

## OUR LUMBER POLICY.

The following letter dealing with Ontario lumber trade and American tariff conditions is sent to the *Toronto World* by Mr. John Waldie, a well-known Ontario lumberman:

"The condition of the lumber industry in Ontario at the present moment is attracting public attention to a very great extent, owing to the fact that the Dingley bill not only provides for an import duty of \$2 per thousand on rough or undressed lumber, but also carries with it a condition that it Canada should place an export duty on sawlogs, the amount of such export duty will be added to the import duty; in effect, threatening Canada, should she resume the position that formerly existed when the United States had a \$2 import duty on lumber, and Canada had a \$2 export duty on sawlogs, and ignoring the agreement made seven years ago, whereby (nappily for both countries) the United States reduced their import duty to \$1, and the Canadian Government withdrew the export duty.

The "kicking" or "we dare you" clause has since been embodied in the American legislation at the request of a few interested lumbermen in Michigan, who are drawing their supplies of pine logs from Canada.

The conditions that govern in the lumber industry to-day are quite different from what they formerly were, inasmuch as Canadian mills, as well as Michigan mills, have to go further for their supply of logs, and both are drawing from the same sources.

We have, therefore, to consider what is best for the people of Ontario, as, no doubt, the American legislation considered what was best for the people of Michigan, and in doing so we have to consider the geographical position of the different portions of Canada, as well as that of the United States, and it presents, in some respects, the same feature as the alien labor law presented. In some provinces of Canada they were not affected by it, while in others it was enforced in a very irritating manner. Therefore, our legislation at Ottawa permits the enforcement of our recent Act by Order-in-Council, in one province, when required, while not put in operation generally.

Let us consider the conditions of the lumber business as they exist to-day. There has been very great general depression throughout the United States and in Canada. In connection therewith there has been a greatly lessened demand for sawn lumber. Building operations have not been carried on to the usual extent for several years, while the manufacture of lumber has steadily increased, partly owing to the desire of the large operators who bought their standing timber at high prices to save interest by cutting it off promptly.

Everyone engaged in the lumber industry in Ontario can clearly see that if the millmen in Michigan are allowed to have free logs, towed to their mills with their own tugs, using free coal, to large centres, where the refuse of a mill can be sold at a profit, that, if added to the natural advantages they have, \$2 per thousand in their own markets, with the right of sending the coarse and inferior product back into Canada free of charge, that it will utterly destroy the sawmill industry of the Georgian Bay, where the logs have to be towed from the same source as the American mills draw their supply, by tugs which are required to pay duty upon their coal and outfit.

Now, it is a question whether the Government at Ottawa should meet the difficulty by an export duty, or should it be met in some other way. I am quite in accord with the proposition outlined in the letter of Mr. Bertram; that as it is a local question, it should be dealt with by the Local Government, and, while an export duty would apply whether the timber was cut upon public or upon private lands, any action of the Local Government would only apply to the public lands.

Two local interests are affected at the

present moment—the local Michigan interest and the local Ontario or Georgian Bay interest—in the manufacture of sawn lumber.

The Dingley bill is specially drawn to care for the Michigan sawmill interests. What is asked by Mr. Bertram and others is that the Ontario Government meet that condition by continuing the cut of pine timber on the Crown lands, for a term, to such quantities as are required to keep the sawmills in Ontario in operation. That is, continue the manufacture of pine lumber taken from Crown lands to Canadian mills. In this way no impediment or hindrance is placed upon the settler in the disposition of his wood of any kind, and a great benefit will be conferred upon the trade generally by a limiting of the cut to the need of our own mills, until the market resumes a normal condition.

From the geographical position of Ontario, transportation of wood products govern equal with the market values in different places. As an example, Ottawa can put lumber at the ship's side in Montreal for \$1 per M. feet, B.M. From the Georgian Bay the rate is \$3. Therefore, the Georgian Bay mill must seek a nearer market or lose the difference, and, as there is not \$2, or anything like that margin, in the business to-day, it is not possible for them to manufacture extensively for the English market. A portion of the better quality will naturally find its way east, about one-tenth of the product, therefore it is useless to suppose that a Georgian Bay sawmill can compete with Ottawa for the English market.

The question is, Who are to suffer by the unfriendly legislation? There are not more than ten Michigan limit-holders, and half that number of Canadians, who tow the immense quantity of sawlogs to Michigan, while on the other hand the mills at Wiarton, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Penetanguishene, Midland, Victoria Harbor, Waubesa, Heskerton, Coldwater, Parry Sound, etc. (where the owners are limit-holders), give employment to fully 2,000 men, representing at least a population of 6,000; and if the employees in the foundries and machine shops at Brantford, Peterborough, etc., where sawmill machinery is made, were included, at least 20,000 of our people would suffer.

The question is, Can the Ottawa or Ontario Government stand idly by and see such results? I do not believe it; and, as the easiest, simplest and most effective means can be used by the Ontario Government inserting a condition that all the timber cut on the Crown lands under license shall be manufactured in Canada, let it be done at once by order-in-Council, supplemented, if need be, by an Act of Parliament. Timber or deeded land would not be interfered with nor settlers disturbed in their employment, and no vested interest would suffer. The same regulation would apply to all alike, and the lessened cut of sawlogs and lumber would be a benefit to all concerned.

JOHN WALDIE,

President Victoria Harbor Lumber Co. (Limited).

Toronto, 7th August, 1897.

## BRITAIN'S CARRYING TRADE.

An English journal says that last year the United States carried only twelve per cent. of the total exports and imports of that country. So that, after a hundred years of national life, the United States are doing less than half the percentage of the shipping trade that was done by the thirteen British colonies prior to 1795. Meanwhile Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy have been steadily increasing their carrying trade. Of course England, France, Germany and Italy have been increasing their shipping, but the people have been paying for it in subsidies. This year the "Campania," "Lancania," "Majestic," and "Teutonic" will receive some \$35,000 each. The Peninsular and Oriental Company will receive about half as much for each of four steamers, and the Canadian

Pacific gets \$100,000 for their three steamers. The armament kept in readiness for such ships in England, in India, and in Hong Kong or Esquimaux, consists of breech-loaders in place of the previous muzzle-loaders. In the event of war breaking out each ship is to be supplied with twenty-six seamen gunners from the naval depots, in addition to a full complement of men from the Royal Naval Reserve.

## ANGLO-SAXON COURAGE.

"Don't be nervous; there'd be fifty jackies over the side after the youngster before he'd have time to strike the water." So said a naval officer once in my hearing to the anxious mother of two little chaps who, visiting one of our men-of-war in the harbor, had gone forward among the crew in company with half a score of kindly, big-hearted blue jackets. And what he said—allowing for some sailor-like picturesqueness of language—was largely true, for when did one ever hear of man-o'-war's man—at least of those that speak English—failing to take any risk, short of absolute impossibilities, to save life, or to go to the rescue of those in peril and distress on the "mighty deep." I think it is in one of Clark Russell's stories that the hero, storm-tossed on a sinking wreck, breathes forth a prayer that the sail he has just sighted may fly English or American colors, confident of rescue at all hazards at sturdy Saxon hands. On the "Trenton," dragging, with colors flying, slowly to destruction on the wind-torn waters of Samoa Bay, generous hearts yet found means of rescuing comrades from the masts of the already submerged "Vandalia." Only the other day the telegraph flashed from far-off China curt news of the foundering of a steamship with its load of passengers, and the prompt response of the crews of our warships near by to the cry for help. Over and over again the heroic story has been told, and it will be told again and again as long as men "go down to the sea in ships."—*Harper's Weekly*.

## SOME COOL SENSE.

The *New York Journal of Commerce*, in an editorial condemning the warlike writings which appear in some of the American papers, has the following reference to the Behring Sea difficulty:

Congress has not performed its duty to England in the sealing matter. The Paris tribunal, upon the creation of which we insisted, decided that we were liable for damages for the capture of British sealers. Our Executive agreed to pay \$425,000 for that liability. Congress refused to pay that sum, and has taken no step to pay any other sum. This is not creditable to us, and it is in the very worst taste for us, in view of this failure to discharge our obligations, to accuse England of bad faith. But the fact is that the negotiations with England for the preservation of the seals is proceeding, and the relations between the officials of the two Governments are friendly enough, and no responsible official of either Government would dream of allowing the two countries to drift into war, or anything approaching war, over the seals.

—The following story is told of the late Sir John Bennett, the well-known English watchmaker: He was, with two friends, travelling up to London from an outlying place some fifteen or twenty miles distant, when a little dispute arose as to the exact distance of the journey. The two friends were emphatic in their contradictions of each other's statements, and eventually offered to back their own opinions. At this point Sir John came to the rescue. He would not hear of a money bet, but consented to allow them to settle matters by betting a ten-guinea (Bennett's) watch.