

that will increase trade still further. If it is merely an increase in trade that the hon. gentleman wants he can get it in that way, but such an increase of trade surely would not be regarded by him as sound economics. Neither is it sound economics to increase trade with Australia in the way in which that has been done.

While I am referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Hants-Kings I should like to comment upon another observation which he made. Directing his remarks to the representatives of the United Farmers of Alberta in particular, he said he had envied the independence displayed by hon. members of the United Farmers of Alberta group in this house until some hon. member on this side said that as the representative of an organized agricultural community he must represent the voice of that community. That was too much for the hon. gentleman. What to him was the voice of the people; what to him were the boasted tenets of historic and theoretical Liberalism? They are no more to him, apparently, than the reddening of the rose or the swing of Pliades to Millet's Man With the Hoe. What would he have us do? There are only two other courses, so far as I am aware, that he or any other member of the house could take. One course would be to follow the party, to be a blind slave of the plutocratic class which dictates the policy of the party. That is one way, but there is another; my hon. friend could disregard everyone and stand up in this house expressing only what he thinks. That is the very acme of autocracy, but even if the hon. gentleman desired to do so surely he would not tell us that there is a community in Canada which thinks what he has to say so wise that they will indemnify him just for the privilege of hearing him say it on the floor of this house. With all due respect to his wisdom that is not a very safe basis of representation. The only other course is to represent the people who send us here, and in this regard also I think the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) misunderstood the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), when the former described the latter as having defended his right to change his principles. The hon. member for Acadia did no such thing although, if it be necessary to change principles, we are not afraid to do so. The hon. member merely established the fact that from the very beginning this group worked under a very different principle from that followed by the hon. member for Lisgar when he sat in this corner of the house.

In reply to the hon. member for Hants-Kings I might say that I regard myself as a delegate of my constituents, and I regard

[Mr. Irvine.]

that as the highest function that can be fulfilled by any hon. member of this house. In trying to be such a delegate I would rather fail in trying to do some things than succeed in doing certain other things; I would rather fail in trying to be a delegate of the United Farmers of Alberta than succeed in being a thoroughly complacent and amiable partisan. May I add that I am free to serve the people who send me here, while a partisan is bound to serve the party system, the thing which sent him here. The party system is the thing which stands between hon. gentlemen opposite, who have criticized us in this regard, and the people they are supposed to represent.

The discussion on the amendment before the house has stirred up the musty arguments for and against the tariff, which cover a period of history from Adam Smith down to Stephen Leacock, who wisely made a huge joke of the "dismal science." The treaty itself is indeed a commodious umbrella under which free trader and protectionist alike can find shelter. The protectionist can argue with a great deal of force that in raising the tariff on raisins and thus increasing the price of raisins to the consumers in Canada he was true to the protectionist principle. He could also argue that in bartering with certain interests of Canada for certain privileges to the manufacturers in Canada, he was also in line with the protectionist principle. On the other hand, if he wishes to pose as an advocate of free trade or reduced tariffs, then he can argue that since he removed 3 cents from the duty on butter, he also is a free trader, and so as I say the treaty does not lend itself to either of the contending parties. Both may stand under it if they so desire, and I could not possibly say whether or not the treaty as a whole is more favourable to the theories of the Liberal or Conservative parties, just as I cannot say whether the hon. member for Lisgar is more free trader than protectionist because of his support not only of this treaty but of a government which is manifestly protectionist.

In this connection I am reminded of an editorial which appeared recently in the Ottawa Citizen, headed "Mulberry Bush of Politics." The editorial begins by saying:

There is more fruitless discussion of tariff protectionism than of any other subject in Canadian politics.

Then it goes on to quote and comment upon certain statements made by the leaders of both parties in this country. The first statement quoted is a very liberal statement by the leader of the opposition, in which he said:

A policy to give fair treatment, equal opportunity in competition with the peoples of the world, for the protection of agriculture, labour, industry and the consumer.