

SUNSHINE HEALTH FLAVOR

in
Campbell's Tomato Soup



DO YOU know the reason for the captivating flavor, the remarkable tang and exhilarating goodness of this masterpiece of soups? It is not alone the matchless quality of Canadian tomatoes, sun-ripened right on the vines—the choice creamery butter and other ingredients. Not alone the spotless new Canadian kitchens which are unexcelled the world over.

Campbell's exclusive recipe is the product of a lifetime of experience. It is this remarkable recipe so skillfully carried out by our expert chefs, which has made Campbell's Tomato Soup the most popular soup not only in Canada, but in the whole world.

Campbell's Tomato Soup is so easy and convenient to get ready for the table. It's Tomato Soup when you add water. It's Cream of Tomato when you add milk or cream. Enjoy it both ways.

CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY LTD
NEW TORONTO • CANADA

MADE IN CANADA

Campbell's SOUPS

SENATE LEADER

(Continued from Page 1)

approbation, accepted a retainer from Mr. Sweezy (then president of Beauharnois) which was contingent upon the approval by the Dominion government of Sweezy's application for ratification of his St. Lawrence development.

Sold Assets of Canada

"The protruding and main facts," added Senator Meighen, "just scream out against Senator Hayden." It was established, he contended, that Senator Hayden utilized his position as a Senator, to further his own interests. The second charge against Senator Hayden was that he collected campaign funds from Beauharnois, proceeded Senator Meighen. "It was a company to which government concessions were vital, were its very life blood. It had received large concessions and had others pending. With that in mind, is any Senator or any person justified in accepting a contribution from that company? I do not think so and I do not think Senator Hayden can justify his actions. He did, in fact, sell the assets of Canada to that company for political purposes."

Withheld Information From Senate

Turning to Senator McDougald, Senator Meighen accused him of acting "in a way that no public man should act." The Montreal Senator, he said, withheld from the Senate information that he was interested in Beauharnois while a member of a committee investigating power projects in the same section of the St. Lawrence. In this he had "misled the House in the matter of his private relationships to his public duty."

In other instances, Senator McDougald's evidence was "incorrect and wrong" and "his conduct was not in line with candor and truth."

In his defence of Senator McDougald, Senator Graham observed that if a senator could not sit on a committee investigating some question, because he owned an interest in a company "then most of us will have to get out of the Senate or out of business."

The committee based some of its criticism of Senator McDougald on his sale to the Beauharnois company of the Sterling Investment Corporation which had a prior claim to power sites. "I am under the impression," said Senator Graham, "most of us would do the same. All he did was make some money out of it and we all like to do that, providing it is ourselves."

"This," said Senator Meighen, "is the crux of the question; did Sweezy or did he not, induce others to take money for what could be nothing else than their political influence." The Beauharnois President engaged lawyers to create a proper atmosphere—they were not so much lawyers as perfumeers—and proceeded to attempt to gain approval of plans. In this, he was successful when the Dominion passed an order-in-council in 1929.

At this point, Senator Meighen digressed to discuss the conduct of Senator Raymond. A distinction must be drawn between him and the other two Senators, he said.

reproach. He had been evasive, not only evasive, but defiant. Every time he got the chance he swung off the track and got into legal argument and political discussions.

Senator Graham had said it was only when Mr. Hayden was pestered that he gave such answers, said Senator Meighen. If Mr. Graham would read the evidence he would see where counsel had suggested times when Mr. Hayden should take a rest, that the committee should adjourn to rest him. Was that pestering?

With regard to the campaign funds, Senator Meighen recalled his previous sentiment that to be entrusted with these was an insinuation of conduct. He did not think Mr. Graham could have thought the matter out, or he would not have said that it did not matter where the campaign funds came from. He had led a party in several elections, continued Mr. Meighen and appreciated the campaign funds were not easy to get. But there was a line beyond which one could not step. If that is transgressed then one was doing what was inherently and eternally wrong. Here was a company, dependent upon the government for concessions. Was any Senator or other person justified in accepting large sums from that source? Mr. Meighen did not think so.

Turning to Senator McDougald, the government leader said he wanted to link the current of the Senator's transactions with four particular occasions. The first was Dr. McDougald's position in the evidence relative to his statement in the Senate in April, 1928. Then, Dr. McDougald had read extracts from an attack on him appearing in the Toronto Globe, then from the Toronto Mail and Empire. The Globe had said that Senator McDougald was reputed to be connected with the Beauharnois Power Company which had recently obtained a charter from the Quebec legislature for development rights on the St. Lawrence. To that the Senator had made absolute denial in unequivocal terms. Not only that but he denied all its implications.

The Mail and Empire had stated that the report of the national advisory committee was written by Senator McDougald, Sir Clifford Sifton and Thomas A'Hearn, and that these three capitalists were suspected of being interested in power schemes in the national section of the river.

In this last article, Beauharnois was never mentioned, commented Mr. Meighen.

The charge was that this trio were suspected of being interested in power schemes.

The government leader recalled the Senate to the emphasis he had placed upon the imperative duty of any members of a legislative body being absolutely frank and correct in any evidence or statement he made relative to his position, where that position might develop conflict between his personal and public duties. Was Senator McDougald's denial of these two statements correct? Senator Graham had suggested that the first was correct, was it not right that these "three capitalists" were interested in power schemes?

Senator McDougald stood in the face of the evidence and said he was not, Senator Meighen declared. When these words were uttered he had filed an application for power schemes—an application which afterwards reaped for him \$300,000 in cash and interests in the later development. Not correct, said Mr. Meighen? The whole implication was correct. What was Dr. McDougald's answer? It was that he had forgotten about sterling, for the reason that the national advisory committee had recommended a development on the north shore, and sterling's application was for a development on the south shore. If it was a fact that this report shut out the south side of the river, why did he take an interest in Beauharnois. That development was on the south side. His interest in Beauharnois showed that this reason fell to the ground.

But, asked Senator Meighen, did the report actually recommend that the development should be on the north side? Throughout these whole proceedings it had been assumed that it did. In the brief prepared by counsel for Dr. McDougald it was stated that the joint engineering board had recommended a north side development and that the national advisory committee had adopted the recommendation.

The whole argument employed to make Senator McDougald appear a disinterested public man rested on this point. Thus, it was asserted, in approving the report, he acted against his own interests. Even if that were correct it would not affect the matter. He might have used his influence in that committee the other way. Or, he may have recommended the north side. That is what he did. But, said Mr. Meighen, hon. gentlemen would be interested to learn that the national

advisory committee never made any recommendation of that kind; and therefore, this virtue of Senator McDougald's did not exist.

"I defy any man to find any recommendation in that report of the national advisory committee for a development on the north side, or any other side," said Mr. Meighen.

Hard Put

One could imagine how hard put Senator McDougald's counsel were to find something to his credit in these circumstances. The committee confined its concurrence to only one feature; therefore, Senator McDougald never acted against his own interest, Mr. Meighen pursued. The report recommended that development should be by private interests in the national section and that power should be used to pay for canalization. Was Dr. McDougald interested in that? He was the man who held sterling. Was he, then, acting as a public man should act, or had he the right to establish himself as a nuisance for money that had come from the people of this country, Senator Meighen asked.

"Not Interested"

Senator McDougald was absolutely right when he said he was not interested in Beauharnois in April, 1928. The Senate committee was specific on the point that he did not become interested until May 19, 1928. But the committee did say that Senator McDougald was open to the greatest suspicion of owning the Sifton shares from the beginning.

Big Profit

Mr. Sifton had acquired the final of his total of 3,200 shares of the second syndicate on May 10, declared Senator Meighen, and on May 18 he had disposed of them to Senator McDougald for exactly what they cost him—although the first block of 800 units he secured at 37.50 had been turned into 1,600 shares of new syndicate worth \$100 each."

Bright Young Man

"Is that explainable?" asked Senator Meighen. "It follows that Sifton must have been a simpleton—and he was not a simpleton. He was one of the brightest young men of his time." If it was true that Senator McDougald wanted to keep his name out of the transaction he would have had Sifton take just the steps he did take. The only reasonable theory was that they were McDougald's shares from the start. Any other theory would lead to confusion and irrationality.

A Real Bargain

In his evidence before the committee Senator McDougald had declared that he paid the same for his shares as everybody else had paid and got the same as everybody else when he sold them. The latter part was true but no person could suggest that the first was true, Senator Meighen argued, when it was on record that he got the first 1,600 shares at \$30,000 when they were costing everybody else \$100 each. Senator McDougald also got 2,000 shares for his holdings in the sterling industrial corporation which had cost him practically nothing beyond the cost of floating a company and flying prior rights on the Soulange district of the St. Lawrence, so his 5,200 shares had cost him "practically nothing."

"The Nuisance Value"

The Senator for Brockville had suggested that Sweezy took over sterling in order to get the engineering services of Mr. Henry, Senator Meighen proceeded, but Senator McDougald had told the committee he was the man who put over the deal that disposed of sterling to Sweezy, and Mr. Sweezy had said his reason was that he wanted to remove McDougald as the obstacle to his securing the rights he sought from the Government. While sterling had nothing of an intrinsic value, he had prior claims to develop the river for power. "It was the nuisance value of sterling—and nothing else—that Sweezy wanted," declared Senator Meighen.

The evidence of Senator McDougald had shown that he, himself, could not tell of any value sterling had except its nuisance value. "He, as a Senator of Canada, used his nuisance value to enrich himself. Has a member of Parliament any right to capitalize himself by being a nuisance?" he asked.

Covering His Tracks

No one had ever given an explanation of why there had been such constant concealment in the transactions of Senator McDougald, proceeded Mr. Meighen. Why was he constantly covering up his

THE CANADIAN STORES LTD.

WHERE QUALITY AND VALUE ARE ALWAYS FOUND

Carnation Milk TALL TINS - - 2 Tins 21c	
WHITE SUGAR, 10 lbs. - - - 49c	
CANADIAN CHEESE CELLEPHANE WRAPPED, PER LB. - - 17c	
Peanut Butter, 10 oz. Jar - 2 for 25c	

ISLAND PORK AND BEANS 2 Tins 19c	MARVEN'S CHERRY FRUIT CAKE 19c
ISLAND BONELESS CHICKEN No. 2 Tin. Each 32c	JELL-O, ASSORTED FLAVOURS 2 Packages 15c
EARLS' CLAMS Large Tin. Each 19c	SEEDLESS RAISINS IN BULK 2 Lbs. 27c

QUAHAUGS, 4 oz. Tin, 2 Tins - 13c

PEACH PASTRY FLOUR, 7 lb bag 23c

PEACH PASTRY FLOUR, 7 LB. BAG 23c	SUNKIST ORANGES Med. Size. Per Doz. 39c
SLICED BACON, Choice Quality Per Lb. 18c	FLORIDA GRAPEFRUIT, Large Size 3 for 27c
COOKED HAM Per Lb. 33c	LONDON CORN STARCH Per Package 10c
KRAFT CHEESE 1 Lb. Package 35c	CLOTHES PINS, 3 Doz. in Box Per Box 10c
EVAPORATED PEACHES Per Lb. 17c	BON AMI CAKE OR POWDER Each 14c
BAKING SODA, Bulk 17c	SHREDDED WHEAT 2 Packages 25c
PURE CREAM OF TARTAR Per Lb. 33c	QUAHAUGS, 4 OZ. TIN. 2 TINS 13c

PRICES EFFECTIVE APRIL 29th TO MAY 6th.

tracks. His actions showed that Senator McDougald knew his conduct to be unworthy of a public man. It was unfitting for it to appear in the light.

The first concern of members of the Senate must be the people of Canada, declared Senator Meighen. It was the function of the Senate to serve the people of Canada. In considering the position of the Senators named in the report, he asked for scrupulous fairness. No partisan bias should be allowed to influence any member of the Senate.

OTTAWA, April 28—(By the Canadian Press)—Rt. Hon. George F. Graham continued debate in the Senate today on the report of the special Beauharnois committee. It condemned Senators Andrew Hayden and W. L. McDougald and issued a rebuke to Senator Donat Raymond for their associations with the power and navigation project. Senator Graham was one of the Liberal members of the committee who did not concur in the censuring report.

Mr. Graham wished to place on record the objection filed in the minutes of the committee in connection with this report, and he read out the brief statement issued last Friday to the effect that the four dissenting Senators were unable to agree with the majority findings which, they had said, "were largely based on suspicions and were unwarranted by the evidence."

The report, continued Senator Graham, was not to his mind, in accordance with the evidence adduced. The present investigation was one that allowed men to be treated in a way they should not be treated. Senator Graham continued. It had allowed a trial without any other members of the House taking the responsibility and accepting the inconvenience of making a charge.

But, some Senators had argued, this was not a charge; it was an investigation. Was that true? It was anything in either of the two committees (the Commons and the Senate) that permitted any discernment between a man on trial and a man under investigation? asked Senator Graham. The only difference was that the man under investigation was tried without anyone taking the responsibility for it and was not permitted the same rights as a man on trial.

At this point Senator Laird interjected that the investigation was demanded by the Hon. Senator from Montreal as a trial by his peers. It was not thrust on him. The committee took evidence, continued Senator Graham, but the findings and evidence of another committee were "thrust on it," so it was not the evidence of his peers which the Senate committee heard.

It had been compelled to consider the evidence and findings of another committee; and these findings and evidence were against the practice and ethics of both Houses.

He had a little fault to find with the majority—not that witnesses were treated unfairly—but that the report was not "per se" the report of the committee. It was something in the shape of a "character-giving" to the report of the House of Commons committee. The Senate adopted an illegitimate child and gave it a character of the Senate committee. The House of Commons committee's evidence, which the Senate committee did not hear, was quoted more freely in the report than the evidence which the Senate committee did hear, Senator Graham continued.

"Mere Piffle" Says Graham

"Nothing has happened in years to so dim the honor and integrity of this House as has the actions of this committee," Senator Graham declared. He referred to Sir Sam Hughes, wartime Minister of Militia and Defence, when he returned to Parliament from overseas and found the members debating routine matters. "In comparison with what is taking place at the front," Sir Sam had said, "what we are engaged at in this House is mere piffle." The spending of two months in committee by men who "think they can give good advice for correcting the troubles of the day," Senator Graham continued, in comparison with the great problems that will present themselves at the Imperial Conference, in a few weeks, "is also the merest piffle."

SENATOR MEIGHEN

Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen, leader of the government party in the Senate, opened his address with the observation that this was the first occasion in more than six decades that the Senate had faced the duty of passing upon the conduct of any of its members. "And we all hope it will be the last," he added.

He had been anxious and still was, that no pressure would be brought to bear on this inquiry save to examine the facts with fairness and sympathy for all concerned, and that the house would face the responsibility involved in the conclusions of the inquiry as a statutory duty and nothing else.

Referring to the speech of Senator Graham, Senator Meighen said he had no complaint to make on the grounds of fairness. But he was afraid the Senator from Brockville had disclosed himself as too great a friend of the parties concerned to qualify as a juror. His complaint was that Senator

Graham had not dealt with the essence of the report. He had dealt only with externals—the flies and insects surrounding the problem."

He would not for one minute say that because a Senator had made a statement that was not true that he should be censured—especially censured with such a manner as the committee report suggested.

The point was one of a Senator's obligations in his capacity as a Senator, who should be most scrupulous in making his statements. The history of all British parliaments is that they have demanded the most rigid adherence to facts and truth. Without such a responsibility under members, these institutions failed of their purpose.

Will Replace Three Vessels On Indies Route

(Canadian Press)
MONTREAL, April 28—The Canadian National Steamships has decided to replace three of its smaller vessels on the West Indies route with steamers of twice their capacity. It is announced. The Canadian Pathfinder, Canadian Skirmisher and Canadian Transporter, each of approximately 8,400 tons dead weight, will be operated during the season between Montreal, Bermuda, Porto Rico, St. Kitts, Antigua, St. Lucia, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Barbados, St. Vincent, Grenada, Trinidad and Demerara, commencing with the departure of the Canadian Skirmisher from here early next week.

These vessels will replace the Colborne, Chomedy and Cornwallis, each of approximately 4,500 tons deadweight. The names, Colborne, Chomedy and Cornwallis will be retained, however, the Canadian Skirmisher taking the name of Colborne, the Canadian Pathfinder the name of Chomedy and the Canadian Transporter the name of Cornwallis. The old Colborne will revert to her former name of Canadian Runner while the Champlain will be known again as the Canadian Carrier and the Chomedy as the Canadian Otter.

BILL ASSURED

(Continued from Page 1)

majority for the bill on second reading, the Labor party holding a fairly substantial balance of power between the Republicans and the

party of former President William T. Cosgrave.

A definite declaration of policy by the Government on the question of the Free State remaining within the British Commonwealth was demanded by J. F. O'Hanlon, Farmer-Independent, when he announced he would vote against the bill. Mr. O'Hanlon said he would support the bill only if President De Valera amended the form of the oath to bring it more "up-to-date in spirit" without at the same time violating the Free State's relations with Britain under the Irish Treaty.

"The bill as it stood however nullified the treaty and was an 'honourable and dishonourable measure,'" Mr. O'Hanlon continued. As an Ulsterman himself he prophesied "it would stereotype the border for all time and deny freedom to Nationalists in the six northern counties." Prof. J. M. O'Sullivan, Minister of Education in the Cosgrave Government, said the bill would bring the maximum of trouble and dishonor with the minimum of advantage. Interest in the debate continued unabated and long queues of people lined up in the rain to secure seats in the galleries.

LIKELY

(Continued from Page 1)

newspaper men this morning on the Lanel—the porch of the hotel building. The session of the long trial seemingly having vanished a lone policeman guarded the court house door and no curious crowd was there to keep him busy. Judge Charles St. Davis, awaiting the report of the racially mixed jury, issued orders, however, for the dispersal of any crowd which might gather around the building.

Masie and the other three accused, Mrs. Granville Fortescue, his mother in law, and Albert O. Jones and E. J. Lord, navy enlisted men, who went to Pearl Harbor late last night after the jury had retired, returned to a downtown hotel this morning to await the jury's report.

While the jurors argued, speculation regarding the retrial of the four remaining men accused of attacking Mrs. Thalia Masie, wife of the naval officer, began among those awaiting the outcome of the present trial.

Kahahawai was among the five men accused by Mrs. Masie and she identified him as the one who broke her jaw while she prayed for mercy. He was abducted and slain while awaiting retrial with the other five men after he had once had disagreed as to their guilt.