

*Government's Right to Office*

mediately the government will go ahead and make such appointments as it considers necessary.

Mr. CANNON: What paper is my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. STEVENS: It is in all the papers.

Mr. CANNON: What is the name of the particular paper he quotes from?

Mr. STEVENS: I am quoting from the *Ottawa Citizen*.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Your paper.

Mr. CANNON: I understood my hon. friend to say that it was a statement of the Prime Minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So it is.

Mr. STEVENS: I was about to say when I commenced reading this statement that it comes from the lips of Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie King.

Mr. PARENT: How do you know?

Mr. STEVENS: I know it, and it is a statement just as direct from his lips as if it had been delivered in this House. It is an indication from him that he intends to seize upon the opportunity of making appointments just as soon as the Speech from the Throne is delivered.

Mr. Speaker, the point before us is this: Shall this parliament have a reasonable and constitutional opportunity of determining whether or not this group of individuals who have usurped the power of government are properly and constitutionally a government? I repeat, Sir, in support of my hon. leader that this motion is not only out of order but is an affront to parliament, and it is out of order because the hon. gentleman did have an opportunity of giving notice of it. It should have appeared on the Votes and Proceedings, and then would have been in order for debate and discussion when the necessary time required for notice had elapsed. That, I contend, would have been on Monday next. I support the point raised by my right hon. leader that this motion is distinctly out of order and not debatable to-day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my right hon. friend has spoken two or three times, perhaps I may be allowed to say another word.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand why we should have such a display of temper.

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend had been able to see the look in his own eyes a few minutes ago he would know where the temper was.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have moved that in view of the situation resulting from the recent general election the government was justified in retaining office and summoning parliament, and is justified in carrying on unless and until it is defeated by a vote of this House. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has read the amendment which he intended to move, an amendment which is purely and simply a negative of the motion I have submitted to the House. We say that we were justified in retaining office and summoning parliament, and in asking for the decision of this parliament as to who should be its executive. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that we were not justified. The arguments he gives are arguments which will be adduced by him to oppose our motion, but why that difficulty now? Apparently my friends opposite want the same question submitted to the House, so why should they object to our submitting it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Debate the point of order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend was not debating the point of order when he read his amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had the case complete.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is all very well to give lectures on procedure, but there is also such a thing as courtesy in debate and discussion.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, you know how these things are prepared. You know that the government is not responsible for the list which has been supplied to my right hon. friend as well as to me. We certainly are not bound to follow any order of procedure which is put in our hands by any officer of the House.

So far as my hon. friend the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is concerned, I admit that if it had been possible to give two days' notice of this motion, possibly we should have done it, but as I said before, that was an impossibility if we were to have this motion before us to-day. The motion presents the very issue that parliament is called upon to decide at the present time, and my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who contends that notice was required of the motion, knows very well that no notice is given of the motion to introduce a bill respecting the administration of oaths of office. There is a tradition that parliament has the right to take up a matter of public importance before dealing with the Address, and that is what we are doing now.