

sent those parties when he asked them to send the letters, and then we will have the whole inwardness of it. I am told he frequently invited the department to allow him to negotiate on behalf of Canada, but the department would not. They believed he was not the right man. He spoke of the resolution of the lumbermen of Ottawa valley. What did these lumbermen say? They said that in so far as he has been instrumental in doing anything, we thank him. They did not say he had been instrumental. No doubt he helped to make that resolution himself. It would have been much better for him if he had not revived this question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the members on this side are attacking him. Who invited the attack? We have rather been defending what we said before and believe to be correct. It is the hon. gentleman himself who brought forward this subject.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this question is put to the House, I desire to offer a few remarks which are called for by some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially by the hon. Controller of Customs. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that the Wilson Bill, as it left the Committee of Ways and Means with the proviso attached to it at that time, was good enough for Canada, and ought to have been let alone. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman, in making this statement, evinces a want of knowledge of the position of matters, or to what to attribute the mistake he has made; but he ought to be aware that the Wilson Bill, as it left the Committee of Ways and Means and the House of Representatives, was in a position, as regards the export duty proviso, that was not acceptable to its friends, and that it had arrived at that stage where, if it stood with that export duty proviso, as it left the House of Representatives, the free lumber provisions of the Bill would have been lost. So when the hon. gentleman tells this House that the Bill ought to have been left in the state in which it left the House of Representatives and that meddling with it resulted in striking out a provision eminently satisfactory to Canada and putting in its place a provision less satisfactory, the hon. gentleman has, unconsciously no doubt, misled this House, because that proviso was not satisfactory to the friends of the Wilson Bill in Congress, and had that proviso remained, these free-lumber provisions would not have been in it at all. So that the question to be faced on that oc-

Mr. SPROULE.

casione was what to do in order to secure the retention of the free lumber provisions of the Bill. It was not that the proviso attached to the Bill with regard to the export duty was not satisfactory to Canadians who wanted free lumber, but because the Bill with that proviso could not pass the Senate, because with that proviso everything we desire in connection with that Bill was lost as a foregone conclusion. The hon. gentleman wants to know if I had anything to do with this matter, if I was in Washington at the time, and why I did not let that Bill alone. Simply because I did not like to see the free lumber provisions expunged from the Bill. If I had let the Bill alone, and if no attempt had been made to allay the hostility that was aroused against that Bill in consequence of the defective character—in the estimation of those who wanted free logs—of the export duty proviso of the Bill, and if no attempt had been made to arrange the export duty proviso to the satisfaction of those whose friendship was essential to the passage of the Bill, the free lumber provisions would have been lost. That is why I felt called upon to make an effort in Washington to secure provisions in that Bill that would be satisfactory to those gentlemen upon whose good or ill-will the fate of free lumber in that Bill exclusively depended.

With regard to the Controller of Customs, that hon. gentleman, Sir, very gravely informed this House that the Premier of this Dominion had informed him that I was engaged in a conspiracy with an American delegation that had gone to Washington for the purpose of forcing this Government to do something that they were reluctant to do, and that I had marshalled the forces of the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley who held an interview with him and with the Premier of this country. Certainly I must be a potent individual to marshal the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley and to compel them to act unconsciously in conjunction with this American delegation for the purpose of embarrassing the Government and wrecking certain interests in Canada. Why, the thing is too absurd to make as a statement seriously before this House. What I did, Mr. Speaker, was this: When I was informed by a friend of mine that this delegation was about to depart for Washington, acting on that information and not because I had the direction of that delegation as the hon. gentleman intimated, but knowing from that information when that delegation proposed to leave Bay City, Michigan, and when it would probably reach Washington,—for I knew the route they would probably travel by—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."—I went to the Premier of this Dominion and informed him that such a delegation was on its way to Washington. I showed him the information I possessed in