

Evidence showed, proceeded Mr. Sinclair, that the Shevlin-Clarke Company, from 1911 to 1919, had cut 400,000,000 feet of timber not paid for or reported to the Government, and he estimated this was worth, with interest, five millions, or, if the price fixed in the recent court judgment was used as a basis, the sum would run up fairly well to ten millions. With figures such as these, he said, "it is beyond my comprehension why the Government settled for \$250,000.

"I cannot understand why the Government was afraid of the appeal entered by the company," he said. It would have been far better, he argued, to have fought out the case to a finish in the courts than to have made the settlement. "On the figures, no Government is justified in accepting such a paltry sum as this."

#### Often Sued in Minnesota.

These same people controlled lumber companies in Minnesota, Mr. Sinclair proceeded. These Minnesota companies had been brought before the State courts 55 times, and the United States Federal courts 77 times, for trespass and other offenses. They fought the cases there, and when they saw the authorities meant business they made settlements.

Concluding, Mr. Sinclair said they might well ask who it was that was settling these large matters for these small amounts.

J. C. Tolmie, Windsor, said he was prepared to give the former Government any credit due it if it had been trying to find out any new and better solution to avoid fires in timber, but none of them could approve the loose way in which things were done, and in which the deputy land officers in the North sent in their reports. Before the last election in Ontario, proceeded Mr. Tolmie, they had heard nothing from the present Premier or the present Attorney-General concerning timber matters, but from one end of the Province to the other the people had been told that investigation was necessary. The man who had done that was the then Leader of the Liberal party.

Mr. Tolmie then entered upon a vigorous criticism of the speech of the Attorney-General. It had been an excellent speech, he said, but the introduction to it had little to do with the bill. He had shown up the weakness, fraud and insincerity that had run all through the transactions. Mr. Tolmie then had expected the Attorney-General to say that they must rid the country of his sort of thing. Then he brought forward his settlement with the company.

One of the reasons advanced for the settlement, said Mr. Tolmie, was that the Government did not want to put the company out of business. The Government took everything that he had from the operator named Russell in the settlement with him, but when it came to outsiders and a foreign company, the Government said "it had no desire to push it to the wall."

#### "Don't Be Too Charitable."

"Don't let your charity run away with you," Mr. Tolmie counselled the Attorney-General. He was told, he said, that the Shevlin-Clarke Company's assets at Fort Frances could not be replaced for less than a million dollars, and the assets of their timber limits were almost limitless. "If that is true, it seems to me these people deserve no charity, and they deserve no sympathy from us."

He wanted to know if the Attorney-General thought his case so weak that it would topple over in a higher court. The Government should have stood by the judgment; have let the company appeal if it wanted to; and "let us take the consequences, whatever they might be." For \$250,000 it was giving up the claims on all this fraud and injury the Attorney-General claimed had been going on for years and years and years. If the Government was entitled to anything it was not getting what it ought to get. Mr. Tolmie announced that he was going to vote against the bill.

#### Put Government in Dock.

After saying that some of the remarks of Mr. Tolmie were inspired by a desire to get at the Attorney-General, Edgar Watson, North Victoria, asserted vigorously the important thing to remember was that if the Shevlin-Clarke Company stood in the dock today accused and convicted, the Government of the Province of Ontario must stand there alongside it.

"Let them both get into the dock," said Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. Watson exonerated Hon. G. H. Ferguson from any deliberate wrongdoing, but he thought the situation and timber dealing methods were loose, and perhaps the heart of Mr. Ferguson leaned a little too much to gentlemen in his own party. If there was any culpability because of the price paid for the timber, then the Province of Ontario had to share in the burden.

#### Ought to Get More.

Sam Clarke (Liberal, Northumberland) gave the Government of the day credit for accomplishing a good piece of work for the Province. "I think," he said, "that we ought to get more, but we are getting a million and a half more than we expected to get. Mr. Clarke advocated a policy of retention rather than sale of fine timber limits which, he said, in 25 years would repay the investment by two dollars to one.

H. H. Dewart, K.C., former Liberal Leader, opened with the remark that nobody in the House, with smug satisfaction, had ever sought to take to himself the credit that was due somebody else as had the Attorney-General. The Liberal party in past years had bent every effort to get the true conditions before the people, and where, he asked, had anyone ever heard of the Attorney-General advocating on any public platform a policy of forest preservation.

#### Attacks Commission Idea.

He attacked the Government's policy of relegating investigation to a Royal Commission, saying: "Two Judges have been put in such a position that they have almost been degraded from their high estate by being subjected to criticism to which they should not be subjected."

Government by commission, he said, was one of the outstanding errors of the present "irresponsible" Government, which he described as the biggest aggregation of "bunglers" since Confederation. Proceeding, he declared that all the facts in regard to the Shevlin-Clarke controversy had not been submitted to the House, and he specified a letter of Mr. Callaghan's of January 5, 1920, upon which the whole investigation was based.

"Either this settlement should be based upon principle or it should not be entered into at all," he added, in declaring that the Attorney-General had "jumped" at his conclusion and had "better jump out of his job." He twitted Hon. Mr. Raney upon functioning as Minister of Lands and Forests of the Province while the appointed Minister sat in the House.

#### Defends Slash-burning Plan.

Charles McCrea of Sudbury supported the charge that the timber inquiry was political in its inception, and, in the connection of R. T. Harding with it, anything but creditable to the Attorney-General and the Government. He defended the brush-burning experiment, which was the basis of the agreement between the former Minister of Lands, Mr. Ferguson, and the Shevlin-Clarke Company, declaring that experience had shown it to be an important contribution to the conservation of Ontario's forest resources, so important, in fact, that the brush-burning clause was retained in the settlement with the company.

Mr. McCrea differed sharply from the award made by Justice Logie, declaring that it had been based on comparisons, not with timber sales in the Rainy River district, but with