

ten years. I wonder if hon. gentlemen realize the operations necessary to produce lumber in the quantities and qualities demanded by the British market? First of all, that market has been completely saturated with lumber dumped into it by Russia and other countries in northern Europe. This has been a direct result of the Soviet policy of dumping. Secondly, because we have lost the trade the lumbermen of Canada have not sufficient stocks, and this applies particularly to eastern Canada. When we enjoyed the market in Great Britain for our lumber from 600,000,000 to 800,000,000 feet crossed the Atlantic each year. Our lumbermen have not sufficient lumber in their yards cut to United Kingdom standards, and for that reason it is impossible to step into that particular market, as is suggested by some hon. members, without taking the time necessary to provide the stock. If in September of this year we had begun to produce logs and to cut lumber for the British market, our product would not become merchantable to any degree until 1934. Therefore, under what sort of trade agreement lasting for only six months or a year, as suggested by hon. members opposite, could we enter the United Kingdom market with our lumber?

Then the accusation is made that in our negotiations we descended to bargaining beneath the dignity of representatives of countries within the empire. I wonder if there was any bargaining when the right hon. gentleman opposite was negotiating the French treaty. Unfortunately the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) is not in the house, because his name is attached to that treaty. I wonder if he resorted to any bargaining, or did he just have the French delegates bring in the treaty on a wooden platter and say to him, "Just sign here, at the point marked 'X'."

Mr. McGIBBON: The results would indicate that.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes, because that treaty involved Canada with twenty-one other countries not supposed to be included at all. I wonder why the Imperial economic conference was called last summer? Why was it necessary to have one? During the election campaign of 1930 the right hon. gentleman opposite spoke of nothing else but the conference. Why was there to be a conference, if negotiations were not to take place? Why did not representatives of different parts of the empire simply exchange by mail their suggestions, and say, "Here, take them or leave them." From the remarks by hon. members opposite we assume they would approve of such a course.

We come next to the most fantastic suggestion hon. members opposite have made. If I may be pardoned for saying so I would say that their observations have been the greatest jumble of contradictions, inconsistencies and fantastic clap-trap that has ever been heard in the house. The statement is made that representatives from the United Kingdom and the dominion met together in Ottawa, along with the producers and manufacturers from all parts of the empire, to enter into a conspiracy to divert trade from foreign into United Kingdom channels. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, and in fact, the leader of the opposition himself, state that such a policy would imperil the peace of the world. I had to consider carefully what might be in the right hon. gentleman's mind when taking that position. I was relieved, however, when the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) let the cat out of the bag when, in speaking a few evenings ago he said, "Do not try to find markets in the United Kingdom for Nova Scotia fish, or the United States will retaliate." And, in like manner, the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) said, "Do not try to find markets for Nova Scotia apples or the United States will retaliate." I should like to inquire from hon. members opposite what the United States could do more than they have already done in their efforts to strangle Canadian trade. During the time hon. members opposite were in power the United States took consistently, one after the other, every commodity that entered that country from Canada and placed a virtual embargo against it. What did the United States do while this house was in session last year? We had been selling to them about \$12,000,000 worth of copper, and taking from them about \$15,000,000 worth of copper products, but last year they placed a virtual embargo against our copper exports. They did the same with our lumber. In 1931 we bought from them \$8,000,000 worth of lumber and sold them about \$15,000,000 worth. In addition Canadian lumbermen bought about \$35,000,000 worth of equipment; yet a virtual embargo was placed on our shipments. In spite of that we hear hon. members opposite say, "Do not try to divert trade to the United Kingdom or into dominion channels, or the United States will retaliate."

In reply to that suggestion, what did the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm) the ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce, have to say? He stated that the Dunning budget was designed for five purposes, and that the first purpose was to divert trade. To whom was he going to divert that trade? Was there