

ing as number six in this preliminary order paper handed to me by the officers of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish-Guysborough): That is entirely different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the government had any other order of business they should have notified the officers of the House. Apparently the government has deceived the officers of the House as well as the House itself. That order of business—and it comes immediately after the report of His Excellency's speech—is in these words:

The leader of the House moves that the Speech be considered on a certain day, and that the debate thereon have precedence.

So the government need not have had any apprehension that they would hang long between heaven and earth without having their position challenged in this House.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) who assumes the right to lead the House at this time. He asked: How could notice have been given? I wish to bring to the attention of Your Honour, before you give your ruling on the point of order, how in my estimation such notice could have been given. Rule 40 provides:

Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address,

And so on. This morning I received in my mail box in the usual way a copy of number one of the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of Canada, dated Thursday, January 7, 1926. This document, which is the official record of the House, and upon which such notice should appear, as hon. members who have not had the privilege of sitting in this House before will learn during the coming weeks,—this document sets forth accurately what occurred yesterday; gives a list of the members returned to serve in this parliament, which is also quite in order; gives a statement by the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General and some statements by the chief electoral officer, and gives also the statement by Your Honour which was read yesterday.

Now, before adjournment yesterday—which was moved in the ordinary way—there was ample time for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lapointe) to have notified the House that to-day he intended to make a given motion. My hon. friend tries to be sarcastic, but he is well acquainted with the amenities of parliament, the little courtesies which from time to time are observed. But this is not only a

lack of courtesy on his part, it is a violation of a rule of the House. He could have handed his motion to the officers of the House yesterday after Mr. Speaker took the chair and before he moved the adjournment. Then his notice of motion would have appeared in the Votes and Proceedings and would have been in order for debate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not to-day.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend says "Not to-day". By that interjection he uncovers to us the reason why he did not give the notice yesterday. What is the reason? He could not have made this motion to-day. That is the reason. My hon. friend says in effect: I will defy the rules of the House, I will wholly disregard them, and I will introduce this motion to-morrow and so "put one over" the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to fortify my argument by reference to a statement made in the public press—a statement which came from the lips of William Lyon Mackenzie King, the gentleman who still claims to be Prime Minister of this country, but who constitutionally is not Prime Minister. That gentleman, not a member of this parliament, states in this morning's press:

Once the Speech from the Throne is delivered, the government proposes to exercise its normal powers unless it should be challenged immediately by the opposition.

I pause to say that we have no objection to the group of hon. gentlemen opposite assuming the right to lead this House as a government, to attempt to carry on, but, as my right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) says, we will challenge them on the first opportunity. But they take another course.

If the government should be so challenged, its future will depend on whether or not it can obtain a majority in the House of Commons.

Premier Mackenzie King said last night that he did not regard the election of the Speaker as a vote of confidence in the government. The choice of a Speaker was a function of parliament, and the selection did not necessarily imply that the government had the approval of the Commons.

On the other hand, he made it clear that the government proposes to resume its full powers after the Throne Speech is delivered. The delivery of the Speech implied such a resumption of power, he said. . . .

I want you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House to notice that.

The delivery of the Speech implied such a resumption of power, he said. It was the right of the opposition to question the position of the government should it so desire, but failing this the government functioned in a normal manner.

Since the election the government has refrained from exercising the power of appointment, and consequently a number of vacancies are unfilled. The above statement indicates, however, that unless challenged im-