

"this judicial body" advisedly, for ever since I have had the honour of being a member of this high tribunal I have been convinced that it is my duty to judge objectively, irrespective of party allegiance, any legislation that comes before us. One honourable member made some reference to party politics. Well, party politics have nothing to do with this bill at all. With due respect for the opinion of some honourable members, I believe that this debate is not being influenced in any way by party allegiance. My honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) knows that I admire him greatly, for many reasons, and perhaps he will not mind my saying that a few minutes ago, when he made a slip about Quebec's separation, he reminded me of a certain song that we sing in French. It is about Marlborough going to war, and there is one line which goes this way:

Trinity will pass before Marlborough comes back.

I might parody that line by saying to my friend:

Trinity will pass before Quebec is satisfied with anything less than freedom and liberty.

I think it is well known to honourable members that before I was summoned to this honourable body I was a Liberal to the core, and so I am sure no one will doubt my word when I say that I do not owe allegiance to the party now in power in Quebec, whose political views are diametrically opposed to my own. But in considering this bill, as in considering all other measures that come before us, I try to rise above questions of party politics and to look at the matter from the point of view of the national interest and the maintenance of that liberty which we enjoy under our political institutions—*institutions* that we are now defending against the tyranny of communism.

Are we members of this high tribunal going to refuse to a province the liberty or freedom to be governed according to its own choice? Surely we are not going to take that stand, even though some people may regard the statute as capricious. I remember that one day our good friend from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar), when speaking in defence of personal freedom, said "I want to be free even to make mistakes, if I so wish". It is for freedom of that kind that we in this chamber should fight unceasingly. If a province, no matter what the party politics of its government may be, decides that such and such a thing should be prohibited within the provincial boundaries, why should any other province prevent that decision from being carried out?

That is one point. Now I wish to say further—

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Before my honourable friend continues, will he allow me to interrupt him? He will admit, perhaps, that the national interest must sometimes take precedence over local or even provincial interests?

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: Quite right. I agree, and I am glad that my honourable friend raised that point. It gives me an opportunity to say that what is involved here is not a question of general and national interest.

Hon. Mr. Hugessen: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: I say it is a question of conflicting views on the value of margarine.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: You say "No," but I say "Yes". And, as someone once said, I have a right to my own opinion, even if I "share" it alone.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: I say it is not in the national interest to allow a right of one province to be interfered with by other provinces. I go further. I should not be surprised if one were to find that the opposition to this measure sprang from a mere handful of people who are interested in the manufacture and sale of margarine. And I ask: If that is true, are we going to be led by an arrogant minority?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. I do not think that any member should charge that any of us here represents some special interest. I will not sit down and take that. I represent no one but the people of Manitoba and of Canada as a whole. I have no interest in any company that manufactures margarine; I do not own a single share of stock in any such company. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that charge.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: My honourable friend has misunderstood me. I do not say that we here are influenced by some interests behind the scenes. My point is that some people outside of parliament are hopeful that this bill will not pass.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I think that perhaps I should take offence at the suggestion that has been made, since I have been very active in opposing the ban on margarine.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: You have permission to be offended.

Hon. Mr. Euler: My honourable friend has suggested that opposition to the bill comes from a very small number of people.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: I said that I would not be surprised if that were so.