

distance between the east and west is so great, that eggs could not be shipped to advantage during a large portion of the year. The heat of summer and the cold of winter would operate against the shipment of such a perishable article from the east to the extreme west, and a duty upon eggs would therefore be of little advantage to the east, though it would probably operate to increase home production in the west.

CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

There is a great deal of talk in Canada at the present time about securing an arrangement with the United Kingdom which would permit of the importation of Canadian products into Great Britain on more favorable terms than is accorded to the United States. It is vaguely imagined by some Canadian journalists that Great Britain will undertake to retaliate upon the United States on account of the McKinley bill, and they conclude that the most natural way to do this would be to place a tax upon imports of products from the Republic, while Canadian products would be admitted free. Those who entertain such thoughts certainly have not arrived at a belief of this nature from a course of common sense reasoning. So far as Canada is concerned, there is no encouragement whatever for the mother country to favor us in any way. THE COMMERCIAL some months ago, and again last week, pointed out that the Canadian tariff was so arranged as to discriminate against Great Britain, and in favor of the United States. We will again repeat the figures: For the fiscal year 1888, Canada imported goods from Great Britain to the value of \$39,433,617, upon which duties to the amount of \$8,972,740 were collected. In the same year imports from the United States were \$55,513,790 upon which duties to the amount of \$7,109,234 were collected. This shows customs collections to have been nearly \$2,000,000 greater on imports from Great Britain than on imports from the Republic, though the total value of imports from the Republic was about \$10,000,000 greater than imports from Great Britain. In other words, 40 per cent. of the total duties collected by Canada in 1888 were on imports from Great Britain, while on a much larger amount of imports from the United States, only 32 per cent. of our total duties was collected.

The figures for 1889 tell the same tale. On imports from Great Britain to the value of \$42,249,555, duties were collected to the amount of \$9,450,243, or 40 per cent. of the total duties collected in Canada for that year. On imports from the United States to the value of \$56,368,990, duties were collected to the amount of \$7,371,148, or 32 per cent. of the total duties collected for the year on imports from all countries. This shows the average rate of duty on imports from Great Britain to be about one-third higher than on imports from the Republic.

In the light of these figures, what reason have we in Canada to expect any special consideration from Great Britain? We call upon the mother country quite savagely at times, it is true, to uphold us in our fishery squabbles

with the big Republic, and then we tax British goods one-third more than we do imports from the United States. Those who foolishly imagine that Great Britain will discriminate in favor of Canada, have evidently not considered the matter in the light of these facts, or they could never have entertained such a thought. The United States places a heavy tax upon imports, including goods from the United Kingdom, but Canada also does the same thing, and moreover, discriminates against the mother country, and in favor of a foreign country. Great Britain has no political connection with the United States, and has therefore less reason to complain of the duties than she has in the case of Canada. While Canada remains a portion of the Empire, and expects to be defended by the Empire, it is quite reasonable for the British people at home to expect more consideration than they would look for from a foreign country. Instead of this we discriminate against Great Britain. Canada, of course, is independent of the Empire in her fiscal policy, and can arrange her duties to suit herself. We make these statements, however, to show how absurd it is to suppose that the mother country will in any way favor us.

It is not at all likely that the McKinley bill will cause Great Britain to discriminate in any way against United States products. In order to keep up her vast manufacturing industries and continue to send goods all over the world, it is essential that the British workman shall obtain his bread and other supplies as cheaply as possible. Britain buys wheat and corn, flour and meat, etc., from the Republic because she must have these commodities, and moreover must have them as cheaply as possible. If the United States did not offer them at prices which compete fairly with products from other countries, she would not take them. It is very unlikely that the British people would submit to a tax upon products from the Republic, with the prospect that such a tax would advance the cost of such commodities to the home producers.

Let us take a common sense view of this matter. What has Canada to offer Great Britain in return for a discrimination in favor of our products? Canada last year imported goods from Great Britain to the value of \$42,317,000. The United States imported from Great Britain during the fiscal year of 1889, goods to the value \$178,269,000. True the balance of trade was very largely against Great Britain in her dealings with the Republic, but at the same time the trade of the latter country is very much more valuable to her than that of Canada. If we expect any favors of the mother country, we must have something to offer her in return. We must offer her a large market for her wares, and be prepared to supply her with the commodities now purchased from the United States, as cheaply as that country can furnish them.

While Canada is not in a position to ask for, nor expect special consideration from Great Britain, there is one thing we can do to encourage trade with her. We can remove the heavy duties from imports from the mother country, and following the natural course of trade, she will certainly buy from us in prefer-

ence to the Republic, if we have the commodities which she wants in sufficient quantities.

TIMBER DUTIES.

It is necessary that a clear understanding of the timber duties between Canada and the United States should be had to take a survey of the present situation. In an article in this journal last week it was stated that the Canadian Government had removed the export duty from logs in order that our lumbermen might take advantage of the reduction of duties recently made in the United States. Canada imposed an export duty of \$2 per 1000 feet board measure on pine logs, an export duty of \$1 per 1000 feet on spruce logs, and an export duty of \$1.50 per cord of 123 cubic feet on shingle bolts of pine or cedar and cedar logs, capable of being made into shingle bolts. These were the Canadian export duties in full. The new United States tariff provides for a reduction in the duty on pine lumber from \$2 to \$1 per thousand feet, but the reduced duty was made to apply only to lumber coming from countries where no export duties were charged on logs, bolts, etc. This of course was intended to apply to Canada, with the object of forcing this country to remove the export duty on logs and bolts, in order to secure advantage of the reduced duty on pine lumber. It will be understood that the United States reduces the duty only on pine. On other lumber the duty remains at \$2 per thousand, with the exception of boards, planks, deals, etc., of whitewood, basswood, sycamore and hemlock, which are dutiable at \$1, this being the rate on this class of lumber before the new bill was brought in. The duties named are for sawn lumber, 50 cents extra for planed, \$1 extra for grooved, \$1.50 extra for double grooved. On spruce, which is an important Canadian lumber, the duty going into the United States is \$2 per 1000 feet, though spruce is less valuable than pine. On account of the reduced duty being on pine only, the reduction will be of no advantage to British Columbia, as that province does not produce pine lumber to any extent. The pine regions of Ontario will be benefitted mainly, as Quebec and the lower provinces do not produce much pine. The new United States tariff also reduces the duty on hewn or sawn timber from 20 to 10 per cent., and on squared timber from 1 cent per foot to $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per cubic foot. On spruce clapboards the duty is \$1.50 per thousand, and on pine clapboards \$1 per thousand. Again on white pine shingles the duty is reduced from 35 to 20 cents per thousand, while on other shingles the reduction is only from 35 to 30 cents per thousand. On railway ties, telegraph poles, etc., formerly free, a duty of 25 per cent. has been imposed.

An understanding of these figures will show that Canada will be benefitted only to a limited extent by the new lumber duties, and this will be confined principally to the pine districts of Ontario. The great timber province of British Columbia will not gain much from the reduced duties. The reduction of 5 cents on shingles will not help the cedar shingle trade of the Pacific province materially, though the reduction on hewn, sawn and squared timber may be of some little benefit.