Forest wealth of Canada.

States needs that raw material, but will not allow its manufactured product to enter the States except by paying exorbitant duties. For every dollar Canada gets by exporting this article she would get a hundred or a thousand if she used it at home, in supporting Canadian labour and capital. Are we then so reckless of our resources, so dull, so slow, so careless of national interests as to allow a rival nation to clear out our raw materials for the price of an old song, to take away our labour for our mills, and deprive our skill and capital of profitable employment, to make our people literally mere "hewers of wood" for a more enterprising neighbour? Unless we are content to rest under such disgrace, we shall put an export duty on spruce and on pine saw-logs, at least equivalent to the duty the States impose on sawn lumber and pulp, say \$4 per cord on pulpwood.

CANADA'S TIMBER AND PULP.

(New York Journal of Commerce, 1893.)

The Ways and Means Committee has done well in putting timber on the free list, but it was hoped that it would put all lumber and wood pulp on the free list. We are brought to a consideration of this subject from the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Foster, Finance Minister of the Canadian Government, in which he intimates that the existing conditions of the interchange of forest products between this country and Canada cannot any longer be permitted to remain in their present unsatisfactory state. The threat made by our western lumbermen that they will make the waters of the lake smooth towing over Canadian logs to start their mids in Michigan now that they have used up their own timber, has forced the Canadian Government to inquire into the conditions; and although Mr. Foster does not appear to distinctly state that it is the intention of his government to reimpose the export duties, he leaves no question that this must be the outcome in case we still persist in exacting heavy duties on Canadian lumber and pulp.

His remarks are sufficiently clear on this point to leave little doubt of the result. When he says: "If conditions remain as they are, when Parliament meets it will become a subject for very grave consideration whether the interests of Canada and her lumber and pulp productions generally, both present and prospective, will not require a strong remedy," and intimates that remedy to be "the imposition of an equivalent export duty on logs exported to any country which imposes heavy duties on Canadian lumber and

pulp.

It is well known that there is in Canada a very strong feeling, among those at least whose mills have been forced to close down, from what they claim to be an unfair discrimination in favour of the manufactures of this country by the Canadian Government; and some go so far as to ask for an export duty higher than the United States import duties on Canadian lumber and pulp, as our lumbermen have always insisted that \$2 a thousand feet was only a fair rate of duty to protect the saw-milling industry of the United States, so long as they had timber, and the Canadians think, now that the Michigan millmen must depend on Canadian timber for the future, that it is but just their own agreement should apply to protect the Canadian milling industry, but this idea Mr. Foster does not appear to entertain, for he speaks only of "an equivalent rate of export duty," and leaves it optional with us to have free logs and pulpwood in exchange for free lumber and pulp.

Many of our best informed people believe, irrespective of protective or free trade principles, that the time has arrived when the conditions of our forests, especially those containing white pine and spruce, require most careful consideration to try to extend their usefulness as long as possible, so as not to leave us in a position of having to depend on the generosity of others for our own requirements of such indispensable material as white pine and spruce lumber and pulp. Even now the aspect is by no means reassuring, for we get from the extra census bulletin of 1890, relating to the saw-milling industry of our great white pine producing states—Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota—an insight into their condition at that time, when it would appear that outside of that

123