

are entitled. There is no moral question involved at all. There is, however, the question of actual results as tested by the great touchstone of common sense. We are receiving in this country to-day for our butter and other dairy products prices greater than the export price, and we have for some years been receiving that better price. Assuming that the Australian treaty were abrogated, and that the tariff went back to where it was, it would result I believe in a temporary advantage to our farmers, but if through that advantage, through the encouragement thus given, through the relation to the wheat market to which I have just referred, our production of dairy products were increased ten or fifteen or fifty per cent, and thereby exceeded by a wide margin the domestic consumption, the farmer would find himself back on an export basis so far as the price of his butter and other dairy products was concerned, and he might in the long run realize less money than he is receiving to-day. There is the danger I see, as suggested by the hon. member for Nelson, and not any danger to the moral standing of the farmer, no danger to his prospect of future salvation as might be suggested by some people.

Mr. NEILL: Then why abrogate the treaty?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: For two reasons. I do not say abrogate the treaty because I am against treaties, I am perfectly willing to see a new treaty negotiated and our people get all the markets they can, so long as they do not climb over the tariff walls of other countries on the shoulders of our farmers. But I do not want to divert my thoughts from the point I have in mind at the moment, which is the treaty itself. Why do I say, abrogate the treaty? In the first place, because it would undoubtedly be an immediate advantage, which is so sorely needed. In the second place, I am not at all certain that the re-establishment of the old tariff would be any material factor in increasing butter prices. I am rather inclined to believe that in view of the condition of the wheat market, butter production will increase anyway, and butter prices improve, and the farmer might as well get that little bit of advantage out of it while he can.

There is another point of view. I have always fought everywhere as well as I could for fair and equal treatment of farmers with other people. I believe that, not in the question of free trade or protection, but in the far more vital question of equality, lies a real moral principle and a real moral obligation, and for that moral principle and that moral obligation I stand to-day. The very reverse

and contradiction of that is exemplified and typified in the treaty that I am to-day asking to have abrogated. There is my reason.

It has never been and it is not now my custom to impute motives in this house. I think I stand clear of that in the eyes of every hon. member. I have never criticized nor attacked any man in this house for the position he has taken on any matter, but when I am attacked, when a member points the finger at me and says that I am guilty of the great apostasy, that I am inconsistent in my principles, then, Mr. Speaker, I think I have a right to examine, indeed, I think that that member has invited some examination of his own position in this house. What do we find? A little earlier in this debate the question of apostasy was very fully discussed and the dictionary definition of that word was enunciated. I too looked in the dictionary and among other definitions given of apostasy I find this—the abandonment of party, the abandonment of old associates and colleagues in the house, of old fellow warriors and fellow fighters lined together in the same regiment fighting for a common cause. As I stand here and think back over the years that have gone, the years when I and others entered this house full of optimism, full of hope, full of courage, as I look along this line and think of the stalwart champions who have fought side by side with us here, and then look across the floor and see some of those stalwart champions facing us from the opposite side, fighting those things which together we advocated and supporting those things which together we denounced, can I do anything but deprecate and lament the change?

A statement was made yesterday by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown)—and I know he appreciates that there is no personal ill will in my references; we have always been friends and I can only regret his present position—as a matter of fact two or three statements were made by him. One was that neither he nor his present associates had ever been heard to advocate the principle of protection for farmers. It is true, Mr. Speaker. But in that regard I think of a certain gentleman of old of whom it was said that what he did so thundered in the ears that it rendered inaudible what he said. It is not what the hon. gentleman has said to which I might take exception. He has at all times to the best of his ability denounced with verbal thunder and verbal pyrotechnics the principle of protection and all those who uphold that principle. I repeat, it is not what the hon. gentleman has said to which I might take exception; but actions speak louder than words, and his actions have failed to second