

that if this great heirloom in Quebec is modernized it ceases there and then to be a link with the past. I view this vote as an act of extravagance on the part of the government, and I must say I cannot support it. We have been told of the great prosperity in this country; that fact has been impressed upon us ever since we have come to Ottawa this session. It seems to me that we have simply run mad in our expenditures this year. For the concentration of wealth and industry and acts of extravagance I do not think there has been any parliament since confederation that has indulged itself as this one has done. A vote of \$10,000,000 for one city in one year is rather too much. The other day we were called upon to support a vote to beautify this city in the interests of national culture. I hesitated to get up to oppose this vote, being afraid that I might be deemed to show a want of culture. Let me say that to me culture does not consist in lavish extravagance. I can remember out west not so many years ago when some of the churches were built of sod, and in one particular case the old superintendent, who was one of the greatest of the nation builders of Canada, insisted on a Gothic window even in that church, because he said it made it look like a church. And the settlers were only too glad to have it so. There was more evidence of culture there than there is in any lavish expenditure of this kind for beautifying a city on so large a scale. If it is to cost so many millions to maintain this old heirloom at Quebec, I think we had better let it go right here and now. I think I can see the end pretty well, placing burdens as we are on the taxpayers of this country. I can see the exit of the old settler from western Canada, the settler who wants to live and not merely to exist. He will have to say goodbye to his home, which will be taken over by the sheepskin coated peasant of central Europe, whom we are so frantically seeking now to take the place of the farmer in the west. I say again I am opposed to this vote. I do not see that we have suffered at all in prestige either in the British Empire or anywhere else through any lack of a residence at this old place during the last twelve years. Ottawa is our capital now, and I think that is quite enough to maintain as it is. I am strenuously opposed to this vote.

Mr. MANION: In view of the debate that took place a moment ago regarding the use of the governor general's name, I desire to

put on record what May has to say, at page 320 of the thirteenth edition:

The irregular use of the king's name to influence a decision of the house is unconstitutional in principle and inconsistent with the independence of parliament. Where the crown has a distinct interest in a measure, there is an authorized mode of communicating His Majesty's recommendation or consent, through one of his ministers (see page 598): but His Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion, apart from that of his responsible advisers; and any attempt to use his name in debate to influence the judgment of parliament, would be immediately checked and censured. On the 12th November, 1640, it was moved that some course might be taken for preventing the inconvenience of His Majesty being informed of anything that is in agitation in the house before it is determined; and on the 16th December, 1641, the Lords and Commons tendered to Charles I a remonstrance to that effect. On the 17th December, 1783, the Commons resolved—

"That it is now necessary to declare, that to report any opinion or pretended opinion of His Majesty, upon any bill or other proceeding depending in either house of parliament, with a view to influence the votes of the members, is a high crime and misdemeanour, derogatory to the honour of the crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of parliament, and subversive of the constitution of this country."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the committee will permit me to continue where my hon. friend left off. Following exactly from where my hon. friend quoted, May has the following to say:

On the 26th February, 1808, in the debate on Mr. Canning's motion for papers relating to Denmark, Mr. Tierney said, "The right hon. gentleman had forfeited the good opinion of the country, the house, and, as I believe, of his sovereign". This the Speaker held to be such an introduction into debate of the personal opinion of the sovereign, respecting the conduct of a member of the house, as justified Mr. Tierney's being called to order. On the 19th March, 1812, complaints were made in the House of Lords of the use of the Prince Regent's name in debate.

Then May continues:

The rule, however, must not be construed so as to exclude a statement of facts by a minister in which the sovereign's name may be concerned.

I contend that the statement I made to the house was a statement of fact to the effect that the representative of the crown desired to reside in Quebec part of the year in accordance with the custom of his predecessors. That is the reference and the extent to which in this connection I brought in the name of the representative of the crown. From that point on, with respect to this vote, I made no reference whatever to His Excellency; I only spoke of what the government is seeking to do, that is, to make the quarters at Quebec suitable for the repre-