



I HAPPENED to be in a gentleman's business office in Toronto the other day when the representative of an American firm called to solicit an order for goods. "No," said the gentleman, "I don't want any Yankee goods. I've made up my mind not to buy a dollar's worth of American stuff if I can possibly get what will answer the purpose in Canada or elsewhere." On asking the reason of this unexpected rebuff, the American was told that it was due to the treatment which was being accorded to Canada by the Government of the United States under the Dingley Bill. I fully concur in this gentleman's policy. Individually the Americans are good fellows, but as a nation they are given to the perpetration of acts of despicable meanness, especially towards this country. Notwithstanding the tariff wall which has existed between Canada and the United States for nearly twenty years past, the Americans have found a market in the Dominion for many millions of dollars worth of goods annually. If the men who are sent over here to sell these goods were for a time to be given the cold shoulder, after the fashion described above, protests would soon find their way to Washington from the manufacturers which these men represent, and as a result, no doubt a more neighbourly policy would soon be adopted towards this country. Let those who have been in the habit of buying from representatives of American houses try this method of securing international fair play.

* * *

DROPPING into the office of Mr. Carl Zeidler the other day, I was asked if I thought the Government were likely to appoint agents in Germany and France to represent the lumber industry of Canada. My reply that I had heard little of the matter caused Mr. Zeidler to discourse eloquently upon the necessity of such a step being taken, and with his views I entirely agree. "Until the Government make such appointments," he said, "we cannot expect to extend our trade, but if we go about it in the proper way there is no reason that I can see why we should not export a considerable quantity of different woods. The persons appointed should be thoroughly posted as to what timber Canada can supply, as well as with the requirements of the foreign markets. They should act as arbitrators, as it were, in all disputes, thereby protecting the shipper from the sharp practices of unscrupulous importers, and also looking after the interests of reliable importers that the stock supplied is up to the mark." I asked Mr. Zeidler in what lines the largest consumption of Canadian lumber might be expected in Germany, to which he replied: "First, in the piano trade, and second, in cabinet making. These industries consume a very large quantity of lumber, much of which is obtained from the United States, while Canada has just the material required; ash, elm, maple, basswood, pine, etc.—we have them in abundance. For the German

market the stock should be cut into small dimension stuff, much smaller, indeed, than our manufacturers are accustomed to, but once they got the run of the trade they would, I think, find it profitable, as there would not be the immense waste that there is in cutting deals and long lumber for the British market. Some of our people who have shipped stock to that market have come out at the wrong end, and that was simply because they had no one there to look after their interests."

* * *

MR. C. BECK, of Penetanguishene, Ont., when in Toronto recently, was interviewed regarding the tariff question: To the query, "How do you think the \$2 duty contained in the Dingley tariff bill will affect the lumber trade in the Georgian Bay district?" Mr. Beck replied as follows: "I would say that if the Dingley duty is kept on and no export duty on logs and no import duty on lumber put on, it would mean that every mill on the Georgian Bay would have to shut up, and we would have either to ship the logs to the United States to be sawed there or to sell them out and out to the Americans. If an export duty were put on saw logs it would no doubt make the trade stagnant at the present time, but then the \$2 Dingley duty would shut out our coarse grade lumber anyhow. As to the threats of retaliation, if we put on an export duty it would be immaterial what amount the Americans will put on, as at present we have a good trade with England for the better grades of our lumber; if the Americans were to want any of the better grades they would have to pay the advanced price, and for our coarse grades of lumber we would have to work up other markets, such as South America, Australia, etc. At present there is, in my opinion, more lumber exported from the United States to foreign countries than is exported to it; therefore, if our people work up that trade, which the Americans have at present, and sell direct to the consumers, they would get the profit which the Americans now reap from our lumber. For instance, I know as a fact there is a large box factory in Tonawanda which receives the principal part of its stock from Canada, manufactures it into box shooks and ships them to South America. In my opinion, if the Government takes a firm stand and puts a prohibitory export duty on logs and other material going into the United States, it might for a short time not be beneficial, but it would before long prove a great boon to Canadians in general." With regard to the imposition by Canada of import duties, Mr. Beck said: "At the present time there is an overstock of lumber in the United States, and they are shipping large quantities of coarse grades to Canada at present—at sacrifice prices. In that way they take our logs, manufacture them, sell the better grades in other countries and flood our country with the lower grades, which is to the great detriment of our trade."

* * *

I OBSERVE that Mr. Geo. M. Warren, manager of the Imperial Lumber Co., of Toronto, has lately been across the border buying some deals. To a representative of the Northwestern Lumberman Mr. Warren thus expressed himself on the much discussed duty question: "Do you know, I believe Canada imports as much American lum-

ber as she exports to the States. Don't look so incredulous," he continued, "you people are making a strong fight against the importation of what you call coarse Canadian lumber into the border states, but here is a little thing for you to put in your pipe and smoke; the cities of Hamilton and Toronto, in Ontario, are now using large quantities of low grade sidewalk plank that was bought in the United States. Now, how do you account for that? You don't give our side of the argument a fair show. We claim that with the few exceptions of some kind of skilled labor, as high prices are paid in Canadian mills as in those of the United States, and by reason of the better machinery which your people use, your lumber is made cheaper than ours. Some of that sidewalk stuff I mentioned a minute ago is shipped all rail from Grayling, Mich., into Toronto. Now, if you think that is a tall yarn, here is another for you to ponder over: When Cutler & Savidge started to build their big new mill and stores up in the Georgian Bay country, they proposed to use Norway for construction timber as the cheapest stuff, and our company had the nearest mill to the location which they selected on which to build. We had a logging railroad and convenient timber, and were mighty glad to figure on the bill; we didn't get it though, and quite a long time afterwards, when I met Mr. Cutler in the east, you can imagine my surprise at being told that my prices were far too high. Why, where on earth could you get any lower, said I. 'In Michigan' replied Mr. Cutler, and it turned out that the lumber and timber to build that mill with was shipped across the lake from Michigan because it could be bought from the Michigan mills cheaper than from ours in Canada."

EFFECT OF AN IMPORT DUTY.

WAUBAUSHENE, ONT., June 25th, 1897.

To the Editor of the CANADA LUMBERMAN.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your circular concerning the import duty of \$2.00 per thousand feet on sawn lumber under the Dingley Bill, I desire to answer your questions as follows:

1. An import duty of \$2.00 per thousand feet on lumber entering the United States would to a great extent paralyze the lumber trade of Canada, particularly of the Georgian Bay. Some of the higher grades might be shipped into the United States, but the coarser grades, such as box, etc., would be excluded, for nothing like cost price could be obtained by the manufacturer.
2. If Canadian lumber is to be practically excluded from the American market by such a duty, I see no reason why the Americans should be allowed to enter into competition in Canada, Georgian Bay in particular, in the purchase of timber limits, and should then be allowed to take the lumber in the form of logs into the United States free of duty, either of import or export, there manufacturing them into lumber, and have the advantage of \$2.00 against the Canadian lumberman who manufactures lumber in Canada. I therefore feel and have advocated all along that such an import duty under the Dingley Bill should be met by a corresponding export duty on saw logs. The lumbermen of Ottawa have a great advantage over their western brethren for the reason that they are so near the seaboard for cheap shipment to England. They are also nearer the New York and New England markets.
3. As mentioned in clause No. 1, coarse lumber would be affected to the greatest extent, not only because there is so much of it, but because the proportion the import duty bears to the price of coarse lumber is very great. The higher grades of lumber are in much greater demand, and the supply is smaller, and therefore the price being higher, and the demand as compared with the supply being greater than in the case of coarse lumber, it is just possible that the consumer might have to pay a portion of the duty by an increase in the price of the lumber.
4. If Canadian lumbermen are compelled to abandon the United States market, there is no doubt but much larger shipments will be made to the English market, and many lumbermen who now do not ship to England would turn their attention in that direction. I have not considered what other markets might be reached, nor what other methods adopted to find an outlet. There is no doubt but South African countries, and South American and West Indian ports, and possibly distant Australia, would be looked to.

Yours truly,

GEORGIAN BAY LUMBER CO.

J. Scott, Vice-President.

[The above letter was received in response to a circular sent out by the LUMBERMAN enquiring as to the probable effect of the proposed import duty on lumber, a number of replies to which were published in our June issue.—THE EDITOR.]