

was made giving precedence to the debate on the address. The debate continued on the next day when the address was passed.

There was no motion formally to continue the debate.

The motion giving precedence to the debate on the address was passed on the 12th of March, 1931, but on April 1, before the debate on the address was concluded, the house voted interim supply for the past fiscal year and went to the senate for royal assent. An amendment to the address was moved by Mr. Gardiner on April 20. It was negatived on the next day when the address was carried.

That was from March 12 to April 20.

In the session of 1932, Mr. Bennett moved, as shown by the journals under date of the 4th of February, that the speech be taken into consideration on the following Monday. On that Monday, before the debate on the address was resumed, Mr. Guthrie, Minister of Justice, moved that a select committee be appointed to inquire into certain charges made by the Hon. G. N. Gordon against Mr. Bennett. A debate took place and the motion was agreed to on that day. Debate on the address was then resumed and concluded on the next day, February 9, when the address was passed.

In the session of 1932-33, Mr. Bennett moved, on October 6, that the address be taken into consideration on the following Monday. Similar motions were made in the sessions of 1934, January 25, and of 1935, January 17.

It will be seen by these precedents that it is not necessary to move that the address be given precedence, but a day may be fixed for it to be considered later in the session. There is no standing order regulating the procedure to be followed with respect to the days on which the address is to be debated.

I might also quote Anson's Law and Custom of the Constitution, part I, Parliament, which at page 74 says:

The speech from the throne setting forth the causes of summons may be necessary to put in motion the business of both houses, but the addresses in answer are non-essential forms: for parliament is not limited in legislation or discussion by the topics set forth from the throne.

I believe that is sufficient to show that there is no departure being made at the present time but that we are simply giving precedence to the business for which this particular parliament has been called.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated that this house has been called to give particular attention to two pieces of business, and with that statement as a general thing we are all in agreement. But I would point out to him that except in one of the cases to which he has referred, namely, a motion for interim supply in the session of 1931, which was made immediately after the ending of the fiscal year, no supply has ever been granted

until this house has first voted confidence in the government by way of passing the address. In that I think the Prime Minister will agree with me. On the occasion to which he referred I recall that the fiscal year had expired and unless interim supply was voted immediately there was great danger to the public service. I presume, though I have not looked up the record, that that was done by consent. I do suggest to the Prime Minister that before this house votes any money to be spent by this government there must be an expression of confidence in the government itself, especially having regard to the history of recent events. This government has not won a by-election—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hesitate to interrupt my hon. friend, but may I say to him as an old parliamentarian that he knows that this motion is not debatable. I would ask Your Honour to see that the rules of this house are strictly observed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If we are to be chloroformed, let us understand that, and I will bow to the rules of the house. But I do protest that the Prime Minister should not be allowed to speak twice on his motions and the rest of us not at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I submit that my hon. friend is not in order, and no one knows it better than himself.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You have done things that were not in order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Crerar:

That on Wednesday the 21st of March, 1945, and all subsequent Wednesdays until the end of the present session, the sittings shall in every respect be under the same rules as provided for other days.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is already a motion before the house that government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question, through you, with the indulgence of the house. Does the carrying of that motion preclude the doing of any other business or the asking of questions on the orders of the day? That is a very special resolution. Is it the intention to shut off any discussion and that sort of thing on the orders of the day? If it is, we protest.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend seems more anxious to protest than to get information. He knows very well that the government will not refuse to answer questions on the orders of the day.