

Mr. Sweezy also on page B117 makes the following answers:—

Q. I think I should ask you this; there has been some question as to funds coming from the corporation and funds coming from yourself, would you have made those donations, some large in amounts, were it not that you were promoter of Beauharnois?—A. Most unlikely.

Q. Is that all you have got to say about it?—A. Well, I think it is obvious that I would not have. I might have been generous but not to that extent.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from these tremendous contributions made to Senator Haydon, on his request, and the fees paid to his office, which are all out of line in respect to services rendered therefor, particularly the large fee of \$50,000 contingent on the passing of Order in Council 422, justify in toto the unanimous finding of the Committee of the House of Commons with respect to Senator Haydon. It must be borne in mind that Sweezy contemplating the user of the full flow of the St. Lawrence River was far from finished seeking favours from the Dominion Government.

Senator Haydon was not examined before the Committee of the House of Commons, and in response to questions asked by his Counsel before this Committee read written replies from a document which contained both questions and written replies. The denial of the contingent fee is in general terms, but the history of the work done by his firm and the accounts filed by it for the work done, drive one to the irresistible conclusion that Sweezy told the plain truth in respect to this transaction, and that Senator Haydon's firm was paid this sum of \$50,000 and received the large retainer over the three year' period which it did, for favours to be done other than legal services and this connection with the later payments by Sweezy in 1930 of such tremendous sums of money justify fully the statement of the Committee of the House of Commons that his actions cannot be defended and should be strongly condemned. It is not too much to say that the only logical conclusion that one can come to is, having regard to the very high place which Senator Haydon held in the Liberal Party, that the influence which he necessarily must have had with the Government of the day was what was sought to be purchased.

There are two further matters on which Counsel feel it their duty to comment.

The first is what is known as the Ferguson incident. It will be remembered that Senator Haydon stated very emphatically and with much heat that in a conversation with Sweezy, referring to the contract between Beauharnois and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, that Sweezy had said "Howard Ferguson won't let it be signed until he gets \$200,000" (B199). It is perhaps sufficient to point out that Mr. Sweezy categorically denies this statement, pointing out that he only met Mr. Ferguson twice in his life and giving details of these two meetings (B217). Mr. Ferguson also at his own expense and at the very first opportunity came all the way from London, England, to be heard, and he categorically denied that he had ever had any such conversation with Mr. Sweezy or with anybody else with respect to this or any other sum, and his recollection of the two meetings which they had, corresponds with that of Mr. Sweezy.

There is a further matter which Counsel suggests deserves comment. At the beginning of the inquiry Mr. Robertson, K.C., Counsel for Senator Haydon, advised the Committee that his client wished to give evidence. He also said that his client was ill. The Committee complied with his request and went on two occasions to Senator Haydon's house to take his evidence, two occasions being necessary because on the first occasion the Committee was advised by Senator Haydon's physician that he should not be questioned further at that