

THE CANADA LUMBERMAN

VOLUME XXI.
NUMBER 3.

TORONTO, CANADA, MARCH, 1901

TERMS, \$1.00 PER YEAR
Single Copies, 10 CENTS

MR. JOHN ARBUTHNOT.

The present chief municipal officer of the city of Winnipeg is an esteemed representative of the lumber trade, in the person of Mr. John Arbuthnot, whose features are portrayed on this page. Mr. Arbuthnot was born at St. Catharines, Ont., and was educated at the public school there. Leaving St. Catharines in 1882 he engaged with the late John Ross, contractor, with whom he worked on C.P.R. construction on the north shore of Lake Superior. In 1885 he carried out a contract on the Northern Pacific Junction Railway in Muskoka, and in 1887 another on the Milwaukee Northern Railway in Wisconsin.

In the year 1888, Mr. Arbuthnot started in the lumber business in connection with the Western Lumber Company at Rat Portage, Ont., and in the spring of 1892 established a wholesale and retail lumber business in the city of Winnipeg, which he still conducts.

Mr. Arbuthnot served as Alderman for Ward 5 in 1897 and 1898, and in the latter year was chairman of the Board of Works. He was elected as Mayor of the city at the last municipal elections.

CONSUMPTION OF RAILWAY TIES.

How many railroad ties are used annually in the United States is a question which is often propounded, but on which there are no exact statistics. There are about 205,000 miles of main line track in the United States at the present time. It is estimated by railroad men that about 400 ties to the mile are each year required for replacements, the average number of ties to the mile is 2,800, and the average life of a tie is seven years. There is therefore required on the present railroad mileage of the country about 82,000,000 ties annually for replacements, with another 14,000,000 needed for new track, assuming that the construction is about 5,000 miles annually. There is thus a total use in sight of about 96,000,000 ties a year. Something over a year ago it was estimated that of the 80,000,000 ties then said to be used for renewals each year, 45,000,000 were of oak, 12,500,000 of pine, 3,500,000 of chestnut, 5,000,000 of cedar, 2,500,000 of hemlock and tamarac, 2,500,000 of redwood, and 1,500,000 of cypress.

Ross & Taylor, of Exeter, Ont., intend building a new planing mill in the spring.

A suit involving about \$400,000 was recently heard in the Superior Court at Hull, this sum being the amount claimed to be due Mrs. F. Dezouche, of Bryson, by Alex. Fraser, of Ottawa, for the alleged improper sale of a timber limit. Mr. Fraser maintains that the limit was legally and advantageously sold.

REQUISITION FOR IMPORT DUTY.

FOLLOWING is a copy of the memorial presented to the Dominion Government by the British Columbia Lumber & Shingle Manufacturers' Association asking for a duty on lumber imported from the United States:

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C.
Premier, and Members of the Dominion Government:

Sirs,—On three former occasions in 1898, 1899 and 1900, we, the Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers of British Columbia, have ad-

present tariff, being, we believe, the only manufacturing industry in Canada which is left totally without protection in our own home markets, whilst contributing largely to the more prosperous conditions of other manufacturers and producers whose manufactures we use, and for which we pay enhanced prices consequent on the protection which they enjoy under the present existing tariff from the competition and cheaper price of like manufactures and productions in the United States.

Our industry contributes largely to the revenues of both Dominion and Provincial Governments in timber dues and by customs duties on all machinery and supplies used in the production of our commodities, or, as we have already pointed out, we contribute to the prosperity of manufacturers of machinery and saw mill supplies of all kinds, and to that of millers and farmers by paying to them higher prices as before referred to, and to that of railways by the carriage of these supplies and of our own productions. On the other hand, when a contractor requires timber for some important Government work such as a canal or bridge, a railway for bridge or trestle work, a manufacturer for a new factory or mill, or a farmer for a new barn or dwelling, and we ask for our production a mere living price, we are met with the reply that pitch pine from the United States can be obtained at cheaper prices, or pine from Minnesota can be got at less cost, and that even our own description of lumber can be bought cheaper on Puget Sound, which may be possible, as they can produce cheaper, because all their supplies cost less.

The above is not a distorted representation, but the true state of our trade, and we trust that it may clearly show the injustice of the conditions under which our business lies.

We have had to base the prices of our productions on those of producers who have advantages towards cheap manufacture which we do not possess. The imposition of a duty on lumber and shingles is not sought for as a means of increasing prices, and competition between the many Canadian producers would prevent this if attempted, but the United States manufacturers having a protected home market of their own in which they make every effort to maintain prices, regularly disturb our conditions and prices by using our Canadian markets as a dumping ground in which to unload their surplus stock at prices below what they will accept in their own markets, or at which we can, under present conditions, manufacture, and it is from this unfair competition we ask protection.



MR. JOHN ARBUTHNOT, WINNIPEG.

dressed you on the subject of the anomalous and unfair conditions under which we have to carry on our trade, in the hope that some alleviation of these conditions would be effected by legislation in the direction of the imposition of customs duties on lumber and shingles imported into Canada from the United States.

We have to regret that so far nothing has been done with reference to this matter, which is of so much vital importance to us that we are forced again to bring the subject to your notice, in the hope that conditions may now permit of a favourable consideration of our desires.

The chief burden of our complaint is that our trade is unfairly discriminated against under the