

it was preposterous to suppose that the southern lumber states would make common cause with Michigan and seek to help them to get free logs, because that would serve to make more effectual Michigan competition against themselves. Why, Mr. Speaker, what they were afraid of was the competition of the Canadian mills, the sending of free lumber from Canada. They cared nothing for the competition of Michigan, for they had had that competition for generations; but they had a suspicion that the enacting of the free lumber provisions would interfere with their business by lowering the price of Canadian lumber in the American markets. Consequently, though this was a part of the Democratic scheme, these states looked upon that feature of the Bill with disfavour. They had in their hearts a desire to see that feature of the Bill eliminated, and they ask only a good and suitable excuse to array themselves against that feature. As I told the hon. gentleman this afternoon, Senator Morgan, the most influential of all the Senators from any southern lumber state, had spoken against free lumber in the Democratic caucus on the 26th February. I considered that an indication of very grave import so far as the prospects of free lumber was concerned. I knew if Senator Morgan's influence was cast against free lumber, the game was up. When the hon. gentleman asked, What was the purpose of the export duty proviso, I tell him that he must have very little discernment, indeed, if he does not see what was the purpose of that proviso. The purpose of that proviso was to allay the hostility that existed against this free lumber provision in that Bill; the purposes of that proviso was to secure the influence of Michigan, which was being withdrawn; the purpose of that proviso was to set aside the hostility of all the southern lumber states, represented in the Senate by at least fourteen Democratic Senators, while there was in the Senate only a Democratic majority of four, if my memory is not at fault. That was the purpose of the export duty proviso. I have laid before this House the absolute certainty of the statement I have made, that the proviso put into that Bill with reference to export duty, alone saved the free lumber provision of that Bill. Now, if that is true, and I affirm it is true, how utterly unjustifiable is the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and of all the members on that side of the House. In pursuing the course they have pursued towards me with regard to this matter; in seeking to cast discredit upon me, and in the very next breath turning around and accepting thankfully the fruits of the arrangement that was made late in February, for which they condemn me. Free lumber was saved, it was saved through this export

Mr. CHARLTON.

duty proviso of the Wilson Bill, that was effectual for the purpose for which it was intended; and free lumber being saved, the Government of Canada was at liberty to put on an export duty, or it was at liberty to abstain from doing it. They were not obliged to accept this proviso that was made by the American Congress. They could have put on an export duty, they could have raised it, or they could have done anything else they chose, and, in doing it, they could have allowed free lumber to go by the board. They did not do it, they thankfully accepted the arrangement, they did not restore the export duty, and they removed the boom duty. First of all, they put the boom duty in abeyance, then they put it in abeyance again last December, and then they totally removed it; and they did all this for the purpose of securing the advantages that the export duty proviso of the Wilson Bill, arranged in February, 1894, secured for the lumber men of Canada. Now, it is said that I went and made representations as a Michigan man. I suppose if I had gone to the Secretary of the Treasury and said: "I am a Canadian lumberman, and I want this and that," I would probably have had a great deal of influence in that quarter. When in Washington, I did what was necessary to avert this disaster.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You would not deceive him?

Mr. CHARLTON. I would not deceive him. I did not deceive him, but I would not foolishly give away the chances I had for the object I had in view. That would not have been diplomatic, and I would not have thrown away recklessly the chances that were laid before me, as my hon. friend's colleagues did when they were in Washington as a reciprocity commission, by refusing to consider a scheme that would include an agreed list of manufactures, and by imperiously presenting their own terms of reciprocity in natural products as their ultimatum. I was after free lumber, and I was going just as far, in my judgment, it was necessary to go in order to secure my purpose; and I was working in the interests of the lumbermen of Canada, and for the good of my fellow-citizens. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that he repudiates me, that his Government repudiates me as an envoy looking after Canadian interests in Washington. I never asked them to authorize me to look after Canadian interests. I never acted as their agent, and I never desired to do so. I went down to Washington, and I acted in the capacity of a private citizen of Canada, I acted in the interests of Canada. I tell the hon. gentleman that if what is said with regard to this export duty proviso being attributable to me, is true, I did more for the interest of Canada in Washington than in all his genius, and