Because it would tend to increase the Canadian lumber business to our injury, and because we see the Canadian lumber interest ready, after years of preparation, to take us at disadvantage, and hold us in their power, and hold our consumers of lumber in their power also. For years they have sagaciously watched this matter of controlling the lumber supply of our great markets from Chicago to New York and Boston. In times of quick sales and high prices they have been ready enough to take the highest rates, but when dull sales at low rates come, if there is no tariff as a barrier, they can sell below us and cripple our whole trade. They will look to their own interest, and if such a course seems best for them they can reduce prices until we are destroyed, and then put them up again for their profit and to the loss of our consumers. This would be but a repetition of the course of British iron makers from 1850 to 1857, who pushed rails into this country at $40 per ton (under a low tariff which they had labored hard to get, even as "reciprocity" is now sought for) until our mills were closed, and then sold us a million tons at $80, with a profit to them of $30,000,000, and *the same loss to us.*

We see no possible reason for exposing an industry which now produces over $100,000,000 yearly in the five States which come in most direct competition with Canada (Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York and Maine), or an amount greater and of more consequence than our total export and import trade with that country, to such perilous disadvantage, the disastrous effects of which would reach the lumber trade all over the land, and go far beyond the narrow circle of a few large lumber manufacturers.

What of the 200,000 men in our employ? Are their wages to be reduced twenty-five per cent to compete with foreign workmen? What of the $35,000,000 paid out to our farmers? Are those farmers to "go farther and fare