

and responsibilities? I suppose in due time we will know what he said in respect to that matter, but I would like if to-night or at some convenient time he would give us a definite statement in this respect. I know the conference did not deal with the question of empire defence. They simply remitted it and left it where it was before. They took a lot of time discussing moving picture films and double taxation,—very important matters in themselves—but when it came to the great and important question of empire defence, they merely remit the matter back to where it was in the conference of 1923, and the conference of 1923 merely provided for an exchange of offices as between the Dominions and Great Britain and the establishment of an imperial college for the military training of officers in London. What about the burdens? What about the responsibilities? Did our ministers offer to undertake any? Are we willing to undertake any? Was our case in this respect properly put before the imperial authorities? These are matters distinctly within our control.

Another matter I would like information upon, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the change in status of His Excellency the Governor General. Under the British North America Act, section 10, our Governor General represents the queen. By the Interpretation act those words to-day mean the king. Now under the provisions of this report His Excellency the Governor General shall in future represent the crown. This report I understand was drawn by very expert draftsmen. No doubt there is a good reason for the selection of every word that appears in it. I should like my right hon. friend to tell me whether there is anything significant in the wording here. Constitutional writers attach different meanings to the words "king" and "crown". Looking at the publication known as *The Round Table* for this month I see a writer in that magazine says the crown means in this case the Canadian Prime Minister. Would the Governor General as representing the crown be subject to the will of the Canadian Prime Minister? I do not refer particularly to the present time but to the future, for all time—whom does he represent? What is the meaning of the word "crown"? Why was it used instead of the word "king"? If there was no reason for the change, if my hon. friend will assure the House that the words are synonymous, I have no further questions to ask in regard to that point.

In regard to the appointment of the Governor General, I have always understood—perhaps I am wrong—that in no case was the

Governor General appointed to the Dominion of Canada without consultation with the government of Canada, and that in all cases the government of Canada expressed its acquiescence before the appointment was made. I have also heard that in some instances names have been submitted by the government of Canada and have been acceded to by the government of Great Britain. Is there any change contemplated in the future? In the future will the Governor General be nominated upon the recommendation of the Canadian Prime Minister, or will he not? I should like to know what is in contemplation in that regard, as I cannot find it in the report. Would the Canadian Prime Minister be entitled to nominate a Canadian to the position of governor general? The report affirms that we have a right to do everything in respect to our own domestic and external affairs. Does it go so far as to give us the right to nominate a Canadian as governor general? There is nothing in the report to give us any definite information on the subject one way or the other.

There are a great many other matters upon which I should like some light before I come to any definite conclusion in regard to them. But this I am going to say, that the course pursued by my right hon. friend during the months of July, August, and September last gave the people of Great Britain an entirely false idea of the actual situation in this Dominion. My right hon. friend in July, August, and September last paraded this country from platform to platform raising grave constitutional questions, indulging in a great deal of vain constitutional babbling, making covert threats that if certain things were not done certain other things might happen.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend tell us what one of those threats was?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That we were being ruled by Downing street.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I never made such a statement. I challenge my hon. friend to find a statement of that kind anywhere. I made the very opposite statement.

An hon. MEMBER: Take it back.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my right hon. friend says he did not—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I say positively I did not, and I challenge my hon. friend to produce any such statement from any paper.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I heard him make in this House during the closing days of last session