There was no statute; there was no law which required that this be done; but there was the concept in the Roman conscience that it was the proper thing to do.

Then, after reciting one or two sad instances in the history of this half of the North American continent when there were certain unfortunate developments regarding the language question, the Prime Minister concluded his statement with these words:

If it is fair; if it is just; if it is proper according to the standards of human decency, it will be done; if it is unfair; if it is unjust; if it is improper, all members of this house will say, "It is not our manner to do such things."

The Prime Minister has it in his power to put this motion and if you, sir, do, as I feel you should, rule it out of order, he has the power to challenge that ruling, marshall a majority and win a verdict in favour of this improper motion. He can do it; he has the power; he has the majority behind him, out of whose souls all Liberalism seems to have gone. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, despite the obvious fact that this is a clear violation of standing order 33; that it is based on a bad precedent which Mr. King criticized and abhorred, nevertheless, he can do it; he has the power and the majority. But I did not think it was his manner to do such a thing.

The hon. member for Kamloops has already referred to the clear-cut statement that was made by Mr. Meighen in 1913 when the Conservatives were putting the closure rule on the books of this House of Commons. I will not take the time to read the particular passages he read, but I will read another one, which is in column 7537 of *Hansard* of April 10, 1913. It is admitted that Mr. Meighen had something to do with the drafting of the closure rule. After the explanation that he had given had been questioned by some of the Liberals who did not quite understand it, Mr. Meighen sought again to explain it. This is what he said:

Mr. Meighen: Yes. Nothing more, however, is done at that time and they pass to clause 3. That is the next thing to do, without a doubt. Clause 3 then becomes the subject of discussion in the committee. Clause 3 is under consideration and the committee discusses it also for a time, and the government takes the responsibility for the length of that time.

Then, Mr. Meighen goes on and moves in his explanation from clause 3 to clauses 4 and 5, and so on, and sums it all up in these words:

A debate has taken place successively on each clause and then when we have got all through the bill and all has been debated clause by clause, the government, or a member of the government, may give notice that he will move on a certain day that these clauses, all of them, be the first business of that committee and be not further postponed, and then all the clauses must be taken up on that last day and concluded by two o'clock. I think that is absolutely clear.

The only change, of course, is that now "two o'clock" would have to read "one o'clock". Mr. Meighen, who is credited with being one of the draftsmen of the closure rule, made it crystal clear that the only time you can move a motion such as the Prime Minister sought improperly to move today is after all of the clauses successively, one by one, each and all of them, have been discussed. I am sure the Prime Minister has read this, as I have read it. I am sure he understands it just as I understand it, but I confess again that I am shocked that he flies in the face of it, as he has done today.

The hon. member for Kamloops has indicated that there is the one terribly bad precedent that Mr. Bennett perpetrated against this house in 1932; but there are three precedents the other way. There was one in 1913 and two in 1917. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in at least two of these cases the issue was far more contentious in parliament than is even the issue that is before us at the present time. Remember that on each of those occasions it was the Conservatives who were in power, and the Liberals like to think that the Conservatives were a little dictatorial, a little high-handed. But I ask the Prime Minister to go back and do some more homework on those precedents and admit to us, as he should, that on both of those occasions the House of Commons painfully, laboriously, at the risk of taking a great deal of time, went through and considered every clause in those bills before the government of the day sought to move closure. In fact, on one occasion there was even a discussion of a couple of paragraphs on the title so that the rule would be met completely.

In the case of the naval aid bill in 1913—hon. members can find this in volume V—after considerable discussion clause 1 was carried. Clause 2 was discussed for a considerable time and then was postponed, as recorded in column 9276. Clause 3 was moved in that column and postponed in column 9339. Clause 4 was moved on that page and not postponed until column 9348. I could go on right down to clause 6. It was only after all of the clauses had had some discussion in the committee—I am not confusing the issue by pointing out the kind of so-called discussion we had on clauses 1, 2 or 3; I am letting that go because the issue about clauses 5, 6 and 7 is so much more important, and I am sure the chairman realizes that—it was only after there had been consideration and discussion recorded in *Hansard* and motions carried under protest and by votes and divisions, and so on, that the government of the day sought to move closure.