

man, not only in this House, but throughout the country, and I am using, I hope, a parliamentary term, when I say that he is looked upon as a political humbug. Well, Sir, this charge from this time out cannot be without proof, because, in the statement the hon. gentleman himself made he proved it to the letter. It seems difficult to believe that a man who poses as a Christian politician, as a moralist, who even goes into the house of God and preaches on Sunday, should have said that he is maligned by misrepresentations. The hon. gentleman has said that he misrepresented as to who he was, in order to gain an end for his own advantage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order. I made no such assertion.

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly, and I believe other hon. gentlemen understood him to say that he led the Secretary of State to believe that he was an American, so that he could better secure the ends he was endeavouring to promote.

Mr. CHARLTON. No. I did not.

Mr. BENNETT. And that if he had gone there as a Canadian he would not have effected his purpose as he did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Let the hon. gentleman state what he did say.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Norfolk denies that he made that statement. The House must accept that denial.

Mr. BENNETT. All I can say is that "Hansard," to-morrow, will prove whether the hon. gentleman said it or not, and I will withdraw it. The hon. gentleman came here to-night, and what did he say? He said that the Wilson Bill as it stood, and the memorial of John Charlton, of Michigan, who, perhaps, may be the hon. member for North Norfolk, or may not be the hon. gentleman, but who was certainly a man who was conspiring against the interests of Canada; and that "Mr. John Charlton, of Michigan," who wrote that memorial—

Mr. CHARLTON. No such representation was made.

Mr. BENNETT. And the man "John Charlton, of Michigan," whether he was or was not the hon. member for North Norfolk; I do not say yea or nay, but I have my own opinion about it, and I think hon. gentlemen have theirs, too. He comes here to-night with a statement that when the Wilson Bill had passed the House of Representatives, and when it was going to the Upper House, that Bill was going to be changed, and that a clause in it that was favourable to Canada, was going to be eliminated. Where is the proof? Why, we have but the

bare statement of the hon. gentleman himself, and not even on oath, as an hon. gentleman suggests. Perhaps that would not go much further in this House, because affidavits of the hon. gentleman have been heard here. The hon. gentleman states then that he caused that Bill to be amended and to be changed. Then if he did, he must have been the writer of the memorial which was sent to Secretary of State, Carlisle. Then, if he be the author of that article, I say that he dare not go before the people of Canada and attempt to condone, or attempt to palliate, or attempt to make good the charges that he has made there. Why, Sir, what is his position? Here was a Bill being passed by the House of Representatives of the United States conceding to the people of Canada privileges that they had not previously enjoyed; here was a Bill being passed that would have permitted the people of this country to have imposed prohibitory tariff export duty on white pine logs, and would have permitted other products of the forest to be admitted free to the United States. That would have meant that we could have exported ties, cedar posts, pulp wood, and all these articles that are combined in the wooden schedule free of duty, and at the same time we could have imposed a prohibitory duty on white pine logs, which could only have brought about a return to \$1 a thousand duty against Canadian lumber. The people of Canada did not fear a \$1 duty on lumber. The lumbermen of Canada had paid \$2 duty, and had made money at that, and all that possibly could have resulted would have been a return to the \$1 duty on lumber. These most enduring benefits to the people of Canada in respect to these other matters would have been granted; but the man, who was to be vitally struck by that was the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If the hon. gentleman is loyal to Canadian interests why does he not establish a saw-mill on the north shore? Why does he not afford Canadians and Canadian lumber a chance? The hon. gentleman has not a saw-mill in Canada, but he is engaged in the work of towing Canadian logs into Michigan so that they can be manufactured there. The hon. gentleman is engaged in the business of selling logs to American lumbermen, and therefore he was the man who was to be hurt. It was not the Canadian lumberman that he was fearful for at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I never sold a log to a Michigan lumberman in my life. I am not in the business of selling logs.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has not been interested in any way in any logs that have been sold to American lumbermen?

Mr. CHARLTON. I did some years ago sell timber, and that was sent to New