

Q. Then will it not be an advantage to have such a thing happen on the other side as happened at the time you are talking about, that lumber will be cheap so that we can get it from the other side and save our own?—A. Yes, but you cannot get lumber from them except when it suits them.

Q. I know you cannot get it from them now, but you could at that time?

*By Mr. Lancaster:*

Q. Is it not a good thing to have another shop to go to?—A. Yes.

Q. But what the chairman means is that if the duty was put back on lumber you would lose the other shop to go to?—A. Of course there is just this about it, if the object of having the duty taken off lumber was to enable the lumber to be imported so as to take the place of lumber that we have, and to save our standing timber, that would be one consideration, but if the removal of the duty from the lumber had for its object the getting of lumber cheaper by the consumer, I think then it has been a failure.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. I can give you my own personal experience. I bought a good deal of lumber for my own buildings in Manitoba, and I bought it from the American side, and I bought, I think, better boards than I can get at almost any price now at \$12 per thousand delivered?—A. I can understand that you were buying under exceptional circumstances, I presume, Mr. Greenway?

Q. Well, that was a benefit to me, I was a consumer?—A. But I do not think it was a benefit to anybody to have the duty taken off.

Q. If there had been two dollars duty I would have had to pay \$14.

*By Mr. Sloan:*

Q. You stated here to-day that lumber is being shipped to Chicago from the Rainy river, what authority have you for making that statement, Mr. Sprague?—A. Well, I was told so by the Rainy River people who shipped it.

Q. You are prepared to accept it, are you?—A. Yes, I think it is true.

Q. It would evidently appear then there is not much danger of any great competition from the United States as long as they have got on their own side of the line a market for their own product?—A. I don't think there is. The circumstances of the removal of the duty, I fancy, we all know. The object in removing it was probably as much for political reasons as it was in the interests of the consumer of lumber. It was removed and this lumbermen's association was given as the excuse for its removal. Since that time the manufacturers of lumber have made several efforts to have the duty re-imposed, and I said that I would give some information that I gave to the Finance Minister at one time in reference to that.

*By Mr. Herron:*

Q. Here is a letter under date of Vancouver, B.C., February 28, 1906, to Isaac Cockburn from the Pacific Coast Lumber Co. The last paragraph of the letter is the only one that I desire to bring to the notice of the witness (reads):—

'We are sorry to see that our name was left off the list of members working in harmony with your association, and would like very much if you would kindly restore it to your list. We have no hesitation in promising you that we will do everything necessary to keep fully in accord with your association.'

A. I was a director of the Pacific Coast Lumber Company, and refused to buy lumber from them while they sold to consumers. There has been a good deal of evidence given—and I am sure you want to get all the information you can—which would go to indicate that independent yards, through the efforts of the Retail Association, could not buy lumber. An effort has been made to prove that. Now, if you will give me permission, I will read this letter, which will not be very long (reads):—

'In reference to our conversation'—