

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What weapons? This is not a case of war.

Mr. MANION: The right hon. gentleman talked of war the other day. But trade is war so far as that goes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the language of my hon. friend—trade is war.

Mr. MANION: So it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I always thought trade was exchange.

Mr. MANION: Yes; but we have tariff wars.

Mr. KAISER: If you don't prohibit the importation of any goods at all what is the object of the proposed treaty?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will have to ask his leader that question.

Mr. BENNETT: He will answer it.

Mr. KAISER: I understood the right hon. gentleman to say this afternoon that he was preparing a treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said we were continuing negotiations.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the New Zealand arrangement?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope hon. gentlemen will not think I am discourteous if I do not try to answer them all at once. May I come to one or two points that remain in connection with the clause that is before the house? The point on which I think the house wishes to be most definitely assured is that which was raised in a very concrete way by the hon. member for Red Deer, namely, whether this particular bill is—I think I might put it broadly—a bill to aid the United States in the enforcement of their laws, or whether it is a bill to control our own officials with respect to their conduct where that conduct has relation to the export of liquor to countries which prohibit importation. If hon. gentlemen will keep in mind the distinction between the two and remember that this bill aims only at the latter and not at the former, they will find many of their difficulties vanish.

Mr. CAHAN: I dislike asking questions, but this is in committee and I wish to get a clear idea of what is meant.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will let me make my statement he will soon comprehend my meaning.

Mr. CAHAN: It becomes more incomprehensible as the right hon. gentleman proceeds.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He has not said anything yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the export of liquor from Canada to the United States as the practice is at this moment, where liquor is being taken out of a distillery for export to the United States an export entry is made before an excise officer. The application for the liquor to be entered for export states specifically that the destination is the United States. My hon. friend referred to my having used the words "known to be going to the United States." It is known to be going to the United States to-day because the application states in specific English language that the destination of that liquor is the United States.

Mr. CAHAN: Then why not use the word "designated" instead of "destined?"

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will only allow me to get to the point I will tell him in a moment. The reason "destined" is used is amongst other things because the words "destination" and "destined" are the particular words to be found in the forms of declaration that at present are in use in the customs and excise departments. I have in my hand form 13 that has been referred to at different times.

Mr. CAHAN: Those forms are not statutory.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Here is the declaration made by the person shipping commodities:

I,..... (owner, shipper or consignee), hereby certify that the above is a full and true statement of the kinds, quantities, values and destination of all the articles delivered by me for exportation as aforesaid.

My hon. friend must not get angry, because that is the form.

Mr. CAHAN: I am infinitely amused.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Or amused either. I am trying to tell him why the word "destined" is used. It is because the word is generally used by the excise and customs officials in respect to exportation of commodities to another country. The first step then is the releasing of the liquor. That is the first step at which the governments' own officials come into the business, and to the extent they enter that liquor for export with the knowledge before them that its destination is the United States the government's officials to-day are facilitating entrance of that liquor into the United States by those into whose hands it comes at the port from which