

the British market with the other European countries to which reference has been made. Surely ten per cent would be an additional attraction to Canadian lumbermen.

I should like to add that I cannot accept the interpretation placed by the hon. member upon article 21. When it is before us for consideration I have no doubt it will speak plainly for itself, and at the proper time I am quite prepared to justify it. I do not wish, however, to violate the rules of the committee by entering into a discussion of an article not now before us.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one or two observations concerning the remarks of the hon. members for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). First, to the hon. member for Quebec South may I say that I concur in everything he has said concerning the attitude of the members of the committee, including himself. I do not know anything about the references he made concerning what some people had said at different points in the province of Quebec, but I do know that during the course of negotiation and the preparation of the brief, from the first week of February last until the agreement was signed in the House of Commons, my hon. friend and the chief of the forest service of the province of Quebec, who acted with him, as well as representatives of the lumber trade in the province of Quebec and representatives from the other four provinces concerned, co-operated in the most cordial way to present the facts as forcibly as possible. The brief submitted was officially concurred in by representatives of the five provinces, namely, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and British Columbia. The hon. member who has just spoken, representing the province of Quebec, met other representatives during the period of the conference to discuss every phase of the matter.

I should like, however, to avoid one or two possible misapprehensions which might result from the hon. member's recital of what the committee of lumbermen from the provinces actually requested. True, we asked for a twenty per cent preference, but with regard to Russia we asked for a partial or complete embargo. It is also true that as a supplement to the agreement submitted more than a month after this was put into the hands of the tariff advisory committee, a quota was suggested. If the hon. member will search his memory he will realize that that quota was suggested simply to bring the action of the whole committee into harmony with the

[Mr. Stevens.]

views of one province, and not with those of the other four. I shall not, however, go into that phase of the matter, because it was submitted only as a possible solution of the problem.

Coming next to the negotiations concerning the control of the Russian trade, I just wish to remind the hon. member of what the chairman of what he has termed the pro-Russian group said to our committee in a letter dated June 7, in relation to the effect that the so-called control they had instituted had had on Russian trade. His words are:

If I might venture to make a suggestion, the first question that would have to be considered before the ills of the lumber trade are tackled is the Russian question. So long as the trade agreement is allowed to operate in its present form and the Russians have control—

Notice this! In the opinion of the chairman of the so-called pro-Russian group the British group did not have control. In his view the Russian government had control. His words are:

So long as the trade agreement is allowed to operate in its present form and the Russians have control we shall have a competitor who knows no rules and is not bound by any question of costs.

I put that on record so that my hon. friends opposite will be clear concerning the measure of control being effected.

Mr. POWER: Is that letter from Colonel Morgan to yourself?

Mr. NICHOLSON: It is a letter from Colonel Morgan to the committee, not to myself. It was written for the purpose of bringing pressure on our government in order that they might bring pressure on the British government. It is stated that the ten per cent preference is of no value, but so far as the New Brunswick and Baie des Chaleurs lumbermen are concerned it actually means a fifteen per cent preference, because it is on the c.i.f. price that the preference applies. When you take transportation, insurance, dockage charges and so on into account, it works out at approximately fifteen per cent.

In regard to the statement I made in the house as to the time within which Canada could hope to re-enter the United Kingdom market in a large way, Mr. Chairman, I did say that if in Canada we started to produce a large volume of lumber for the British market in September, 1932, it would be 1934 before that lumber would be in any general way a merchantable commodity. We cannot expect to get the British market if we take saw logs out of the water in May, June, July and August next year, saw them into lumber