

*Australian Treaty—Mr. Neill*

those verbal thunders. Again, it was suggested that by our refusal to follow him and his associates across the floor we repudiate and refuse responsibility; and the hon. member for Lisgar suggested that he and his associates—for all of whom I have the utmost regard—were prepared to accept that responsibility. Well, are they prepared to accept responsibility for every action of the government, for all its policies?—which actions and policies differ not one tittle from the policies and actions which those same hon. gentlemen denounced when they sat with us on this side of the house. And yet if we follow the hon. member's argument to its logical conclusion what other interpretation can we pass upon his statement as to responsibility? Politics, he said, makes strange bedfellows. Well, when I see my friend in close communion with and sharing the responsibilities of those whose gods are not his gods, I think again of him when he spoke of the husks for which the farmers would wallow in the trough if they adopted protection. I think there is a good deal of truth in his remark. But, sir, when I think of him running free in the green pastures of independent thought and action on this side of the house, and look at him as he now sits opposite, cribbed, cabined and confined with those whose gods are not his gods, I think I detect a touch of regret, a touch of pathos as he realizes too late the fact that all he has received in exchange for those green pastures are but husks—husks neither nourishing nor palatable.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Might I be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DUNNING: We could proceed with this debate to-morrow, but for the fact that of course on Thursday the Speaker leaves the chair automatically without question put. If the debate could be continued to-morrow with the same result as if a division had been reached to-day, it would be very helpful.

Mr. BENNETT: I see no reason why that should not be done, speaking for those with whom I am associated. Of course, the hon. member who moved the amendment may have some other reason in the premises. There seems no good reason why the debate should not be proceeded with now for another fifteen minutes.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the discussion, Mr. Speaker? We cannot hear anything in this corner.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend's leader has indicated his willingness.

(Mr. Speakman.)

Mr. IRVINE: To do what?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Your leader heard it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is whether this house should continue to sit this afternoon or whether the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) should be allowed to move the adjournment of the debate. It has been suggested that the debate might be continued to-morrow, although it being Thursday the Speaker automatically leaves the chair without question put. As this affects a rule of the house, the suspension of the rule must be agreed to unanimously. Will it be agreeable to the house to proceed to-morrow as if it was not Thursday when the Speaker automatically leaves the chair without question put?

Mr. NEILL: I would point out, sir, that the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae) was allowed last night at fifteen minutes before eleven o'clock to adjourn the debate.

Mr. BENNETT: No, it was less than five minutes to eleven. I object to the house stopping at fifteen minutes before six o'clock. The other night we finished up a matter a few minutes after six, I think we should continue until six o'clock.

Mr. NEILL: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is possible for me to waste fifteen minutes—

An hon. MEMBER: It usually is.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. An hon. gentleman states that I often waste the time of the house. I ask for your ruling, sir. I submit that it is out of order for such a statement to be made, and I am willing to go at great length into the rules which so prescribe, as I think you will find, sir, if you will allow me time to look them up. I know I saw the other day that it is out of order to use the expression "stupid," and I know it has been ruled that the word "misrepresentation" is also out of order. Surely it is out of order to suggest than an hon. member on this side often wastes the time of the house. I would ask your ruling, sir, on that definite point: Is any hon. member justified in saying that another hon. member often wastes the time of the house?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, it is not in order to say that an hon. gentleman wastes the time of the house. Therefore I would ask that the expression be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think it is on the records of the house.

Mr. GEARY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am referred to, but I did not make the remark.