

Atlantic to help out the great ship-building industry of the Old Land; to the dogs with the lumber industry of Canada, to the dogs with the steel industry of Canada, to the wolves with the nickel industry of this country, so long as we can keep the friendship of the great ship-building industries across the Atlantic. So long as we can be locked upon as the party of loyalty and the only competent party to wave the flag, we will let all those industries go, we will hold on to power, and we will not go to the Canadian people and ask them which of the two policies they prefer.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman's time is now up.

Mr. BORDEN: As my hon. friend is making an interesting speech, from his point of view, I would suggest that if he desires to continue his remarks, with the consent of the House he may do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will you do the same at two o'clock in the morning?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand it is with the unanimous consent of the committee that the hon. gentleman should proceed.

Mr. BUREAU: I think we should have a time-keeper here if we are to be limited in that way. I do not think it is fair to trust the Chair.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I desire to know whether the extension of time to the hon. member means that other members who may desire to speak later will be shut off from discussion.

Mr. BORDEN: Of course, if any hon. member objects to my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) proceeding, the rule must be observed. I suggested as a matter of courtesy that the hon. gentleman might continue his remarks with the consent of the House.

Mr. BELAND: Will you extend the same courtesy at 2 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no rule. The hon. member can continue his remarks as a matter of right.

Mr. BORDEN: I understand that there is a definite rule of the House on this subject, and I do not think that my hon. friend's mode of treating what I intended to be a courteous suggestion is very commendable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My reason for stating so is that I sincerely believe there is no binding rule. There was a resolution carried by the majority, in which the minority had no voice, and no opportunity to make amendments or suggestions. I say it is not a rule of this House, but simply a

Mr. CARROLL

tyrannical resolution of a majority of this House.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): If there is a point of order, I would like to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not see that there is any point of order.

Mr. CLARK: Then I want to raise one. I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, is, as usual, extremely courteous, but I question if his course is one which, in the end, will lead to the orderly conduct of debate in this House. I totally disagree with my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when he says there is no rule. The rules have been passed, and they are now the legal rules by which debate is conducted in this House. I totally disagree with my hon. friend, but I also disagree with the action of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, because when we have rules, debate in this House should be conducted accordingly to the rules, and not by the favour of any man, even if he be a man whom I regard so highly as my right hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN: I am afraid my hon. friend from Red Deer misunderstood me. When a man has lost his privilege by already speaking, we sometimes permit him to speak again for some particular reason. That can only be done by the unanimous consent of the House. My suggestion was subject to the unanimous consent of the House, therefore every member in the House had the right to safeguard himself in respect to it. I agree with my hon. friend from Red Deer that we ought to observe the rules. My suggestion was made entirely in good faith, and, as I have said, was subject to the unanimous consent of the House, under which condition every member of the House would have the right to protect himself.

Mr. CLARK: I do not want to prolong this debate. I hope my right hon. friend understands that no one appreciates his courtesy more than I do, but I do not appreciate his point as to any one of us not having had opportunities of talking upon this subject.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, whether or not there is a rule of this House limiting debate to twenty minutes—

Mr. CARVELL: That rule is gone now.

Mr. CARROLL: I appreciate the action of the right hon. gentleman in allowing me to finish my remarks. In view of the fact that, in my humble judgment, the sending out of this money to Great Britain will be detrimental to the fostering of the steel and coal industry in this country, in view of the fact that it is going to be detrimental to the nickel industry of this country, in