

Then the editorial goes on to quote a protectionist statement by a member of the Liberal government as follows:

Free trade is all right in theory, if countries did not erect impassable tariff walls around them. I am not afraid to say and use the word, that in a country which is excluded from the markets of another country, the tariff may legitimately be used in a reasonable way to protect the rights of the consumer and also for protection of the industries of that country so that these industries may have a right to their own market.

There you have the mulberry bush of politics. In that connection I believe there is a story of a strange way in which the foxes of Manitoba capture the turkeys. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the story itself, but I do vouch for the accuracy of its application. It is said that when the turkeys in Manitoba go to the tops of the trees in the evening to roost, they are sometimes captured by the foxes, which come to the foot of the tree, take their tails in their mouths and roll around and around the tree. The turkeys become so giddy after watching the foxes roll around the tree that they fall down, and are easily captured. It appears to me that the hon. member for Lisgar has been sitting at the top of the mulberry bush of tariff discussion and that he has watched and listened to the circumlocutions of his friends to such an extent that he has become giddy and fallen down to become the easy prey of his adversaries. He wants to be generous with regard to dairy products; he wants to salve his political conscience with butter. He has not been able to reduce the tariff on anything else, and so he dabs butter on his conscience and tries to make himself satisfied with that sort of thing. He suggests that those engaged in the dairy industry are incapable of speaking for themselves. I hope he will not charge me again with misquoting him; rather, I am interpreting him. He stands up to speak for the dairy industry, and says that they do not know what they want when they ask for the abrogation of the treaty; that apparently they are suffering from some kind of mental strain; that he knows better than they know what they want, and he knows they do not want any protection at all. When we in this corner of the house recognize the appeal of organized agriculture the hon. member for Lisgar charges us with apostasy. In doing that he reminds me of the story about the man crying "stop thief." The hon. gentleman is trying to direct the attention of the country away from himself. That word apostasy, like some of the hon. gentleman's opinions, belongs to the dark ages. It does not savour even of theoretic Liberalism, not

to mention Progressive philosophy. My hon. friend will have to accept either the word "apostasy" or something worse as descriptive of his own position. It is quite possible that a man who had changed his views might be dubbed an apostate, but there are worse words than that. If he believed in what he said when he was on this side of the house, then he is now an apostate; if he did not believe what he said at that time he is worse than an apostate, and I will leave the house to supply the proper word to describe him. I presume I would be out of order if I spoke that word.

Let us see what my hon. friend was elected to do. According to the new national policy, which was apparently still born, he believed in the following:

We believe that the best interests of the empire and of Canada would be served by reciprocal action on the part of Canada through gradual reduction of the tariff on British imports, having for its objects closer union and a better understanding between Canada and the motherland, and at the same time bring about a great reduction in the cost of living to our Canadian people.

And in dealing with definite tariff demands, it says:

By reducing the customs duties on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

Mr. STEVENS: How long ago was that?

Mr. IRVINE: That was in 1918; I am afraid the five years are up.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Crerar) was there also.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. Minister of Railways was the leader of that new national policy; now he is the chaser of it. Let me point out what the hon. member for Lisgar did in that regard. A subamendment to the budget was moved last year by an hon. member from the farmers' group, urging upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations. That subamendment was moved on April 9, 1929. The vote upon the subamendment appears at page 1465 of last year's Hansard, and the name of the hon. member for Lisgar appears in the list of nays. That vote was cast in the face of the declaration which I have just read. Then the hon. gentleman has the audacity to stand up in this house and shout "apostasy" to hon. members across the aisle.