

the Progressive party, that I do not object in the least to any of the views they may put forward; I believe absolutely in their sincerity with respect to lower duties on commodities and the help that lower duties might be to the country. But what I do take exception to is the method whereby they seek to effect the objects they have in view. Does my hon. friend from Brome believe that Pitt, that Huskisson, that Peel, that Gladstone, that these great protagonists of free trade, never had their days of darkness, of disappointment, and of difficulty? Does he believe that these great statesmen never knew what it was to feel solitary and alone in their inability to realize within a limited period of time the ideal which was so strong in their own minds? Had these men seen well to divide themselves from their party, even to the limited extent to which my hon. friend has found it necessary so to do, would Gladstone's name, would Peel's name, would Huskisson's name stand out to-day in history as they do, as the men who brought about these great reforms in trade?

Mr. BIRD (rising)—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BIRD: If I am not transgressing—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. BIRD: I am sorry if I am transgressing any usages in this regard, but a question did occur to me and I am going to ask it in justice to the hon. member for Brome.

An hon. MEMBER: He can take care of himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BIRD: If I have the permission of the Prime Minister, I want to ask him if England would have had free trade to-day had it not been for John Bright?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not omit the name of John Bright intentionally. I happen to have before me the names of those identified with particular reductions of the tariff at the time they were made. I think my hon. friend is quite right; John Bright's contribution was one of the greatest—but John Bright fought within the ranks of his party. John Bright, through his great moral strength and his noble eloquence, was able to influence the men of his own party to his own view, and he exerted that influence by standing in their ranks and commanding them with his majestic power. I say in all seriousness to the hon. member for

Brome that I am sorry to see him take a seat opposite. Why? On his own account? Yes. On account of the party? Yes; but most of all because of the very ideal that he has at heart; for the place to realize that ideal is among the men who are helping to bring about its fulfilment. I would say much the same to the members of the Progressive party, because of their attitude; that is to say the attitude of some of them. They feel it necessary not to interpret the difficulties of the economic situation in this country to their constituents, but to create in the minds of their constituents, by their attitude in parliament, the impression that there is, in this parliament some unwillingness to have justice done to western Canada, that there is a need for agitation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friends applaud that remark; I am happy to say, however, that I noticed only a very few of them do so. They take this attitude, Mr. Speaker, instead of seeking to interpret to their constituents what they know to be some of the problems and difficulties in connection with all these tariff matters, and the extent of which they had not learned as they now know it until they came into this parliament. There is a double duty on the part of members of this House: they owe a duty to their constituents, but it is not the duty merely of advocating in parliament the particular demands of particular sections; they also owe a duty to return to their constituents and to explain to them the problems with which the nation as a whole is faced. I was told by several members of the Progressive party before this budget was introduced that regardless altogether of what the Minister of Finance might say in the budget they would find it necessary to bring in an amendment. Where is there in such an attitude the extending of help to a government that is seeking to effect reform? How can any government be expected to co-operate with men who, though proclaiming a like purpose and a like aim, maintain that—regardless of what is done—for the sake of agitation, for the sake of making clearer and wider a division and a breach in our country, they will bring in some amendment and by their course in debate create an impression throughout the land that a condition of injustice exists so far as the attitude of one section of Canada toward another is concerned? Let my hon. friend from Brome, and my friends of the Progressive party look at the gentlemen directly opposite and take a leaf from their books. You do not find in their ranks any high priest of