

WILLIAM E. BURT  
7038 SUNRISE CIRCLE  
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE 37067

**RECEIVED**

(615) 662-1924

OCT 15 2003

DEPT. OF COMMERCE  
ITA  
IMPORT ADMINISTRATION

October 7, 2003

The Honorable James J. Jochum  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration  
U.S. Department of Commerce, Central Records Unit, Room 1870  
Pennsylvania Ave & 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20230

Attention: Section 201 Duties

Dear Assistant Secretary Jochum:

In response to your request in the Sept. 9 Federal Register for comments on the appropriateness of deducting section 201 duties and countervailing duties from prices in order to calculate antidumping duties, I believe it is essential that the Department amend its policy immediately to fully address the magnitude of dumping by counting subsidy duties as a cost.

**My family owns 650 acres of pine timber in Emanuel County, Georgia. Since the early 1980's, we have spent in excess of \$90,000 (probably \$250,000 - \$300,000 in 2003 dollars) clearing and planting pine timber on this property, anticipating a fair price when the timber was marketed. We recently contracted to sell approximately 3,500 tons of pine pulpwood at \$6.29/ton as a part of our timber management plan. That price compares to a market price of approximately \$12/ton in late 2000 and approximately \$22/ton for pulpwood we sold in 1998. We believe that this dramatic drop in timber prices is a direct result of the Canadian dumping and results in an unfair market price for my family and other American timber growers.**

As a U.S. forest landowner, I sell my standing timber at a competitive market price and the buyer is responsible for harvesting costs, transportation, and all the other expenses of obtaining logs to be used to produce lumber. All of these costs must be recovered in a fair price for the finished product if our industry is to remain profitable and robust.

That is not the case in Canada -- Canadian producers buy timber at government-subsidized rates that do not reflect market forces and are unfairly low. The Department of Commerce imposed duties to offset the subsidies, but the Canadian prices still do not reflect a fair price as the


Canadian mills have decided to simply “eat” losses and buy market share -- this is dumping. Dumping duties are currently being imposed on Canadian shippers.

The Department’s current policy of not including countervailing duties as a cost when calculating dumping rates is very problematic as it does not accurately assess the full scope of the dumping. The subsidy duty is imposed in an effort to level the playing field between importers and the domestic industry by offsetting the value of the subsidy – it reflects what their true costs should be in a competitive market. Costs that must be recouped in their sales prices if they are not to be considered dumping into the U.S. market.

We strongly favor changing the Department’s policy to align it with current policy in both Canada and the European Community. This is the only way to place Canadian mills on a level playing field and to stop their predatory trade practices from diminishing the value of U.S. forest lands.

We are of the view that the enormous problem of unfair Canadian lumber trade will only be solved when the Canadian governments and mills understand very clearly that they must stop their unfair practices or the U.S. government will fully offset the unfair trade.

Sincerely,



William E. Burt