

His efforts in defending himself in supporting the government remind me of an old parlour game which no doubt many hon. members of the house have seen played. I think it is called tailing the donkey. The game is to put a picture of a donkey upon the wall, which donkey is minus a tail, and then the competitor is blindfolded and handed the tail and is told, "Now, don't look, please, but stick the tail in its proper place." The hon. gentleman from Lisgar with the handkerchief of partisanship around his eyes has been groping for the proper spot upon which to pin the donkey's tail, which would complete the picture of his defence of his apostasy, but in his struggle he has pinned the tail upon the back of the donkey's neck, thus making a monstrosity. He attacks the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) upon the grounds of inconsistency, but I would commend to him Emerson's essay on self reliance, in which he will find the following:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen.

I would point out to him that a great soul like the hon. member for Rosetown has nothing whatever to do with consistency. That hon. member will have to bear the penalty of the great, which is to be misunderstood. He is so great that he baffles the understanding of the hon. member for Lisgar.

I think the morality of the tariff issue was dealt with quite finally by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), and I was pleased to discover that in one instance the hon. member for Lisgar supports the non-moral view of the tariff. He says, "What is the use of the farmers being protectionists, they can only get the husks anyway; if there was any chance of their getting the corn, then it would be all right for them to be protectionists." I quite agree with him that there is no morality in this tariff business; it is a business proposition pure and simple and there is no morality in business. We hope there will be some day, but at the present time it is every man for himself and the devil take the last one, and so far the farmer always has been last. Why does not the farmer want protection? Because so far as he knows there is no practical policy which will give him a protection equal to that which the manufacturer enjoys. There is no morality in that. Why does the manufacturer want a tariff? Because it is a practical political policy to give him the privileges he desires. There is no particular morality about that, and he is no more immoral in wanting a tariff than is the farmer in not wanting it. What we do

[Mr. Irvine.]

want is equality of treatment. We want that firstly, because equality of treatment is sound economics, and we want it secondly because if there is going to be any morality in economics it must be upon a basis of equality.

The hon. member for Lisgar wants a treaty, and he wants it at once. He does not know why he wants it and he does not know what he wants to be in it, but he must have a treaty. He calls to account the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) for not wanting it. Let me say a word or two about the treaty, and about the subamendment which involves that treaty. The subamendment holds out the suggestion that this treaty which we seek to abrogate might be amended and might be improved thereby. We in this corner of the house are more interested in getting rid of a bad treaty than we are in negotiating a new one which, for all we know, may be equally as bad as or worse than the present treaty. This treaty offers an example of how a government can negotiate such an agreement to the disadvantage of agriculture. If we were to vote blindly and allow the government to proceed to negotiate another treaty, it might be worse than the present one and then, like the hon. member for Lisgar, we would have to assume part of the responsibility of having asked the government to take such action. We ask for the abrogation of this treaty because it discriminates against one class of people in our community. We insist that the government recognize that discrimination and we say that it is the first essential of good government to do so. If the government fails to recognize that discrimination it will not be able to get away from the evident implication that it is a servant of the class which is obtaining the most advantages from the treaty. There is more involved in this matter than so many pounds of butter or so many dozens of eggs; this is a very important question to the agricultural industry of Canada.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with the expression of the hope that this amendment will be carried, but should the government be technically defeated we shall restore it. I assure the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) who is so jealous in safeguarding the government that I shall help him to reinstate it in power. Perhaps it would be better to vote to sustain the government before we vote on the treaty, and in that way make sure that the government will be protected. I am willing to do anything which will please the hon. member for Comox-Alberni who is so afraid that the government will be wrecked.