

Now let me deal with a despatch which appeared in the *Toronto Mail and Empire*, also on April 18, and similar to that of the *Globe*, with the exception, perhaps, that where the *Globe* "reputes" the *Mail and Empire* "suspects".

That the report was written by Senator McDougald, Sir Clifford Sifton and Thomas Ahearn is believed, and the other members of the committee played unimportant parts and did not influence the decision. These three capitalists are either known or suspected of being interested in power schemes, and the proposal to develop the national section first at the expense of private interests who would have the power, is credited to them. The criticisms so far advanced are many and pertinent. . . . that the proposal endorsed by the Government was prepared by power interests represented by Sir Clifford Sifton, Thomas Ahearn and Senator McDougald.

*Speaking for myself, I want to make a further positive and absolute denial of the implications and suspicions of the *Mail and Empire*. The report was prepared by the Advisory Committee, and by the Advisory Committee alone. That the Government put upon that committee men who presumably knew something about power and power schemes was probably for the same reason that it puts upon the Railway Commission men who presumably know something about railways; but for two of the prominent newspapers of this country to put out an impression to the public of this and other countries that the members of the committee were actuated by motives of private gain, or collusion with power interests, is, I think, an action which is undue, unfair and unwarranted. So far as I myself am concerned, I cannot add too much emphasis to my denial of the suspicions and aspersions which these despatches have cast upon me as a member of the Advisory Committee, as a member of this honourable body, and as a private citizen. Perhaps I may take some slight comfort from the fact that this sort of thing seems to be one of the ordinary penalties of public life.*

We have already dealt with the question as to whether or not at the time this speech was made Senator McDougald was the owner in whole or in part of the Winfield Sifton shares or part interests. Even if, however, we are to assume that he became the owner only on 18th May, 1928, he was at the time the above speech was made, and had been for several years before, the owner of the Sterling Industrial Corporation (subject to an indefinite and un-enforceable understanding for division of its stock with Mr. Henry) and the Sterling Industrial Corporation was interested directly and very practically as it turned out, in the St. Lawrence Power and Canalization development at the very point in question. In the body of the *Mail and Empire* article it is said that three capitalists including himself "are either known or suspected of being interested in power schemes and the proposal to develop the national section first at the expense of private interests who would have the power, is credited to them." When, therefore, Senator McDougald made on 19th April, 1928, "positive and absolute denial of the implications and suspicions of the *Mail and Empire*," he was not speaking the language of candor and truth.

Turning now to the speech of Senator McDougald in the Senate on 20th May, 1931, and assuming again that his purchase of the Sifton interests in Beauharnois Company was made on the 18th May, 1928, or twenty-nine days after the speech of 19th April, 1928, we cannot acquit the Senator of lack of candor again in saying in the latter speech that he became interested "some six months later, in October, 1928," when the Sifton part interests previously held