

## APPENDIX No. 6

tion the restriction was still maintained that a man could not buy from the wholesaler unless he was a member of the Retailers' Association?—A. Our restriction was always on, Mr. Lancaster, but they did sell to anyone and that was the cause of the friction, that was the cause of the trouble between the manufacturers and the retail dealers. The cause of the trouble was that the manufacturers were selling, and several independent yards were selling to anybody they saw fit. And not only that, but the retailers were buying from everybody.

Q. Yes.—A. Now, when they withdrew the Retail Association would accept any yard as a member that was established at that time.

Q. Yes—So that—

*By the Chairman :*

Q. The association would accept him as a member, but he had to become a member?—A. There was not any restriction as far as membership was concerned.

*By Mr. Lancaster :*

Q. The manufacturers who were on friendly terms with the association were only to sell to members and the members were only to buy from wholesalers who were friendly to the association?—A. That is what the association was proposing to do according to that resolution, but, of course, as a matter of fact, they sold to everybody they liked.

*By Mr. McIntyre (Perth) :*

Q. They did so in spite of the retail association?—A. They did so in spite of the resolution. Of course it is one thing to pass a resolution and another thing to give it effect.

*By Mr. Crockett :*

Q. At any rate that was a specific instruction to the secretary to strike off the membership list any wholesaler who would sell to any other than a member of your association?—A. Well, I do not know, whether in practice any were struck off the list.

Q. But the secretary was instructed to strike them off?—A. Yes, that is right.

*By the Chairman :*

Q. Is there anything else you would like to say?—A. There is one other matter I would like to speak upon. The question of duty has been mentioned, and I would like to put in a letter to the Hon. Mr. Fielding from myself when he was out getting information for the tariff revision. Now this is of interest to the committee because it is a comparison of the prices that obtain on the Canadian side and those that obtain on the American side at that particular time?

Q. When was this?—A. This was on December 13, 1905. It was a little earlier than that when the commission met at Brandon. Mr. Cameron and I appeared before them and I made the statement that there was not any case for a duty at that particular time because the price of lumber on the Canadian side of the line was cheaper than on the other side. That, of course, was promptly disputed by several who were there, and I promised Mr. Fielding that I would send him a letter and give him the lists.

*By the Chairman :*

Q. What verification have you of that, Mr. Sprague?—A. Of this letter?

Q. How are those figures prepared. You speak of two sets of prices?—A. It is my own letter and the price lists were sent to the Minister. I have a copy of the letter and the price lists.

Mr. LANCASTER.—If Mr. Sprague swears his letter is true I suppose it would be evidence.