

*Coronation Oath*

Question: Is Bill No. 9, entitled An Act to Ensure the Publication of Accurate News and Information, *intra vires*?

Answer: No.

Question: Is power of reservation a still subsisting power?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Is power, if subsisting, subject to any restrictions, and, if so, what is the nature of restrictions?

Answer: No.

The court stated that the only restrictions on disallowance or reservation were the statutory restrictions contained in the British North America Act, and the limitations on the power of the lieutenant-governor contained in his instructions.

The opinion on every one of the references is unanimous.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice, in view of the great interest taken throughout the country in the decisions handed down, if the text will be printed for distribution?

Mr. BENNETT: Print them in the votes and proceedings.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes, that might be done. Of course it is a pretty bulky document, but if the house would agree it might be printed in the votes and proceedings, for the convenience of hon. members.

## CORONATION OATH

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF MR. CAHAN RESPONDING ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON FEBRUARY 28

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the house on Monday last when the Prime Minister replied formally to a question I had asked with regard to the coronation oath. His reply has been interpreted by some members of the house, and some people outside the house, as raising a question of personal veracity between the Prime Minister and myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, no.

Mr. CAHAN: I did not think that any such issue was raised.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly not.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. CAHAN: But, as a personal explanation, I should like to say that in asking the question I was quite familiar with the statutory changes in the coronation oath since first prescribed by the Coronation Oath Act. I was familiar with the fact that originally the kingdom was referred to as the Kingdom of England, that upon the union in 1706 of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland the name prescribed by the statute was the Kingdom of Great Britain, and that by the act of 1800, providing for the union of Great Britain and Ireland, the name prescribed was the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Since then there has been another change in that designation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, which, since the organization of the Irish Free State as a dominion, has been known as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

But when referring to changes in the coronation oath, as administered on May 12, 1937, I was not referring to any such statutory changes, because former changes in the name to that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were not, I conceived, changes in the terms of the oath. Those were statutory changes in the name of what was originally known, when the oath was prescribed by enactment, as the Kingdom of England. I was referring to other terms. I do not wish to raise any further question at the present time which would lead to any discussion, but I wish simply to say that in asking my question I was not considering statutory changes. I had in mind certain alterations which I did not conceive to be statutory alterations, and with this statement I am quite content. I was sure from the beginning that no question of personal veracity had been raised by the Prime Minister's reply.

I also notice that newspapers from the Atlantic to the Pacific allege that I, in my capacity as a member of the house, was deemed by the Prime Minister to be guilty of gross impropriety in asking another question. I infer that his reply referred to the form of my question, and not to any real impropriety in the question which I asked.

I have nothing further to say except that in reading the reply I did not believe that the Prime Minister was making any imputation with respect to my personality as a member of the house.