

signature appears on it, and that is the treaty that said: If you have a suspicion that the liquor is going to Mexico in a rowboat, refuse clearance; but if you know that it is going to the United States in a ship grant a clearance. Is it any wonder that, applying the principles of international comity, the United States said: If you admit that you should not clear for the United States indirectly, we ask you in good morals and good faith to say that you will not do it directly. Now we are passing this legislation, instead of a treaty, and we are thereby dispossessing ourselves of the one single weapon we would have in negotiating the treaty namely, to be in a position to say that we will not make a treaty with the United States unless we get a reciprocal arrangement covering all articles smuggled into Canada from the United States. But we are not going to do that. We pass the law first, and make the treaty afterwards.

These, sir, seem to me to be considerations that should weigh mightily in the minds of the members of this house, not in connection with the passage of this legislation, but in asking ourselves why the government has been so derelict in its duty, so changeable in its opinions, so long delayed in taking the action it has. These are questions that we have the right to ask the government. We asked them on the second reading of this bill. We ask them now on the third reading of this bill, now that the amendments have been made which the government thinks are ample for the purpose of guaranteeing this country against the dangers which the Minister of National Revenue foresaw. We on this side can only say, the principle of this bill having, without division, been approved, the amendments having been approved, without division, and the bill now standing for third reading and about to pass, that this country has a right to know whether the Minister of National Revenue meant what he said a year ago and for conditions unchanged—there is no evidence of a change—was he right then or is he right now? We have also a right to ask whether the Prime Minister and his friends around him, who are so ready to accuse us of moral turpitude if we neglect to take steps to pass this legislation—and we have no power to do so—have overlooked the fact that since 1924 he has been as silent as the tomb with respect to this matter that he now considers to be of such pressing and urgent importance. We vote for the third reading, and leave it to the people of this country and the history of Canada to determine whether conduct such as that, so lacking in sincerity, so lacking in conviction upon a great issue, shall long deceive or begot the judgment of the Canadian people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot resist the pressing invitation of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), and may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, also to offer a word of comment.

My hon. friend has spoken of the amazing spectacle that he is contemplating at the present time. Let me refer to the still more amazing spectacle that we on this side of the house are witnessing at the present time and have been witnessing since this bill was introduced. We are witnessing the spectacle of hon. gentlemen opposite, under the distinguished leadership of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), talking one way and voting the other way. My hon. friend speaks of the solidarity that must exist between members of the government. Surely there must be another solidarity, a solidarity between the vote of a member and his speech.

My hon. friend speaks of Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. What about the Jekyll who speaks and the Hyde who votes?

My hon. friend also speaks of hypocrisy. He did so the other day. I do not want to use such a word, but if my hon. friend is so ardent, so keen, about refusing to grant clearances to liquor vessels, how is it that he did not say a word about it last year? How is it that he did not say a word about it the year before?

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition speaks of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) having spoken last year against this policy, but if I remember well, the refusal to prohibit these clearances was the only policy which was received with commendation at that time by hon. gentlemen opposite and by their press throughout the country. Even up to the very day this bill was introduced, the whole Conservative press of Canada, at least, the one I read, was unanimously opposed to this policy, and I know well enough the connection of my hon. friend with his press to know that if he had been willing to go in another direction, his press would have followed him in that direction.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry you are mistaken.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Even now some of the press supporting my hon. friend are assailing this bill openly. Other papers of my hon. friend's press, do like my hon. friend and his friends in this chamber; they do all that is within their power to try to make this legislation repugnant to the country. If that is sincerity, my hon. friend is welcome to it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the greatest testimony to the statesmanship and to the