previous to the coming of the Duke of Connaught) on the ground that such an appointment could not be otherwise than harmful ultimately

in a democratic country such as Canada professed to be? How many of these newspapers backed up the late Hon. Mr. Emmerson in his dignified protest along the same lines in the House of Commons?

The truth is that we have had so much toadyism among the press of the Dominion that the British have mistaken it for the real spirit of the country, and have decided to cater to it. Had the press and publicists now so indignantly repudiating the mistaken notion in Britain that we are hankering for an aristocracy protested at the time it became apparent that we were being "readied up" for the honors, it is scarcely likely that we would have the respectable foundation for a titled class which we now possess.

Calgary Herald.

In entering protest against the tendency which is becoming apparent in Canada for wealthy people to go title-hunting, and particularly against the fastening to our democracy of a number of hereditary titles, the Ottawa Journal-Press is speaking for the great mass of the Canadian people, and it is to be hoped its protest will carry weight with the powers at Ottawa and elsewhere.

In this country men are judged on their merit and the incident of title carries little weight. The man who is a "rotter" cannot hope either to gain or retain the respect of the masses through such distinction handed to him by the dispensers of that sort of thing. We still are democratic enough to pay tribute to real worth in the man, regardless of his station in life, or the presence or absence of appendages to his name, and we want to remain that way.

As for hereditary titles, they are altogether objectionable in this country, and we doubt if ever the time will come when they will be regarded, here at least, as of greater value than the ordinary family heirloom to their possessors. Certainly they will not serve the purpose of an Aladdin's lamp except in those very limited circles where pedigree and position count for more than brains.

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, Kyoquot, Nuchatlitz and other sonorous aboriginal names—would be quite impressive.

Hamilton Herald.

In the Montreal Weekly Standard, one of Sir Hugh Graham's publications, Henry Dalby discusses the question, "Sir Hugh Graham—Did he deserve a peerage?" Mr. Dalby has been for many years associated as a writer with the Graham publications. He is still in the employ of the new Canadian baron. It is natural that his estimate of that personage should be favorable and that he should put his opinion into print. Probably a good deal of what Mr. Dalby says in eulogy of Sir Hugh Graham or Baron Graham (his new title is not yet announced) is true enough. Sir Hugh must be a very capable man, else he could never have achieved the success he has. But Mr. Dalby misses the real point. Whether Graham or any other Canadian "deserves" elevation to the peerage by reason of ability and public service is not a question worthy of discussion. The important question is whether any Canadian, resident in Canada, however worthy of honor he may be and whatever his services to the Empire, should be made a peer or receive any other hereditary Imperial honor. The Herald, for one, ranges itself on the negative side of this question for reasons which it has already stated.

Another good reason for protesting against the bestowal of such titles we find in a letter to the Ottawa Journal. The Ottawa writer quotes the Manchester Guardian to the effect that there is a plan on foot for an Imperial Senate with an overseas peerage. If the elevation of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Sir Max Aitken and Sir Hugh Graham to the peerage is to be regarded as a succession of preliminary steps toward the consummation of this plan, there is the greater cause for protest. Such methods, instead of knitting the different countries of the Empire closer together, are more likely to stimulate separatist tendencies.

Hamilton Spectator.

Fortunately for Sir Hugh Graham, elevated to the peerage, he shows no

disposition to adiposity. Otherwise, he might be dubbed "a baron of beef."

Woodstock Sentinel-Review.

Speaking in the Legislature a few days ago and referring to some honors recently bestowed on Canadians, Mr. Rowell, the Liberal leader, took note of a statement in the press that a gentleman who was made a baron was the first native Canadian resident in Canada to have such conferred. Mr. Rowell commented: "I venture to think that in the free democracy of Canada we are not improving conditions by importing hereditary titles passing from father to son. I hope it may be the last. I think that when we are fighting the battle of democracy the world over the tendency will be in the Old Country to bring themselves into harmony with the spirit of democracy rather than for us transplanting part of the old feudal system into Canada."

It is well that a man like Mr. Rowell should speak thus frankly. It is time for plain speaking. Millions of men are offering their lives on the battlefields of Europe that the spirit of democracy may still survive in the institutions of our civilization. But it is not on the battlefields of Europe that the fate of democracy will be finally decided, but in the homes of democracy itself, in Canada and elsewhere. The feudal system had its day and its uses. The feudal lord had his obligations and responsibilities as well as his title and his privileges. It may be that there is still some use or excuse for perpetuating the system in the old lands, where it had its origin and found its development. But there is no excuse for attempting to transplant it to this country. It will serve no good purpose. It is likely to be fruitful of evil. Healthy-minded Canadian citizens, all those who cherish the ideals of a Canadian democracy, all those whose attachment and devotion to the Motherland are genuine and unselfish, will regret that a beginning was ever allowed to be made in this matter, and join with Mr. Rowell in the hope that, so far, at least, as hereditary

titles are concerned, we may have had the last of it.

The whole business of bestowing titles in this country is open to the objection that such things are out of harmony with the spirit of the country. And, besides, these honors and decorations, when they are not entirely meaningless, are misleading. They are said to come from the Sovereign, the fountain of honor, and are paraded before the public as the Sovereign's recognition of public service of great value. The truth is, of course, that the Sovereign has probably never heard of the names of many of the candidates until the list has been presented to him, and that often enough the titles are the reward of a kind of service which could not with safety be mentioned in public. Occasionally men who have become eminent in science, art, literature, politics or other fields of endeavor are selected for distinction; and if titles were restricted to such use there would be little objection; but the value of titles so bestowed is utterly destroyed by the bestowal of other titles for no public service that can be recognized and no service at all that can be mentioned.

Why, for instance, was Sir Hugh Graham made a baron and given precedence over every other native-born Canadian? What was the nature of his public service to Canada or the Empire? It is true that he has made a success in business and has acquired some personal power by virtue of his position as the proprietor of a newspaper with an extensive circulation. The fact of a man having acquired a fortune may be to his credit or otherwise, depending on the methods by which he has succeeded. We take it for granted that Sir Hugh Graham has acquired his wealth and the power associated with his position as a newspaper owner by perfectly legitimate business methods. But the mere accumulation of wealth and power does not of necessity imply such service to the state or the people as to call for special recognition from the Sovereign. Wealth and power give opportunity for service or for abuse, according as they are used for the public benefit or for private ends. How has Sir Hugh

Graham used the power which his wealth and his newspapers have placed at his command? In Montreal they will tell you that his aim has been to utterly destroy the freedom of the press by either crushing or controlling his weaker rivals. In municipal politics his influence has been on the side of the special interests at least as often as it has been on the side of the people. In the larger field of politics he has stood some times with one party, some times with another, but always for Hugh Graham, his knighthood being his reward for services rendered the Liberals, his feudal lordship the reward for service rendered the Conservatives. In all this he has been no worse and no better than hundreds of other men who have succeeded in acquiring wealth and have used the power which their wealth has given them to gratify their own ambitions; but why in the name of all that is rational and honorable and decent should he be singled out, not only for special recognition, but for recognition without precedent among native-born Canadians? Is it the desire of the Sovereign that such a life and such a service should be held up before the eyes of young Canadians as their highest ideal? The Sovereign, to do him justice, probably knows no more about Sir Hugh Graham than he does about hundreds of others who have been the recipients of favors at his hands. Why then perpetuate the delusion? If we must have titles and honors let us know from whom they come and why. So much fiction and make-believe cannot be good for the healthy development of a young democracy.

The sooner we learn to honestly face the facts of our national existence; the sooner we learn to distinguish between what is real and what is mere fiction, between the recognition that is earned and the recognition that is bestowed for a consideration, the better it will be for Canada, both as a young nation and as a part of the British Empire. The more faithfully Canada clings to her own ideals the better service she will be able to render to the Empire. They are no friends of Canada who are seeking to re-establish in this

young land the worn-out institutions of other countries, and especially such institutions as are antagonistic to the spirit of our democracy.

Nothing of what has been said is directed against Sir Hugh Graham personally. It would apply to any man in his place. He happens to be the man in the place.

Woodstock Sentinel-Review.

The announcement is made of an other batch of titles to Canadians. Hon. W. H. Hearst, Premier of Ontario, Hon. A. E. Kemp, Minister of Militia, and several others whose names are more or less familiar to newspaper readers, have been knighted, and Sir Hugh Graham, already a knight, has been made a baron, and will probably be known hereafter as Lord Graham. He is the publisher of the Montreal Star. What do these titles represent? For what kind of service were they granted? What qualities of merit do they indicate? What public service has A. E. Kemp rendered that he should be picked out for special recognition? Or Sir Hugh Graham, that he should be given precedence over men like Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and all but one or two others in Canada? It is not impossible to understand why Mr. Davis, of Montreal, tobacco manufacturer, should be regarded as entitled to royal favor, for, after all, as Kipling puts it, a good cigar is a smoke; and as for Premier Hearst—well, he is Premier of Ontario, and probably could not have escaped.

The Weekly Sun seeks to throw some light on the subject by the statement that "the King or his advisers have received payment in cash or in kind" for titles so bestowed. It would be interesting to know how much cash or what kind; but we suppose that is a matter that is not intended for the vulgar public. Perhaps, if all the truth were known about the methods by which these titles and honors are secured, there would be a rapid depreciation in their value. And yet it might be for the benefit of the country if the subject were thoroughly ventilated.

And unless the Canadian spirit is

either dead or asleep there is one question that will be ventilated, and that is the bestowal of hereditary titles. These may have their uses in the Old Country; at any rate they represent a natural development of conditions there; but they are out of place in Canada and out of harmony with the spirit of our democracy.

It is no answer to say that these titles and honors come from the King, and that the bestowal of them is part of his prerogative. In a sense they do come from the King; but nobody believes that the King himself is responsible in this matter in any other way than as a constitutional ruler who acts on the advice of his responsible Ministers. It is very well known that sometimes the methods used for the securing of titles have as little regard for honor as they have for merit.

The Guelph (Ont.) Mercury.

A correspondent, whose letter was printed in Friday's Mercury, does not agree with the views of this paper regarding the giving of titles, especially hereditary ones, to Canadians. The Mercury, at all times, welcomes the views of readers, no matter whether they coincide with those of this paper or not. There is just one statement in the letter referred to that we cannot let pass, and that is this:

"The postponement of the New Year's honors must have been a bitter disappointment—but all in good time and you had an especially venomous one ready."

The word especially objected to is "venomous." The article in this paper did not contain anything approaching that, and at no time does anything of that nature find expression in these columns. We have never felt that we were deputed to run the universe, and at no time is anything criticized or commented upon in a "venomous" spirit.

The Mercury is convinced that there is a growing feeling against the practice of giving titles to Canadians. Here is a letter, appearing in the Journal-Press of Ottawa in regard to an editorial opinion along the same lines as appeared in the Mercury:

"Sir,—I have read, with pleasure, your editorial entitled 'Hereditary Titles' in this morning's issue. Although I do not read all your editorials with pleasure, I say 'more power to your elbow.'

"There is absolutely no sense in creating hereditary titles in this country. The other titles, while not so bad, are bad enough. They are not transmitted to descendants, but we will soon get into a condition where anyone who does anything at all will expect to be knighted for it. We are creating an aristocracy which is out of keeping with our democratic organization and principles and we will be sorry for it.

"I am writing merely on the principles involved, and not in reflection upon recent or older recipients of such honors. The trouble with these rewards is, that while the recipients may be entirely worthy, there are hundreds of equally worthy men who must be left unrewarded.

"Why create these distinctions? Have we not enough problems now?"

"Yours very truly,

"DEMOCRAT."

Ottawa, Feb. 14.

The feeling of the Canadian press on the matter is fairly well reflected in the following:

Toronto Star:—The Manchester Guardian's London editor says that the last three Canadian peerages have gone to Montreal and remarks that the rivalry between Toronto and Montreal is as keen as that between Liverpool and Manchester. Not, we hope, in regard to peerages. Montreal is welcome to all of them.

Ottawa Citizen—It's a poor day now in Canada that hasn't its knight.

Peterborough Review—Give the common people coal, and they care little who gets the titles.

St. Thomas Journal—Even the London Press seems not overfond of titles in Canada. "Are we in pursuit of Kentucky's record?" it asks.

Kingston Whig—It is strange that the man of great kindness of heart and long suffering is not the recipient of knighthood. Why should Mr. Rogers not be addressed as Sir Bob?

Ottawa Citizen—In these days of titular profusion a startled Canada is likely to awake some morning and find that one of our prominent Cabinet ministers has been created Baron Bunk of Winnipeg and Ottawa.

St. Thomas Times—Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Evening Telegram, whose philanthropy is well known, is said to have declined both a knighthood and a senatorship. We commend Mr. Robertson's decision as to the knighthood. That honor would not add to the fine distinction he now possesses, but Mr. Robertson in the Senate would do much to increase the usefulness of that chamber.

The Mercury believes that the press has been more outspoken this year than ever before on the matter. While we respect the views of those who differ with us on the matter, we cannot recede at all from a position that we are thoroughly convinced is right.

Brantford Expositor.

Mr. Henry Dalby, who has been a journalistic associate of Baron Graham for many years, writes to the Montreal Standard, which is another Graham annex, an elaborate eulogy of the career and public services of the gentleman who has recently been honored in such an unusual manner. The Expositor has a suspicion that Mr. Dalby does not specify the real reason for the elevation of the Baron above his fellows, and it has an honest belief that there are Canadians who have done more for Canada and for the Empire than he has done, and have not even been honored with knighthood. But, assuming all that Mr. Dalby says in his eulogy to be true, the fact remains that honors of an hereditary character are distinctly unpopular in Canada, and unsuited to the democratic conditions which exist here. The newly-created baron would have shown evidence of the commonsense and modesty which Mr. Dalby ascribes to him had he been satisfied with the knighthood he already enjoyed.

Toronto Globe.

Kitchener, Feb. 21.—John Gardhouse of Milton, speaking before the Waterloo County Farmers' Club tonight, emphatically declared that in the democracy of the provinces, as exemplified in Canada, we have no use for the titled gentry. He sounded the warning that there are too many knights and barons being created in Canada. He said that politicians declare that the farmers are the backbone and sinew of the nation, but they forget this when they get to Parliament. It is up to the farmer to see that the farmers are more directly represented in Parliament, so their interests may be better protected, he stated.

Ottawa Journal-Press.

"La Presse has an invidious and somewhat ungracious comment on recent bestowal of honors from the Crown, when it remarks that no Canadian of French origin has been given the distinction, adding: 'We do not understand why they persist in England in recommending only persons of English-speaking nationality for royal decorations.' One has only to recall the names of Sir Evariste LeBlanc, Sir Alexander Lacoste, Sir Lomer Gouin, Sir Horace Archambeault, Sir Rodolphe Forget to disprove the insinuation of La Presse. The honor list announced this week was not a lengthy one, and there is no reason to doubt that, as in the past, so in the future, when the royal accolade falls, it will touch the shoulder of distinguished Canadians of French origin."—Montreal Gazette

The Gazette does not trouble to give a long list of French-Canadian knights. Among the living ones, in addition to those the Gazette names, are Sir Louis Jette, Sir A. A. Angers, Sir G. Garneau, Sir Pierre Landry, Sir F. X. Lemieux, Sir A. B. Bouthier, Sir L. O. Taillon. And, of course, Sir Percy Girouard. And still more, of course, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Le Presse's wonder why they "persist" in England in ignoring French-Canadians would also intimate that they have always been ignoring them. Answer, shades of

Sir George Cartier, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Henri Joly, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir Charles Pelletier, Sir James Le Moine, Sir Louis Casault, and goodness knows how many more!

We cheerfully admit that our French-Canadian compatriots cannot as yet boast a baron, and we hope we will never be able to boast any more barons among English-speaking Canadians. To be brutally frank about it, there never was a decent excuse for an inflection upon this country of the principle of inherited titles.

Ottawa Journal-Press

Sir,—I have read with pleasure your editorial entitled "Hereditary Titles" in this morning's issue, although I do not read all your editorials with pleasure. I say "more power to your elbow."

There is absolutely no sense in creating hereditary titles in this country. The other titles, while not so bad, are bad enough. They are not transmitted to descendants, but we will soon get into a condition where anyone who does anything at all will expect to be knighted for it. We are creating an aristocracy which is out of keeping with our democratic organization and principles, and we will be sorry for it.

I am writing merely on the principles involved, and not in reflection upon recent or older recipients of such honors. The trouble with these rewards is that, while the recipients may be entirely worthy, there are hundreds of equally worthy men who must be left unrewarded.

Why create these distinctions? Have we not enough problems now?

Yours very truly,

"DEMOCRAT."

Ottawa, Feb. 14.

Guelph Mercury.

The owner of the Montreal Star has been made a knight or something like that, so we suppose the editor of his paper will have to be wheeled down to work now wearing a pair of silk breeches.

Ottawa Journal-Press.

We may have had doubts as to the wisdom of introducing life titles into this new country, but we have no doubt at all as to the unwisdom of establishing hereditary titles here. This can be said without any reflection upon recent recipients of such honors.

The idea that any man should be set apart, should be given a handle to his name, and any precedence or advantages attaching thereto, simply because of something done by his ancestors, is foreign to the make-up of the people of this country.

Our principle is and should be that every man must stand on his own feet, and that his position among his fellows must be gained by merit. The acquisition of wealth sometimes upsets that principle, but hereditary titles violate it to an extent that calls for protest at the very outset.

Hamilton Herald.

A day or two ago the Herald, commenting upon the elevation of Sir Hugh Graham to the peerage, expressed the hope that there would be manifested in Canada a spirit of protest against the bestowal of any more hereditary titles upon Canadians resident in Canada.

We are glad to see that the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature has given utterance to such a protest. Mr. Rowell's words, spoken in the Legislature yesterday, were pointed and appropriate. Alluding to the fact that the new-made baron is the first native Canadian resident in this country to receive a peerage, the Liberal leader said:—

"I venture to think that in the free democracy of Canada we are not improving conditions by imparting hereditary titles passing from father to son. I hope it may be the last. I think when we are fighting the battle of democracy the world over the tendency will be in the Old Country to bring themselves into harmony with our spirit of democracy rather than for us transplanting part of the old feudal system into Canada."

The protest was all the more forceful from the fact that it was made immediately after Mr. Powell had congratulated Premier Hearst upon having received an Imperial honor in the form of a knighthood. There is no objection to Canadian knight-hoods. They are not undemocratic. The objection is to hereditary titles.

London Advertiser.

There are many things Canada can learn from Britain and benefit by them; there are other things that Canada could learn which are most undesirable, and, unfortunately, some of these seem most attractive to the Government. There is, for instance, the granting of peerages or other titular honors as recognition of generous contributions to party funds.

During very recent years there have been honors bestowed in Canada by the King which have caused amazement, not to say amusement, and people have wondered what service had been rendered the Empire by these recipients to warrant the King's favor.

But, it must be remembered that these men and their worth (or lack of it) are often unknown to his Majesty, who confers the honors on those selected by the Government. Then, the reasons are sometimes more obvious. The question is reduced to this: What outstanding service have they rendered the party in power?

Canada is autonomous; she does not need to be bound by the bonds which have for many years been hindering Britain's full development. Canada should set the example of giving honor where honor is due, not where it has been bought with cold cash. The nation ought to express disapproval of this purchase system at once.

Kingston Whig.

Public men in England are not so eager for knighthood. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright did without it in their day, and Mr. Balfour, Mr. Asquith and Lloyd-George have done without it so far. Canada is being overlaid with titles, and they are not congenial to the soil.

Guelph Mercury.

The Hamilton Herald is not at all enamored of the creating of a titled set in Canada, and says:

"Once more the Herald enters its protest against the bestowal of a peerage or any other hereditary title upon a Canadian resident in Canada and intending to remain in this country. . . . If encouragement is given, to this new departure in the way of Imperial honors in Canada, it may not be long before we shall wake up to find ourselves with an aristocratic caste fastened upon our social system. In Britain these hereditary honors stand for something real. They are links with Britain's historic past, survivals of the forms of feudalism though dissociated from the powers and privileges which accompanied them in the old feudal days. They are, therefore, interesting historically, and, to a people who reverence their past, they have real symbolic value. In Canada they are exotics, and, to be frank, seem somewhat absurd. There is no historical background for them in this country. They are as incongruous and out of place here as would be a Gobelin tapestry in a log cabin or a suit of medieval armor in the cottage of a day-laborer. And will mere baronies satisfy the craving of the new aristocracy? If barons, why not Canadian viscounts and earls and dukes? The reason for engraffing the lesser hereditary honors upon the Canadian social system may prove equally good when claims are made for the higher honors. No man who wants to be a baron, no woman who wants to be 'Lady,' will be content with these distinctions when there is any prospect of the baron becoming an earl and the lady a countess. It is to be regretted that a beginning was ever made in this bad business. But we hope there will be so general and pointed a protest against it that it will be discontinued. This is an essentially democratic country, and we are sure that, so far from there being any general desire here for the establishment of

a hereditary titled aristocracy, such a movement, if attempted, would be regarded generally with resentment and disgust."

Isn't it queer to think that while we're growing a generation of barons and earls in Canada, ex-Premier Asquith and Premier Lloyd George bear the very modest title of plain Mr.?

Orangeville Sun.

On more than one occasion we have called the attention of King George to the outrageous fact that he persists in ignoring the farmers when handing out honors. Once more we wish to draw his Majesty's attention to this persistent omission. Knighthoods, we must admit, are getting mighty common, and, like cigars, they don't care who smoke them. In fact, they have become so common that rich newspapermen, cement manipulators and others who have scraped the pennies together go out gunning for bigger game in the form of baronetcies, and the less desirable knighthoods are thrown at actors, tobacco manufacturers, brewers, distillers and others of their ilk. If his Majesty continues to let our advice go in one ear and out of the other we are fearful he will put the whole menagerie on the bum. But why not save the situation while it is yet time? This can be done by picking out a prominent farmer in every township and making him a Sir. Why not be logical? Surely the man who feeds a hog and sells it at \$14.50 per cwt., live weight, is doing as much for suffering humanity as the man who brews beer, bottles it, and unloads it on a thirsty public at so much per, or the fellow who distills whisky, and, incidentally, causes murders, riots, and makes hells that should be homes. But why continue this long-range audience with our most beloved Sovereign? Too many flatterers are at his elbow to queer our good suggestions, but we would suggest that the farmers organize and establish a modern Magna Charta in order that they should receive their fair proportion of knight-hoods.

Simcoe Reformer.

Sir Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, has been made a baron. That makes two newspaper barons for Canada, counting Lord Beaverboard as still a Canadian. Then there's Baron Shaughnessy, to represent the railroads. What have the Canadian brewers and pillmakers done? Over at 'Ome they come right to the front when such titles are being tossed about.

Guelph Herald.

Being knighted isn't so bad, but in these political days there is something suspicious about being made a baron. . . . The night-blooming cactus only blooms once in a long time, while the night-blooming Canadians can be seen any old time. . . . Care should be taken to see that Canada does not become too much of a be-nighted nation. . . . The rich can have their titles, but give us a few tons of coal.

Toronto Globe.

To the Editor of the Globe: Your comments in yesterday's issue and timely editorial in to-day's paper regarding Mr. John Ross Robertson declining to accept a knighthood and senatorship are refreshing, to say the least, and I would say hats off, three cheers and a tiger for Mr. Robertson, who, by his gracious yet firm refusal of these distinctions (now viewed more in the light of a joke than an honor), has achieved a far greater distinction than a title could bestow.

The fact that one who has refused what beyond all question he so truly deserved proves he is a bigger man than many of those who have aspired to wake up some fine morning and see their names in the papers prefixed by a little word of three letters: and I have reason to believe that the sentiments briefly expressed in this letter will be shared and endorsed by many democratic Canadians who will, in this case, consider it a privilege and an honor to take off their hats to Mr. John Ross Robertson.

William J. Helm.

Port Hope, Feb. 15.

Toronto Star.

Editor of the Star: The decision of our respected citizen, Mr. John Ross Robertson, in refusing the honor of knighthood is indeed a commendable one. As a senator he would be invaluable to this country. Just at the present time there seems to be a perfect mania for the bestowal and acceptance of titles and university degrees of all kinds, which does no credit to Canada generally.

Again, those responsible for the conferring of such distinctions might, with advantage, go outside the coteries of wire-pullers, politicians, and money-makers.

Among the greatest offenders are those ministers—ministers of the Gospel—in this city who hold cheap American D.D. degrees, which are not worth the paper on which they are written. If Canadians who are acknowledged leaders in thought peddle and dabble in such, what can be expected from the rank and file of our citizens?
Jacques.

Toronto, Feb. 21.

Halifax Chronicle.

The Canadian press is giving Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, much credit for having recently declined to accept a senatorship and a knighthood. Mr. Robertson is entitled to credit, and his action is wholly praiseworthy, but it should be pointed out that the precedent was set long ago by a Halifax newspaper man, equally as deserving of public honor and preferment. Mr. C. C. Blackaddar, editor and proprietor of the Acadian Recorder, had the distinction, many years ago, of declining a senatorship and the lieutenant-governorship of his native province, and we have no doubt that if Mr. Blackaddar had any desire to be other than the democrat and good citizen that he has been and is, a knighthood would have been at his disposal. He preferred, however, as Mr. Robertson has chosen, to wear the distinction which comes from long and faithful service as a journalist and an exemplar of good citizenship.

Ottawa Citizen.

. . . Among those who were not knighted was Mr. Justice Galt, of Winnipeg. But, of course, he has done nothing to further the cause of Empire and Empire connection.

Hamilton Herald.

Upon the whole we think that John Ross Robertson, of Toronto, deserves to be admired even more for declining a knighthood and a senatorship than if those blessings had been bestowed upon him.

Lumsden (Sask.) News.

Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Evening Telegram, declined the honor of knighthood recently. No frills for John Ross.

Vancouver News-Advertiser.

Mr. J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, known for many benevolent works, has recently acquired more eminence by refusing a knighthood and a peerage than he could have obtained by accepting them. The Telegram remarks that a knighthood makes a man's name longer to read, but not longer to remember

Lethbridge Herald.

J. Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, refused a knighthood. Probably he thought that as Sam Hughes had one, he didn't care to travel in the same class.

Orangeville Sun.

True democrats should take off their hats to J. Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram. He declined a senatorship and a knighthood on the same day. By rising above the tendency of the day in this respect Mr. Robertson has rendered Canada a great public service and, at the same time, has proven himself to be an even greater

man than most of us were inclined to admit. In these days of wealthy cement manipulators, tobacco manufacturers, brewers, quack medicine makers and numerous other got-rich-quick upstarts chasing titles (and getting them, too) it is quite refreshing to see a man with brains in his head and red blood in his veins declining such "honors." Mr. Robertson deserves the commendation of his fellow-Canadians for waking the people and press up to the impropriety of having such tommy-rot planted in this country.

While on this subject it would be interesting for the people to know just how much cold cash Sir Max Aitken, Sir Hugh Graham and the motley crew paid for their "honors." Few of them have ever done anything that would bring much more than a curse from the public, and why they should be "honored" is a mystery to everyone except those who understand the trafficking in titles of nobility.

Is it not about time that some democrat in Parliament forced an investigation into these scandals?

Again we say, all honor to J. Ross Robertson!

Vankleek Hill Review.

Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, sought a "peerage" and got it. John Ross Robertson, Toronto, was offered a peerage, but refused it.

The Ottawa Citizen truly says: "The peerage was not elevated to Mr. John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram."

If the "powers that be" think they are making the ties between England and Canada stronger by handing out "peerages" to Hugh Graham, Max Aitken, etc., they are worse guessers than Germany has proven to be.

The editor of the Montreal Star sought a "title" and got it.

The editor of The Toronto Telegram was offered a "title," but gracefully declined it.

It is not the only difference between "Sir" Hugh Graham and "Mr." John Ross Robertson.

One of them is a great man in every respect.

Goderich Signal.

John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, has earned distinction by refusing a knighthood. Good for him! Toronto is benighted enough already.

Possibly the real reason John Ross Robertson, of The Toronto Telegram, declined a knighthood is that he didn't want to be considered in the same class as the only newspaper knight that Toronto possesses at present.

Sydney (C.B.) Record.

The Toronto Globe, commenting on John Ross Robertson's non-acceptance of a knighthood and a senatorship, says: "While the acceptance of a British title, knighthood or other, for services rendered to the people of Canada, is sanctioned by custom as well as by law, it is refreshing to hear even at long intervals that it has been declined by some one to whom it had been offered in good faith. John Ross Robertson's fellow-citizens will think none the less of him, perhaps they will think all the more, because he preferred to be known to and by them without any factitious distinction purporting to be conferred by the addition of a title to his name. No one of all the individuals in the rapidly lengthening list of Canadian knights was better entitled to any such distinction than he is, but he preferred to be enrolled in the very much shorter list of those who declined the honor, along with such distinguished Canadians as George Brown and Edward Blake.

"It is equally to Mr. Robertson's credit that he declined a Canadian senatorship. He was years ago a useful member of the House of Commons for Toronto, and from this really distinguished position he retired voluntarily when he might have held the seat indefinitely. He knows how much more useful a member of the House can make himself than a member of the Senate can possibly do, and he is fortunately no more in need of a life pension than he is of factitious distinction. Even the Canadian Senate would be a more efficient legislative chamber than it now

is if there were fewer veteran valedudinarians in its membership. Stalwart democrats are much more numerous among the Canadian people than are the aspirants to either titles or sinecures."

We think better of John Ross Robertson than we ever did before. His mind is not of the broadest; but he has had the good sense to decline one of these wooden-sword and tin-helmet knighthoods, which are getting so cheap and so common. We see no particular objection to recognizing, by such means, real merit and real service; but when a Max Aitken gets one for political services, and a John Willison for services which, to whomsoever they have been given (and they have been given in opposite directions), are not such as justify honor at the King's hands, the thing begins to get a shabby look. If his Majesty really picked the new knights, no doubt he would make a good job of it; but it is the Government at Ottawa that picks them for Canada. But Mr. John Ross Robertson has declined. He will be the more respected for it.

KNIGHTHOOD IN FLOWER IN CANADA.

Winnipeg Free Press.

Ottawa, Feb. 19.

Knighthood is in flower in Canada. Nobody knows where or in what new species the flower will bloom next, nor how the seed got to the democratic soil of Canada in the first place. Certain it seems to be, however, that it has secured a firm rooting and is spreading like tumbleweed on the prairies on a windy day. Its chief habitat is the gardens of the well-to-do.

Until but recently titles conferred upon Canadians were largely confined to that sort which were given as marks of real distinction and died with their holder—sort of hardy annuals. Now it would appear that there is a grave danger in the near future of a class of men springing up in the Dominion bearing titles for which their own standing or attainments never fitted them, but which have been handed down to

them from the previous generation. Hereditary titles—the perennial sort—are taking root in the Dominion.

Those who receive knightly recognition are the men whom the King delights to honor. Ostensibly their claim to such honor must be "service to the State." But it should be remembered that the King is guided in his delight by the recommendations of his advisers in the Dominion, who at the present time happen to be Sir Robert Borden and his Cabinet. The privilege of choosing knights is as much a prerogative of the Government as is the privilege of choosing senators or appointing charwomen. It is, in fact, largely part and parcel of the patronage system, with a slight difference. It is seldom that the King confers his honors on those not recommended by the Government; on the other hand, he has been known to withhold them from men so recommended. Whether on all occasions service to the State is the first consideration of the Government in making its recommendations it is hard to say. If so, the Government must have a fairly high opinion of its own services in that regard, for it has already recommended half of itself for Imperial honors and received them.

FIVE IN FIFTEEN YEARS.

The late Laurier Administration was more modest in this respect. During the fifteen years of its regime only five members of the Cabinet, as such, received titles. They were Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was made a Knight of the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George by Queen Victoria on the occasion of his visit to England during the Jubilee of 1897; Sir Frederick Borden, whose services as Minister of Militia during the South African War won him the distinction of Knight Commander; Sir Louis Davies, Sir William Mulock and Sir Allen Aylesworth, all of whom received the same honor at various times. Five titles in fifteen years was the record of the Laurier Cabinet. Not a private member of Parliament was recommended for a title by that Government.

A CABINET ONE-HALF KNIGHTS.

Sir Robert Borden's title of Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael is the same as that held by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and is a birthday gift of the present King, conferred in 1914. In addition, there are in his Cabinet five Knights Commander, namely, Sirs Thomas White, George Foster, Albert Edward Kemp, George Perley and James Lougheed. Having precedence over all those holding titles of the "perishable" variety in Canada is Major-Gen. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B. (Knight Commander of the Bath). In addition to the above the King has delighted to honor with the title of Knight Bachelor three private members on the Government side, namely, Sirs James Aikins, Herbert Ames and E. B. Osler.

Another new year and another birthday and Canada may have a whole Cabinet of knights of one sort or another.

A MATTER OF COURSE.

Lieutenant-Governors, Chief Justices and Premiers of provinces receive knighthood from time to time without much comment on the part of the public, though there are at present in the Dominion only two Provincial Premiers with the title of knighthood, Sir Lomer Gouin and Sir William Hearst, the latter being of the vintage of 1917. In recent years there have been four Conservative Provincial Premiers with the title of knight, namely, Sir Richard McBride, Sir Rodmond Roblin, Sir James Whitney, and the present Ontario Premier. Sir Lomer Gouin is the single Liberal knight.

MAY BECOME COMMON.

So luxuriously has the flower of knighthood been blooming in Canada, however, that there is grave danger of it becoming "common." Honorary colonels have become so plentiful since the war commenced that even the bearer of the real article is sometimes lightly looked upon. There is the same danger in connection with the honors of the King. In fact, men are suspected of going after knighthoods to-day!

Yes, laying their plans deliberately to secure them. So much is this the case that when a wealthy individual undertakes to give his services free on behalf of any worthy war cause the casual and matter-of-fact remark is often heard, "Oh, he is looking for a knighthood."

Toronto Saturday Night.

"Saturday Night" tenders its congratulations to John Ross Robertson, owner of The Toronto Telegram. It is not given to every man to refuse a knighthood and a senatorship all in one day.

Lethbridge (Alberta) Herald.

The latest batch of knighthoods and peerages for Canadians doesn't make us any fonder of this title business. The whole thing should be cut out. We want real democracy in this country and titles have no relation to real democracy. Then our titles are usually handed out to men of wealth, for no other reason than that they have wealth. Canada's latest peerage was given for no other reason, as the recipient had gained prominence in no other respect. All he had done was to make money, which he has largely hoarded for his own use. If wealth is to be the chief consideration in securing a title might it not be a good idea to attempt to pay off Canada's war debt by distributing amongst the munition profiteers and men of wealth generally titles of various degrees at so much per title? In that way the climbers ought to be able to wipe out the debt. It is certain also that there are scores of Canadians who, rather than be loaded up with a title, would gladly contribute to avoid this magic wand that others are so eager to be touched by.

* * * *

John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, refused a knighthood. The ranks of the knights would have been vastly elevated had they secured John Ross Robertson as a companion. But John Ross Robertson doesn't require a knighthood or a peerage to give him distinction

amongst his fellow-men. He is already recognized as a great Canadian with a big heart, and seventy odd years of life spent for the good of his fellows.

London Advertiser.

Most Canadians of English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh descent will be able to recall grandfatherly traditions concerning how it happens they are now on the soil of North America rather than in the old country.

The story is almost always the same. Our ancestors came principally from the artisan, middle or farming "classes" of England, Ireland or Scotland. One Canadian will relate with pride that his father came to Canada hoping that some day his children might have a chance to own their own homes, the sire realizing the futility of renting from the landed classes of the old land, with rentals constantly increasing.

The outlook for a class that may be broadly described as "working-men" was not bright for the old countryman fifty years ago.

Another, perhaps now the owner of a big Canadian mill or foundry, may tell how his father was a skillful mechanic, who had been denied his chance to launch a business of his own in the old land. Men who worked in stores, banks or other lines of trade set their faces west and turned their backs upon the land of hereditary values.

They loved their native land none the less. With song and story they carried the history and traditions of each branch of the race down to their sons and daughters. They went as a son goes to make his own way, and their fathers are proud of them. We find men who are two generations from Scotland who call themselves Scotsmen. England and Ireland are proudly perpetuated.

But as each new Canadian family got its feet into the soil and breathed the air of democracy, down to the lisping schoolboy they knew that they were not to be a race of "flunkys." They reasserted, not as rebels, but as a new branch of the family, the decision that brought

Magna Charta. They overthrew the influences of family compacts and petty dynasties. They declared most strongly for men of the people. They bowed the knee to none, but they stood with outstretched arms for all. And as each new immigrant from the shores of the old land reached Canada, he, too, became filled with the knowledge that here "Jack was as good as his master." It's a glorious boast, and it's Christianity!

Is it any wonder, then, that Canadians, taught from infancy in home, school, church and State to detest "flunkeyism" and to spurn "snobbery," should decline to rise up and acclaim with loud rejoicing the latest batch of Canadian barons, etc.?

Ottawa Journal-Press.

"That highly respectable English newspaper, the London Morning Post, declares that British titles of honor are now bought and sold, and each has its stated market value; that the dispenser of honors is the chief whip of the party in power, and that the money paid by the purchases of the titles goes into the party chest as an election fund. If this is true it is not strange that Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour, Lloyd George, and Bonar Law prefer to be plain "misters," and that men like Gladstone and Chamberlain died untitled. There is such a thing as being too big for a title."—Hamilton Herald.

It is probably true that a good many British titles are bestowed upon persons who have subscribed large sums to party funds. There, as here, men and politicians are only human. But men in Britain who arrive at large wealth possess often other claims to public honor than their money. Moreover, while some titles may be "bought and sold," a large majority probably still go to men whose achievements merit recognition although the men themselves have not been large contributors to party funds.

Possession of money is not a crime. Neither is a large subscription to the funds of a party a man thinks best for his country, and a man who

has been able to make a lot of money honestly and who parts with it generously for what he believes to be good public purposes, is likely to be a man who is worth public honor on several counts. So we do not imagine that what may be going on in Britain in regard to titles can contain much that is likely to bring titles into disrepute, although it is quite true that the biggest men over there at present are untitled, and that there is such a thing even there as being "too big for a title."

Title in Britain is all right, as long as the British people think so. It is part of their history and tradition. They are used to it, and even poison doesn't hurt if you work up to it gradually. All we need trouble about in this country is that we shouldn't allow inherited titles to be foisted upon our condition. Inherited "rank" which may be excusable when you can't help it in a hurry is a shoddy stupidity to be inflicted upon a young nation in a new country whose people ought to have the manliness to wish to carry on their community on some other basis than that of society caste.

SIRS COMMON AS SNOWBALLS.

H. F. GADSBY.

Ottawa, Feb. 22.—The long delayed New Year's honor list is out at last. Rumor says that it was delayed because a recalcitrant Montreal editor who handled Tory campaign funds objected to certain names on the list. Be that as it may, the list is now made public and adds one more Cabinet Minister to the increasing number of knights in this fair Canada of ours.

The Borden Government seems to have no fear that titles from overseas will denationalize our public men. Through its recommendations, not only have a large number of otherwise sensible citizens been knighted, but about half the Cabinet has been similarly decorated. To be accurate, seven Cabinet Ministers out of seventeen have been tagged. The Borden Government has been in office five years and a half. It will presently be seeking a year's extension. The idea is that it will take

another year to knight the remaining members of the Cabinet. One can hardly expect knighthood to be in full flower for the Borden Cabinet in less time than that.

Not only has the Borden Government grabbed off titles for half the Cabinet Ministers, but also for four members of Parliament. The motive probably is to give Parliament a social leaven by giving it eleven knights—a social eleven so to speak. But by actual figures it works out somewhat less than that. A social leaven of eleven knights is just about one-twentieth of the House of Commons as it exists to-day. One twentieth is five per cent., which is the current rate of interest on our domestic war loans. The proportion is both touching and significant, if you can look at it in that light. But if you pause to reflect that the proportion of knights in Parliament, if the Borden Government continues to have its way, may soon be ten or even twenty per cent., you may be inclined to ask what this democratic country is coming to.

Let us tell the names over and append thereto the reasons and a comment or two. Sir Robert Borden got it because he was Premier of Canada, but he has long ago outgrown it. Sirs are getting as common as snowballs in this country. They're so common, in fact, that we have stopped calling them "Sir," and simply address them as "You." One can't go out of doors nowadays without tripping over a knight. They're under your feet most of the time. Almost any citizen would sooner have a ton of coal than a knighthood. Sir Robert feels that knighthoods are getting cheap and that is why he aspires to a peerage and a law lordship in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a suitable finish to his career.

As a matter of fact all the big fellows go after peerages nowadays, leaving the knighthoods to judges, provincial premiers, and other toads who are only big officially. Thus Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is now a baron—Lord C. P. R. Baron Shaughnessy is the peer that made Milwaukee famous. It is worth noting that staunch republicans from Mil-

waukee and other cities across the line always take titles when they are offered them, just to show that a real democrat can't be kept down, no matter how you try. The latest honor list also shows Sir Hugh Graham as a baron—Lord Tramways would be an appropriate name. There is also Sir Max Aitken, who may thank his Canadian connection, as I witness that he is now Lord Beaverdam—or some such name as that. What he really ought to be called is Lord Merger. One never thinks of Max Aitken as Lord Beaverdam without thinking of another lord who is generally in his company. I mean Lord Help Us.

This explains why Sir Robert Borden has his eye on a peerage. If he would be first among his equals he has simply got to have it. The spray, so to speak, from the fountain of honor must not rise higher than its source. Sir Robert isn't foolish enough to go on recommending peerages for everybody else, and then forget himself. Mr. J. W. Flavell, chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, who has long been known as the Napoleon Bologna-parte of Canada, is the next on the list for a peerage. It is understood that he will take the style of Lord Bacon, a name which not only symbolizes the greatness of his intellect, but also the primeness of his chief product. Since it has been his custom to order barons of beef about it is not likely that they will ask him to be anything less than a viscount. Precedence must be maintained, even in the cold storage business.

Next to Sir Robert Borden comes Sir George Perley, who is also looking for a peerage, because he intends to spend the remainder of his days in England, where, no matter how much money you have, you must be a lord or a lover of the Lords or you can't go to heaven when you die. Sir George Foster, our genial trade wind, is a knight because he needs it in his business of impressing foreign boards of trade with the advisability of exchanging Canadian snowballs for Australian kangaroos and other bargains of a similar nature. As Sir George is not a rich man and expects to live in Canada

once this Government goes out and he doesn't have to associate with it any more, he is probably content to remain a knight. He probably took the title in self-defence.

Sir Sam Hughes cherishes his knighthood as about the only thing the Borden Government was willing to leave him. They kept all his policies, as he points out, but they fired him. His successor, Sir Albert Edward Kemp—after whom, no doubt, the late King Edward the Seventh was named—also becomes a K.C.B., an honor which he shares with Sir Sam and the great Nelson. Sir Albert Edward has an aide-de-camp to hand him his gloves and overcoat, just as Sir Sam had, and in due time will be made a Lieutenant-General so that Sir Sam won't have anything on him. Sir Thomas White gets his title because he is the best borrower we have had since Confederation. He is the man who put the "tic" in politics. He is a sort of reversed Midas—he lays his hands on the gold standard and it becomes paper. He will probably be a lord before he dies—you can't teach Tom anything—lord knows.

Sir James Lougheed is another Cabinet Minister who is rich enough to be a lord. They will have to make him a lord so that they can make Richard Bedford Bennet a knight. R. B.'s career has been held back by the fact that Sir James, who is senior partner in the law firm of Lougheed, Bennett & Company, beat him to it. The objection was taken out that one law partnership couldn't possibly support two knights. The objection will be overcome by raising Sir James to the peerage as Baron Calgary, and then R. B. will enter into his reward as Sir Richard. He should have had it long ago, if only as the business partner of Sir Max Aitken in an elevator combine which infests the prairie provinces. If R. B. is ever to talk to Lord Beaverbrook on the level then R. B. must be a knight, and it's doubtful if Beaverbrook will talk on the level even at that. As chairman of the National Service Board R. B. has done great work—work for the knight is coming.

There are ten Cabinet Ministers unknighthooded, but the chances are that they will be bagged before the Borden Government goes out, at any rate such as can afford the expense. Among these would be the Hon. Robert Rogers and the Hon. Frank Cochrane, who are rich men, and the Hon. Charles Doherty, who is in receipt of three salaries, \$2,500 as M. P., \$7,000 as Minister of Justice, and \$6,000 as superannuated Quebec judge who was supposed to be too tired to work any longer. The Hon. Mr. Hazen, who is known as Dare Devil Dug from having crossed the ocean three times with Premier Borden, deserves knighthood, and Messrs Sevigny, Blondin and Patenaude should really be given it to take the Nationalist smell off them, but that about completes the list. I doubt if Mr. Burrell could find any use for it on his fruit farm, and as for Tom Crothers, Doc. Reid and Doctor Roche—it would be about as much help to them as a pair of corsets.

The four lucky M. P.'s are Sir James Aikins, who got his for being the goat in the Manitoba election; Sir Herbert Ames, who got his for making such good shoes for the soldiers; Sir Rodolphe Forget, who got his for having such a perfectly lovely railroad as the Quebec and Saguenay to unload on the Government; and Sir Edmund Osler, who got his for being an Osler.

It is rumored that the Government has it in mind to carry the system of premiums and rewards still further and give a knighthood to Billy Maclean, if he will only shut up. It is also their intention to make the Chief Government Whip, William Sora Middleboro, a knight. Mr. Middleboro's polished ivory dome, being completely unthatched, offers a splendid surface for a coat of arms, which will serve as an oriflamme and guiding star for Conservative members when the division bell rings. It would also give him the edge on the Opposition Whip, Fred Pardee, who has frequently declared against knighthood, not only as social arrogance but as a means of turning our public men's thoughts away from Canada where their thoughts ought to be.

**Halton County Reform Association
Congratulates J. Ross Robertson.**

Toronto Daily Star

The following resolution was passed unanimously at a well-attended meeting of the Halton County Reform Association last Friday:

Moved by James Waldbrook; seconded by C. H. Cross: "That the acceptance of the knighthoods and other so-called honors by Canadians is alien to the democratic instinct of our people. It breeds toadyism, snobbery and flunkeyism, and tends to create social and class distinctions which should have no place in Canada.

"We call for a revival of that spirit of democracy which prompted such men as George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie and Edward Blake to decline titles for themselves, they being content to look for reward for public service to the Canadian people alone.

"We congratulate John Ross Robertson upon his refusal to accept knighthood. In taking this course he has rendered a service to his country that we deeply appreciate. We call upon all Canadians to whom titles may be offered hereafter to follow his example."

British Opinion.

Manchester Guardian, in a recent letter from its London correspondent, said under the heading, "The Canadian Peerage": "Canadians here I find are discussing the Canadian peerage in the honors list from a point of view of their own; the last three peerages which have been conferred on Canadians have all gone to Montreal men. This is a fact not altogether pleasing to men who do not come from Montreal. To Toronto people, for instance, the rivalry between Montreal and Toronto is as keen as that between Liverpool and Manchester, or Glasgow and Edinburgh. The Toronto man declares that his city could also produce a self-made millionaire newspaper proprietor equally worthy of honor for his independent patriotic outlook and his philanthropy. It is true, To-

ronto people add that their newspaper millionaire has always refused any honors, and this is some consolation to them."

Halifax Nova Scotian.

The Canadian press is giving Mr. John Ross Robertson, proprietor of The Toronto Telegram, much credit for having recently declined to accept a senatorship and a knighthood. Mr. Robertson is entitled to credit, and his action is wholly praiseworthy, but the precedent was set long ago by a Halifax newspaper man, equally as deserving of public honor and preferment. Mr. C. C. Blackadar, editor and proprietor of the Acadian Recorder, had the distinction, many years ago, of declining a senatorship and the Lieutenant-Governorship of his native province, and we have no doubt that if Mr. Blackadar had any desire to be other than the democrat and good citizen that he has been and is, a knighthood would have been at his disposal. He preferred, however, as Mr. Robertson has chosen, to wear the distinction which comes from long and faithful service as a journalist and an exemplar of good citizenship.

Winnipeg Tribune.

Toronto Globe—While the acceptance of a British title, knighthood or other, for services rendered to the people of Canada is sanctioned by custom as well as by law, it is refreshing to hear, even at long intervals, that it has been declined by someone to whom it had been offered in good faith. J. Ross Robertson's fellow-citizens will think none the less of him, perhaps they will think all the more, because he preferred to be known to and by them without and fictitious distinction purporting to be conferred by the addition of a title to his name. No one of all the individuals in the rapidly lengthening list of Canadian knights was better entitled to any such distinction than he is, but he preferred to be enrolled in the very much shorter list of those who declined the honor, along with such distinguished Canadians as George Brown and Edward Blake.

(Toronto Globe, Feb. 24)

HIFALUTIN HAPPENINGS

BY PETER McARTHUR,

(Copyrighted)

Ekfrid, Feb. 22.—The practice of giving knighthoods as birthday honors has more to justify it than most people suppose. In the old evil days before the passage of the Ontario temperance act even citizens in the humblest walks of life, when they had a birthday, were known to go out and make a knight of it. (Business of dodging bricks.) Now I have a birthday coming in a few days, and I decided to celebrate it according to the best precedents. Having called up Sir Jingo McBore, Sir Philabeg McSporran, Senator Redneck, Mr. Gosh Whatawad, Baldy McSporran, and several other aspirants for honors, I proceeded to distribute my favors according to what I understand is the method at present in vogue. I counted them out as the children count one another out in their games:

"Eenie, meenie, minie, mo,
Catch a nigger by the toe,
If he hollers let him go;
Eenie, meenie, minie, mo.
You are IT."

As might be expected, Sir Jingo McBore won on the first count, and I have decided to create him a baron. It is only just to say that this distinction was due to him, as he was a knight of an earlier creation, and his title was beginning to lose its lustre owing to the deluge of knighthoods that has come upon us during the past few years. Since his elevation to the Peerage he has decided to be known as Lord Prettiepants, Baron of Bunkbank. His title strikes me as a very happy selection, for he will look well in the satin knee-breeches to which he is entitled. His limbs are not of the Chippendale variety, and it is not necessary for him to hang a gate between his knees when he goes to head off a pig. On the contrary, they are excellently preserved examples of the highly carved, early Etruscan leg, with which a court tailor can work wonders. After all, it is qualities of hoof and calf rather than of head or heart that

lend distinction in the circles in which Lord Prettiepants will now move, and his Lordship will certainly be an imposing figure among those present at all future Imperial functions. His heraldic emblem will be a burglar's jenny, rampant on a field, or, with a pair of handcuffs, argent and suggestively open, on a field gules, in the lower right-hand quarter.

Baldy McSporran also ranks among the fortunate, but, as this is his first step on the ladder of titular preferment, I shall try to find him in a yielding moment and confer upon him the order of I. O. U. As he is a farmer, this will be a delicate recognition of the treatment his class has always received—but I am not spending any money on the strength of getting away with this scheme, for Baldy is very canny.

Mr. Gosh Whatawad is also happy over the receipt of a title. In future he will be known in this column as Sir Gosh. For the present he must content himself with a plain Knight Bachelorship, but as he has a bunch of munition contracts he is not without hope of an early preferment. As everybody knows, Sir Gosh is a member of the N. P. Whatawad family, and has a record for getting what he wants—if he manages to get next to the custodian of the party campaign fund just before an election. At the present time there are many who think that he is over-working himself counting up his profits, and think that he should take a long vacation at the celebrated rest cure at Kingston, which is conducted by the Department of Justice.

Out here in the country people seem to lack that veneration for titles which makes them desirable in the cities, and the reason is not far to seek. We have titled personages galore, and our stock registers and herd books make fully as impressive reading as Debrett's Peerage. This leads to a curious letter that I received after publishing the article which you may remember on "Where Knighthood is in Flower." My correspondent says:

"When I was a lad I thought the House of Lords a great spring show of

fancy stock, for all the important animals in my native country bore resounding titles. My boyish notion was that in England the House of Lords was the big building where the aristocrats of the prize-ring were exhibited to the swells who could afford to pay a high price of admission." In this connection I am reminded of a story about the Hon. George Brown. He had a stock farm, and on one occasion startled an eminent visitor by waving a telegram and shouting excitedly, "The Duchess has had a calf." In a country where such things are liable to happen at any time it is hard to take titles seriously. At the present moment Baron Buchlyvie is better and more favorably known to the farmers than Lord Beaverbrook or any of our recent human barons. Really, I am afraid that old-world titles can never be acclimated in Canada. If we are to have titles in this country we might well follow the suggestion of my correspondent and "have a Canadian brand, defined, owned and controlled by ourselves, so as to rid the minds of Canadian boys of the herd-book idea."

For fear you may think that I am lacking in reverence for powers and dignities let me quote a couple of passages from that refreshing collection of essays, "Pebbles on the Shore," by Alpha of the Plough, recently published by J. M. Dent & Sons. You will get a glimpse of how titles are regarded at the seat of Empire, from which we are importing them so recklessly even in this time of sorrow when we should all walk humbly:

"It is not the fact that inferior people get titles that should concern us. It is not even that they get them so often by secret gifts, by impudent touting, by base service. These things are known, and they

are no worse to-day than they have always been. Every honors list makes us gape and smile. If we see a really distinguished name in it we feel surprise and a certain sorrow. What is he doing in that galley?

"But it is the corrupting effect of titles on the national currency that is their real offence. They falsify our ideals. They set up shams in place of realities. They turn our minds from the gold to the guinea stamp, and make us worship false idols of social ambition. Our thinking as a people can't be right when our symbols are wrong. We can't have the root of democracy in our souls if the tree flowers into coronets and giegaws. France has the real jewel of democracy, while we have only the paste. Do not think that this is only a matter touching the surface of our national character. It is a poison in the blood that infects us with the deadly sins of servility and snobbery. And already it is permeating even the free life of the colonies. If I were an Australian or a Canadian I would fight this hateful taint of the old world with all my might. I would make it a criminal offence for a colonial to accept a title. As for us, I know only one remedy. It is to make a title a money transaction. Let us have a tariff for titles. If American millionaires, like Lord Astor, want them, let them pay for them at a market rate. It would be at least a more wholesome method than the present system. And it would bring the whole imposture into contempt. Nobody would have a title when everybody knew what he had paid for it. It is a poor method of getting rid of the abomination compared with the French way, but then we are some centuries behind the French people in these things."