

Of course, in this matter, there could be no other aspect worth while presenting to a lawyer.

The consensus of opinion is that constitutionally the Liberal party has unquestionably the right to continue to govern if it can get a majority in the House behind it.

That is what the Montreal Standard says, that the consensus of opinion is that constitutionally the Liberal party has unquestionably the right to continue to govern if it can get a majority in the House behind it. That is the consensus of opinion of the eminent lawyers in Canada and Great Britain who were consulted on this question and with all due deference I put it to my hon. friend from Mount Royal whether the opinions of these gentlemen should not be given consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who are they?

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish-Guysborough): If my hon. friend inquires from the paper he will know. He knows the gentleman who owns this paper very much better than I do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has the paper there. Surely he will tell us who these authorities are.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish-Guysborough): It does not state them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish-Guysborough): Does my right hon. friend mean to say he has no regard for the opinion of a paper of the standing of the Montreal Standard, especially when he has regard to who its proprietors are? I do not know whether they supported Patenaude or Meighen in the last election, but they are always for the Tory party anyway.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will the hon. member tell us whether the journal he is now quoting is the journal that is discredited by the Montreal Herald in the circular I, in common with others, no doubt, got today?

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish-Guysborough): I do not intend to follow the windings of the minds of my two journalistic friends who sit over there. I quote further from the Montreal Standard:

The debate on the question should be conducted with due regard for the importance of the crisis in a manner deliberate and unimpassioned.

The victory in such a case not infrequently goes to those who do not lose their heads.

The leader of the opposition lost ground when he displayed irritation. It is invariably the case in al-

most any contentious argument that to him who knows best how to govern his temper goes a decided advantage.

The debate yesterday might have been intended as an attempt at instructing the Governor.

If it was so intended, it was a waste of time and energy.

The Governor General knows full well what are the rights of the parties, and what are the duties of a governor.

That statement, I submit, cannot be disregarded when we are considering the question of the proper constitutional practice in the present situation. If the amendment of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition were adopted, we would be putting on record in this country and incorporating as part of our parliamentary procedure a practice which does not exist in England, and one that would be a most pernicious one.

Let me recall an instance which comes to my mind of a case where a minister of the crown remained as minister although he did not have a seat in the House. In December, 1845, the great Gladstone became Colonial Secretary in the government of Sir Robert Peel. He again stood for election after his appointment, and was defeated, but still he remained in the government as Secretary for the Colonies until June, 1846, when the government retired. The matter was mentioned and discussed in the English House of Commons, but no hysterical declarations were made such as we have heard here as to the constitution being torn to pieces, because they were simply following the ordinary practice. Then again, in the Lloyd George government, Mr. Montagu ran for election as a member of that government, and was defeated, but he remained in office for almost six months, when he ran again, and was defeated a second time. It was not until after his second defeat that he gave up his portfolio. These are illustrations of the practice which obtains in the Mother Country.

Now what does my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition contend? Where are his precedents in the face of the precedents given by my colleague the Minister of Justice and myself? Let us look at his amusing suggestion. He apparently suggests to the House and the country that we should have retired and the Prime Minister should have suggested that my right hon. friend be sent for. What are the facts? There was a great and well-known dividing line between the party of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and all the other parties running in the last election. This is a sample of the platform which my right hon. friend laid down. Speaking in Vancouver, my right hon.