

An hon. MEMBER: Forever.

Mr. CAHAN: I do not know if it is ever to return to the Liberal party, but if it should I should be only too glad to see my right hon. friend as the leader of that party and acting again as the Prime Minister of this country. However, I do not think that the hair-splitting controversies into which the right hon. gentleman has entered during the past three weeks will ever restore to him the confidence of this country.

Parliament must assume and exercise its rights, and by closure we are simply exercising by a majority vote in this house, which must always prevail, the constitutional right of a majority in this country and in parliament to express its will in the legislative enactments of parliament. The mother of parliaments has exercised time and time again the right which is being exercised in respect of this bill. We are not proceeding one step beyond the constitutional procedure which has found expression in imperial enactments. We have not set aside one single precedent or tradition which the right hon. gentleman assumes to revere so highly. We have by the constitutional right of closure prevented the right hon. gentleman, who, by physical force, by loud speaking, by the opprobrious and brutal epithets which he has hurled across the the floor of this house—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I respect the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) very much as a gentleman, so I ask him what are the opprobrious and brutal epithets, and whether those are terms he has a right to use? My hon. friend is speaking a little hastily.

Mr. BENNETT: The Hansard of this afternoon alone is full of them.

Mr. CAHAN: My right hon. friend perhaps does not realize the epithets he used.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask whether or not that is a proper term to be used by any hon. member, and whether my hon. friend should not retract the words he has used.

Mr. CAHAN: My hon. friend asked the question first. He used the word "dictator."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "Dictator" is a perfectly proper word to use.

Mr. CAHAN: It is an entirely opprobrious and brutal epithet to apply to the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask whether the words "opprobrious" and "brutal" should not be withdrawn by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the words "brutal" and "opprobrious" are not parliamentary, but the leader of the opposition asked the Secretary of State to name those opprobrious and brutal epithets, or the epithets which he considered to be so, and the Secretary of State has done that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The word to which he has referred is "dictator." Does your honour regard the word "dictator" as opprobrious and brutal?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand the Secretary of State to have finished his enumeration of the epithets.

Mr. CAHAN: I would not be disrespectful in any way to the right hon. gentleman. I applied the word "brutal" to an epithet and not to himself. I have no intention of being disrespectful, because I respect the right hon. gentleman as a former prime minister of Canada, one who has occupied the highest position which his fellow countrymen and parliament can confer upon him. But some consideration must be allowed to those of us who have sat here during the last three weeks and heard epithet after epithet hurled against us by the right hon. gentleman and those with whom he is associated. He has been the leader in doing this, and I tell him that the words which he has used and applied to the leader of the government, the words which he has used and applied to the colleagues in the cabinet of the Prime Minister, are unworthy of one who has occupied the high office of prime minister of Canada. If he wishes at some future date to ensure that respect for the dignity of that high office which he always desired when he held it, and which was happily given to him by those who then sat on that side of the house; if he ever wishes to resume that position of high dignity in the commons of the country, he ought to cease to use such language as he has used this afternoon in this debate. The right hon. gentleman says that this is government by force. I ask him to reflect upon his own conduct during the past two or three weeks. Does he think the reiteration of those arguments which he gives hour by hour and day by day have any intellectual influence upon the house or the country? Does he think he is persuading the Canadian people to accept his views rather than those which have been expressed by the Prime Minister, his colleagues and those supporting him? Does he think the form of argument which he has used in parliament is persuasive and convincing? I think not. What the right hon. gentleman is attempting