

*Export Act—Mr. Bennett*

But we have here the picture of a minister who, representing the government of this country, last year made a statement in which he condemned in unmeasured terms the attitude which the same government now takes. He now bows the neck to the Prime Minister and says: You are right; I am always wrong but I will remain; the people were misled by me a year ago, but they are now being led by my leader. A self-respecting minister would resign and ministers have resigned for less. Take the case of Mr. Tarte; take the case of other ministers I might mention, who have resigned because of differences of opinion on issues not as great as this. The position is quite clear. If the minister was leading the Canadian people along right lines ten months ago, he is wrong now, because there is not on the records of this parliament a single word to justify a change of heart on the part of anyone.

But an election is in sight; a great moral issue was to divert the people's minds from the real issue before the country, and the right hon. gentleman thought with the aid of the editors of the Toronto Star, the Toronto Globe and the Manitoba Free Press, those great pundits, he could divert the people's minds from our critical national condition and on a great moral issue they could retain a little larger place and power.

The people are getting a little weary of that sort of clap-trap. They are beginning to wonder why if, ten months ago, the government decided not to make a reciprocal treaty with the United States now, only ten months later, the Prime Minister should stand up and condemn in unmeasured terms every word uttered by his Minister of National Revenue. How can you have responsible government under conditions like that? How long in Great Britain would a minister of the crown permit himself to be thus publicly insulted by his prime minister and held up as a joke to the public? What are people hereafter to believe when the Minister of National Revenue rises in his place and says: This is the correct course to pursue. They will say: Let us wait ten months and see what the Prime Minister says; he will repudiate it.

In addition to that we have the statement made yesterday by the Prime Minister of this country that we are now to negotiate a reciprocal treaty with the United States of America. We are to negotiate a treaty that the United States offered to us nearly five years ago, that they asked us to confer about five years ago, and we declined for two years even to answer their despatches. Two years later, as I say, we had a conference and now, instead of introducing legislation after

[Mr. Bennett.]

a treaty, we are, by force of public opinion passing legislation which will operate against ourselves, according to the Minister of National Revenue, and we are proposing later to negotiate a treaty. We give to the press reports from Washington and our own country that despatches went forward on Saturday last asking for the negotiation of a treaty. Name me any treaty that this government has negotiated that has not been a fiasco. In 1924 they negotiated a treaty with the United States in regard to liquor and smuggling, in which treaty they asked His Majesty the King to say that he was desirous of suppressing smuggling; and the Prime Minister stands in his place in this house and reads the regulations that were adopted by the government to assist in sending intoxicating liquors to the United States, ensuring that such liquor was, in the words of the Minister of National Revenue, being legally shipped to the United States. As the minister said in 1929, it was legal then to do it, although in 1924 we signed a treaty in which the name of His Majesty was used to express a desire to suppress smuggling. Oh, what a spectacle! And now in 1930, on the 24th day of March, the Prime Minister tells us that we are to negotiate a treaty with the United States of America. The old Australian treaty over again, I suppose, when the minister went down there to negotiate and came back with proposals that would have been acceptable to the Canadian people, but abandoned them and was compelled to place a dumping duty on Australian goods for the purpose of doing indirectly that which he could not directly do. The treaty operates just as we indicated it would. The same with New Zealand; France the same, shutting out Canadian wheat while France enjoys all the benefits conferred under the treaty; Italy and other countries the same; and now this government is to negotiate a treaty with the United States for the reciprocal prohibition of imports that are prohibited entrance into the two countries, after we have passed a statute giving the United States what they want. Oh, what a spectacle! Is it any wonder that the people of Canada ask themselves what it all means? Who is sincere, the Minister of National Revenue or the Prime Minister?

An hon. MEMBER: Neither.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Nor the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad that the Minister of Justice has had a vision. We have not heard from him in this case. I am glad that the Minister of Justice has had a vision because he negotiated the treaty of 1924. His