

that I was a Canadian. In a conversation which followed he said they were having a great time in Canada. I asked him what it was about. He said a man named Stratton, who was in the Government, had bought a Tory by the name of Gamey, and that Gamey had charged Stratton with the crime. He said that he knew all about the business, and his son-in-law, Frank Sullivan, had told him.

(2) Wilson asked me to call and see him at the hotel, which I did repeatedly, having with him at least six interviews, and in these interviews Wilson re-told the story which he told me on the tenth of April, and he added the following:

(3) Wilson said he had left Newmarket because he was afraid he would be summoned as a witness in the bribery case.

(4) Wilson said that some time ago Frank Sullivan had come to his house to stay over night, and that Frank Sullivan had asked him (Wilson) not to go to bed at the time the other members of the family retired. When the rest of the family were in bed Sullivan had taken out of his pocket a paper, which was an agreement signed by Gamey, in which Gamey agreed to support the Ross Government. Wilson said he had read said agreement, and handed it back to Sullivan, at the same time remarking to Sullivan that he had better be careful, to which Sullivan answered "Gamey is all right; he will stick."

(5) Wilson said that Sullivan told him at his interview that Gamey was to get \$5,000 for supporting Ross, but that the money had not all been paid yet.

(6) Wilson said that, at a later time, when Parliament met, Gamey gave the whole plan away on the floor of the House of Parliament, and that Frank had to resign his position in the Parliament buildings.

#### Why Wilson Left ?

(7) Wilson said that Frank Sullivan was scared, and that he came out to Wilson's house, near Newmarket, and hid for a time, so as to avoid being served with a subpoena, but after a time he (Frank) went off to a place called North Bay, where they caught him.

(8) Wilson said that when Sullivan was at his house the second time Sullivan told him that Stratton had put the money down on a table, and that he (Sullivan) had paid it over to Gamey.

(9) Wilson said that Sullivan told him at this interview that he had an agreement with Stratton under which he was to be paid \$5,000.

(10) Wilson said that Frank would get \$25,000 instead of \$5,000, because Stratton was liable to go to penitentiary for fourteen years if the case was proven.

(11) Wilson said Frank was afraid that he (Wilson) would tell the truth if placed in the box, and that they had agreed that they would pay him \$500 if he got out of the country and kept out until the trial was over.

(12) Wilson said that they had sent a vehicle for him in such a hurry that he had not time to get all the clothes he wanted, and that they told him a subpoena was out for him.

(13) Wilson said that they went to Buffalo, and that while there his wife was given a paper in which it was agreed that he was to be paid \$500 for keeping out of Canada.

(14) Wilson again and again regretted that he had not asked \$5,000. He said they would have paid it, as he could smash the Government.

(15) Wilson said they had told him to go from Buffalo to Rochester and stop at the National Hotel.

(16) Wilson repeatedly told me that if they did not pay him the \$500 on his return to Canada he would give the whole conspiracy away and smash the Government. All of the foregoing statements were made to me by Wilson before I saw Mr. Leavitt.

(17) On the 18th day of April, at the National Hotel, Rochester, Wilson substantially repeated the above statements to me in the presence and within the hearing of T. W. H. Leavitt of the city of Toronto.

(18) On the night of April 18th I saw Wilson and a strange man on Main street, Rochester, about 11

o'clock. I have since seen Frank Sullivan in Toronto, and recognized him as the man I saw on the street with Wilson.

The affidavit concludes with a lengthy categorical denial of Wilson's evidence on these points.

The affidavit of T. W. H. Leavitt gives a statement of an alleged conversation between Davis and Wilson at the National Hotel, Rochester, on April 17th, which Mr. Leavitt overheard, in which the same statements are alleged to have been made by Wilson, and a subsequent conversation between Leavitt and Wilson bringing out the same points; a third affidavit by Geo. Palmer of the American Express Co., Rochester, reported similar conversations with Wilson.

#### Mr. Gamey Begins.

Mr. Gamey was furiously applauded by the Opposition when he rose at 3.10 and commenced his address from notes which he followed very closely.

He scarcely need apologize, he thought, for asking the indulgence of the House because his remarks would necessarily be of a personal nature. The House would remember his inability to put his case with the ability and experience of the Provincial Secretary. How things had changed since that bright afternoon of March 11th, when he had been shaken by the hand by the Premier and received an invitation to the Provincial Secretary's official dinner! (Applause.) All this because it was thought he was an apostate and a traitor to his political friends. Now no names were too vile to characterize him. Had he smothered his conscience and buttoned his pockets he might still be basking in the sunshine of Government favors, and might still hope for large additional financial profit if he had supported the Government, which would have been enormously to his advantage. But he chose to take the other course. He was, he claimed, not responsible for what the press had said about him, for or against, and had no doubt what the real and ultimate verdict would be when the people had a chance to record it.

#### His Rough, Simple Way.

Those charges were made in his own rough, simple way, made without previous Parliamentary experience or legal advice, expecting they would be dealt with by the House. He had asked that that be done, and had consented to no other course. They had been tried by men specially chosen by the men charged, Judges acting not as Judges, but as commissioners. Since the days of Magna Charta, never in English history had a commission found a Ministry guilty. In the Pacific scandal the Judges found there was nothing wrong on the part of the Ministry, but they went on and were defeated. He had been told not to make a speech before the commission. He was cut off while giving his evidence. Compare that with the treatment given to Mr. Aylesworth. He stated something wrong, and it was called a mere slip. Had he himself done this it would have been called perjury. Mr. Gamey complained that he had no counsel before the commission. He should have had a counsel to cross-examine the witnesses. He asked why he had not had a chance to nominate at least one of the Judges. Why didn't the Government nominate two Judges and let him nominate a third? Everyone knew that perhaps the last man in the world to discover any political fraud was the Chancellor of Ontario. Which of the Judges was the graduate of a political school?

#### Treated as a Libeller.

Before that purely constituted court he had been treated from the first as a libeller. That was done by those titled personages dressed up in their unnecessary and unauthorized robes. He had not realized that the whole force, social and political, of a Government of 35 years' standing would be focused on him. But the truth would some day be made clear. What had been intended as a coat of whitewash for the Ministry had resulted in a coat of mud for the judiciary.

Mr. Gamey wished to say a word or

two on some of the remarks of the Premier. He had said that the Government had been tried by fire. He wondered whether it was the fire that burned the West Elgin ballots?

Mr. Whitney—Saved by fire.

Mr. Gamey remarked that the Premier had said that Mr. Hammond told all in his evidence. He himself believed Mr. Hammond had told all. But the Premier tried to give the wrong impression, that what Hammond told was not relevant to the case. The Premier had also said there do so, that what Hammond was asked to forget was very relevant to the case. The Premier had also said there was nothing wrong in the patronage he had exercised, that the returning officer was appointed in the regular way, because he was the Sheriff, and of necessity must have got the appointment. That was absolutely wrong. The appointment was made because he (Mr. Gamey) wrote, saying the Sheriff must be appointed, although the Provincial Secretary had suggested the appointment of the previous returning officer.

#### An Appointment in Question.

The Premier knew that what he said was false when he gave the impression that the Sheriff was not the returning officer one year ago.

Mr. Ross—I must put my hon. friend right. The Sheriff was in the line of the statutory appointment. He had said that all the returning officers went either to the Sheriff or the registrar.

Mr. Whitney—What my hon. friend the Premier did was to contest the allegation of the member for Manitoulin that this returning officer was appointed at his suggestion, and gave the argument that by statute certain returning officers are ex-officio in the line of appointment. But he did not say that the appointment in this case was not made at the instance of the member.

Mr. Ross—I say it now.

Mr. Gamey, continuing, complained that the Premier had spoken of "the virtue of the hon. member for Manitoulin—if he had any virtue," a nice statement for the Premier to make. He would say himself by way of offsetting this that he remembered when a boy that the school teachers and inspectors of the Province would say that if they wanted anything of the then Minister of Education they could not take his word for it, but must have it in writing. Mr. Cameron had passed lightly over the slips of the Judges on some matters. Did they pass lightly over any errors he (Mr. Gamey) had made? Were they simply misses? Oh, no! The report of the Judges was absolutely false in many regards. The blustering, bluffing senior counsel of the defence had tried to throw dust into Mr. Aylesworth's eyes, and tried to get him to say things he had never said.

#### The High Muck-a-Muck.

Mr. Gamey next referred to the report as that document "which bore the signature of the great high muck-a-muck of this land." He quoted from Mr. Aylesworth's evidence, which, he said, corroborated his statement in the House respecting the negotiations as to a "stock transaction." "So much for the speech of the great mogul from West Huron," said Mr. Gamey. Then he took up the speech of the Provincial Secretary, and said it was absolutely false to say he (Gamey) had had legal advice in preparing his statement. Mr. Stratton had said that the Opposition had had knowledge of his statement beforehand. "I wonder if