

sentative of His Majesty. If hon. gentlemen consider the rules as laid down in May they will find that I was wholly within the rules in making the statement of fact which I did make in this connection.

Mr. MANION: I do not wish to carry the controversy further; the remarks of my right hon. friend and myself will speak for themselves. So long as the Prime Minister simply gave it as the opinion of the government that these repairs should be made for the proper convenience of His Excellency I think he was absolutely on solid ground, but the moment he began quoting a conversation between His Excellency and himself he was quoting the opinions of the representative of the sovereign to influence a vote of this house.

Mr. KAISER: Why was the conversation delayed so long?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GARDINER: I have always held a very high regard for the Prime Minister's knowledge of constitutional procedure, but I would remind him of some things which happened in 1926. He will remember that memorable occasion when he resigned his position because the governor general of the day did not accept his advice, and following that resignation this country got into more or less of a squabble over the question of constitutional procedure. On many occasions the Prime Minister stated that it was the duty of the government to advise the representative of the king, but to-night it has been contended that the Prime Minister has been advised by the representative of the king.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all.

Mr. GARDINER: Under these circumstances I submit that it is very improper for the Prime Minister to use a conversation which took place between His Excellency and himself for the purpose of influencing this vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that he has drawn an entirely erroneous impression from my remarks, as I think he will see when he reads them over carefully. There is a very great difference between the representative of the crown expressing a wish which he regards as important in relation to his own office as the representative of the sovereign in this country and that wish being communicated as a statement of fact to the house, and whether or not, for the purpose of making certain quarters suitable for the governor general to occupy, a particular vote shall be passed by this house. With respect to the latter, the govern-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

ment take the whole responsibility; His Excellency never advised that quarters should be provided at Quebec but merely expressed the wish that during part of the year he might reside there. The government have to take the responsibility as to whether or not it is desirable that that wish shall be complied with, and what provision may accordingly be necessary. Quite apart from any wish having been expressed, even if such had not been the case, I would have felt it desirable that these quarters should be provided as formerly and that the ancient custom should be continued.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The interesting feature of this item which we are discussing and of the debate which has taken place is that hon. gentlemen opposite stand revealed as the upholders of tradition and precedent, and the Prime Minister's words to-night are in striking contrast to the speeches he makes throughout the country, particularly in western Canada. This is a new country; we have very heavy liabilities, and it seems absurd that we should spend about \$250,000 for the purpose of providing a seasonal residence for His Excellency. Let me just compare this amount with some other votes which are found in the estimates. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 60 they will find the following:

Grant to the Canadian Council on Child Welfare, \$5,000.

Grant to the Canadian Dental Hygiene Council, \$5,000.

Grant to the Canadian Social Hygiene Council, \$10,000.

Grant to the Canadian Tuberculosis Association, \$25,000.

I am sure that when the people who are spending a great deal of effort and time in these different organizations, doing a great deal in the public interest, compare this item with the meagre sums they receive by way of assistance in their work, they will not look upon this vote with any great favour. I am sure the house was not very much impressed by the camouflage, if I may call it such, of the Solicitor General when he attempted to bring in the racial issue in connection with this vote.

Mr. CANNON: I rise to a point of order. If the statement that I made use of camouflage had been made by any other hon. gentleman than the hon. member for Mackenzie I would insist upon my point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was just going to say, when I was interrupted, that I had too high an opinion of the good sense of the French-speaking people of Canada to believe that