

flicts with the information given here. The answer also says that at Three Rivers there was none, but I have information there was a guard at Three Rivers. The answer says that at Montreal there was none and I am not going to dispute that. Then the question was put:

On what state occasions or other occasions, if any, is it proper for the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, or Senate, to wear his official robes or apparel outside the precincts of parliament during the recess or when parliament is prorogued?

On all such occasions when he attends any function or gathering in that capacity should he not be accompanied by the Sergeant-at-Arms with the mace?

That was answered as follows:

The government is not aware of any precedents in the matter referred to; although there may have been occasions when speakers of Canadian legislatures have attended such celebrations.

Well, I was not aware that there ever was such a celebration in Canada before. Then the answer continues:

On such occasions it is customary in the province of Quebec for judges of the higher courts to appear in their official costumes, and His Honour the Speaker holding rank as a magistrate—

Not as the Speaker of the House of Commons, but as a magistrate, and I ask myself the question: If he were going on the bench to try a case would he appear there in his official robes as the Speaker of the Commons.

—informs the government that on the occasion above referred to he appeared similarly attired as a mark of respect for the solemnity of the occasion.

Well, that is rather a peculiar answer if it is not somewhat amusing. Then, I asked a question with regard to the administrator of the government, and the answer is that Mr. Justice Girouard was not acting in August as the Governor General was here during all the month of August and attended to his duties, but afterwards the answer says that Justice Girouard was appointed in August. Then it says that Mr. Justice Girouard was applied to for information, but he failed to give it. It does seem to me that when the government is asked to give information on a public question they should surely have sufficient authority to enable them to make any official give an official answer. I am speaking on this matter with a little restraint on account of the lamented demise of Mr. Justice Girouard, and I only refer to it because I am obliged to do so in connection with these other matters. I think the least that could be ex-

pected is a courteous reply, but that is not deemed to be given to the House. It may be in the estimation of the person who gave the reply that it was only some insignificant private member who asked the question, and therefore any answer would do, but in my judgment a member of parliament is a member of parliament, and as such is entitled to the courtesy of a proper reply to any proper questions that are put by him. Then, the following question was put the other day by my hon. friend from Dufferin:

1. Did the federal government tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli in Montreal during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September last?

2. If so under whose supervision or orders, acting for the government, was it carried out?

3. What members of the federal government attended?

4. How many invitations were issued?

5. What government officials besides the cabinet ministers attended?

6. Did such government officials including the Speaker of the House of Commons, attend clothed in their official robes of office?

7. How much did it cost the country, under whose authority and out of what item of the Supply Bill or estimates was it paid?

The simple answer given to that question by the First Minister is:

The federal government did not tender a reception to Cardinal Vannutelli during his attendance at the Eucharistic Congress in September?

But, I have in my hand the narrative of that gathering in Montreal published by the parties themselves, and it states:

Reception of the Dominion government. Unusual, not in magnitude, perhaps, but by reason of the cosmopolitan character of the guests was the reception given at night at the Windsor by the Hon. Charles Murphy, Secretary of State, acting for the federal government.

It says:

The gathering was large but the composition of it was its striking feature.

And it gives a full account of the reception. The question now is which is right, and which is wrong. I do not say that the answer given by the First Minister is wrong, but one or the other is wrong. Of course, the denial that there was any state reception given covered all the other questions. I draw attention to these answers because they appeal to me as not being proper, or at least not such as give the whole information. They may be absolutely correct so far as I know, but they are certainly not in accord with the information given to me by reliable sources.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have already spoken on this matter, but the House will,