

ation. Coming to the Sutherland Commission, he said it had cost less than 4 per cent. of the interest for one year on the amount Sir Adam Beck had proposed to spend on Hydro-radials. Naturally, he was closely questioned as to his figures, but he refused to be sidetracked. He claimed the cost of the Gregory Commission would be a small thing compared with the investments it was probing.

Then came the usual crack at Mr. Ferguson, whom the Attorney-General accused of saying a departmental inquiry had cost two or three thousand dollars whereas the total expenditure was but \$58.30. He supposed a lot of Conservatives believed everything their Leader said.

Hint at Campaign Funds.

Next Mr. Raney switched to a lengthy defense of the Backus deal, and what looked at first like a serious scrap began. This deal had been criticized by Gen. Hogarth of Port Arthur, and the Attorney-General went out of his way to tell the House that Gen. Hogarth now spent most of his time in Oklahoma. Several times Mr. Raney had to appeal to the Speaker, who ruled against interruptions. Col. Currie tried to ask a question, and the Speaker told him to take his seat, while the Attorney-General said he preferred to answer no more questions. He compared the Backus deal with Mr. Ferguson's reputed offer to the Spanish River Company for 4,000 square miles of pulpwood lands, adding that the Spanish River Company had financed on the strength of a letter from the former Minister, now Conservative Leader. During an interchange the Attorney-General mentioned something about campaign funds, which brought Mr. Ferguson to his feet with an indignant denial. "Campaign funds came from somewhere," retorted Mr. Raney.

Mr. Raney denied any secret, sinister motives in the Backus bargain, and added that the Conservative criticism had suggested improprieties. This and many interruptions again forced him to ask for protection "against the member for Grenville. I know he is nervous." T. H. Lennox took up the task of asking questions, but was told, "You may not ask that question, nor any other question."

Cash-and-Carry Patronage.

The Shevlin-Clarke Co. limits, sold by Mr. Ferguson when a Minister, formed a good subject for Mr. Raney. He told how J. A. Mathieu, Conservative, M.P.P. for Rainy River, was Vice-President of this company, and how an utterly inexperienced young man, McDonald, had valuated the timber berth without seeing it, and practically had done the same thing with other berths, by which the Shevlin-Clarke Co. had benefited. Much of Mr. Raney's statement was taken from the evidence in the timber probe. Mr. Ferguson interrupted to admit that it was the "grossest piece of misrepresentation ever practiced on the department," but the admission did not save him from the wrath of the Attorney-General. Mr. Raney charged that Mathieu, who was not in the House yesterday, really had been given a present of more than a million dollars. The deal was dubbed "gross cash-and-carry patronage," and "perhaps there has been nothing in Canada to compare with the relations between Mathieu and the member for Grenville."

A New Hydro Policy.

A significant remark was uttered by Mr. Raney in dealing with the Nipigon power controversy. He was telling of the attempts made to get Mr. Allstead of the Great Lakes Paper Co. and Sir Adam Beck together on the price of power. "And this is no novelty—friction developed," he asserted. Further, he announced that the Government might override the Hydro Commission and fix the price of power at

Port Arthur and Fort William. This price would be the same for both places. He contended the Government had the right to do this, in view of the present deficits there.

Mr. Raney admitted he had neglected to deal with many matters affecting his own department, and again the U.F.O. were given a chance to cheer when he eulogized the Premier, who, he said, had not sought his position, and who, if defeated, "will retire to his plow at Crown Hill and be perfectly content."

No Redistribution Words.

So ended as militant a speech as was ever delivered in the Legislature, and one which will require Conservative answers for many days to come. But, in case someone forgets it all in the heat of political battle, it must be mentioned that Mr. Raney had not a word to say on redistribution and the amendment to the Address calling for it.

Charles McCrea, Conservative, Sudbury, continued the debate, naturally entering into a totally different explanation of the Backus deal from that given by Mr. Raney.