

April 3rd

ardson's farm work had been paid by Government funds, he said, "That's my sign." Then he stated quite frankly that he could not read or write. He said that Gamble had met him in a poolroom and asked him to sign the paper, but that he could not remember whether there was writing on the paper or not. Gamble, he said, wanted him to sign because he was "checking up" on Richardson.

Mr. Sinclair then spoke of the "affidavit" statement of McMahon before E. Montfort. McMahon said that he had made a statement to Montfort in Gamble's presence, telling of his business relationship with Richardson. But, said he, they wanted him to wait while they typed the statement on another sheet of paper. He said that he had told them that his horse was hungry and he wanted to get home. So, he continued, he signed a blank sheet of paper and they put the typing on it afterward when he had gone.

Not Read to Him, He Says.

"Was the affidavit read over to you?" he was asked.

"No," he replied.

Mr. Finlayson said that Montfort was another Liberal Association President, just as was Gamble.

"Well," said Mr. Sinclair, looking at the witness, "I don't believe a word that this man is saying. I must frankly say."

"He's your witness, not mine," Mr. Finlayson retorted.

Then Mr. McMahon said, in regard to the "affidavit," that a little of it had been read to him. But, he declared, "no one told me I was taking an affidavit." He also stated emphatically that he had not been "sworn" when making the statement.

When he was asked about the date when he made the statement, he replied: "Oh, I can't read or write, and pay no attention to dates. When I want to know a date I ask my wife."

"Do you want to see some of my writing?" he inquired, naively. Then he fumbled in a pocket and said: "It's on a permit, but that's no matter."

"Hotel" Written Backward.

He smiled at the committee members and told them that when he had come to Toronto he wanted to know his location, so he wrote on his liquor permit where he was staying. He had seen the words on a window, he explained. He displayed his writing to the committee. He had scrawled down "letoh." Mr. Finlayson looked at this for a moment, puzzled. Then he laughed. Other members laughed as the meaning dawned on them. Soon the committee rocked with laughter.

"Why," said Mr. Finlayson, laughing, "it's 'hotel' written backward." And another jumble of letters beside the "letoh" finally was discovered to be reverse writing of "Walker."

"Sometimes," McMahon continued, "I can't write my name; that's if I'm shaky a little."

Mr. Sinclair wondered how he kept track of days of working so that he would get paid for his time. "Oh, I scratch it on to something," McMahon explained.

No Government Cheques.

Continuing, in reply to questions, he stated positively that he had never been paid in Government cheques for work done for Richardson.

Questioned as to further details of what happened when he signed the sheet of paper for Gamble in the poolroom, McMahon grinned and said that he had used his permit that day; in fact he had been drinking. "You see," he explained, "a lot of fellows just got in from camp and I knew them all."

Had he used his permit in Toronto? he was asked.

"No," he replied. "But I want to get one to get home with if I can."

Explaining why he had gone with Gamble to make the statement before Montfort, McMahon declared: "Jim Gamble said if I didn't do it they would look after me."

"What did he mean by that?" McMahon was asked.

"Well, maybe they'd put me in the 'clink,'" he retorted, and again the committee room was filled with laughter.

"Whom did Gamble mean by 'they'?" he was asked.

"Oh, mebbe somebody," McMahon re-

plied. "I wasn't really afraid, but I thought I'd better go."

"When I was making the statement," he continued, "they asked if they could put down that I worked for Richardson and was paid by Government money. They wanted to put it down, but I said no."

Mr. Sinclair wanted to know if he had anything to drink on that day. "Oh, I was pretty good, but I made home all right," McMahon replied. "I had some drink of my own. I didn't have any with Gamble."

Explains Refusal.

McMahon was asked why he had refused to give a statement to Mr. Dicker, the Government investigator, when he went North to inquire into the case. McMahon said he had come into the Junction to meet Dicker, but that Rawlinson, who kept a store there as well as Richardson, advised him to avoid Dicker. "He said they might get a hold on me," McMahon added. "They might write anything down after I signed."

"Rawlinson had experience," Mr. Finlayson observed.

McMahon stated that when he was coming to Toronto Gamble and Rawlinson had advised him to see Mr. Sinclair.

Again questioned as to the number of drinks he had had when he made his statement to Montfort, the witness replied: "That's something we don't keep track of."

He declared that he never saw the typewritten statement until just before he was coming to Toronto, when Gamble gave him a copy.

"That was part of Gamble's deep-laid plot," Mr. Finlayson interjected.

McMahon, continuing to reply to questions, declared that he, Richardson and Kydd had travelled to Toronto together, but that he did not talk the case over with them.

"And you never saw me until you saw me here today?" said Mr. Sinclair.

"That's right," McMahon replied.

Duties as Inspector.

When Richardson, the next witness, took his place before the committee, Mr. Sinclair began questioning him as to his duties as Government Road Inspector and the road system in which he played a part. Mr. Finlayson several times undertook to explain the system. Mr. Sinclair said he wanted to get the information from Richardson. The Minister, said he, could tell about the ideal system, but he wanted to see how it worked out. Mr. Finlayson declared he was just trying to have Mr. Sinclair understand the situation. "Go on and examine it without understanding," he told the Liberal Leader.

"That's just about what I'd expect from a Minister of the Crown," Mr. Sinclair retorted.

Mr. Sinclair wanted to know why Richardson had asked Kydd for Gamble's letter. "I wanted it to show who pushed this thing from the start," the witness stated.

Did he know anything about the statement made by McMahon to Montfort? he was asked.

He replied that when McMahon and Kydd and he were coming to Toronto on the train McMahon had told him that he had made the affidavit.

Mr. Sinclair referred to an item in the 1927 public accounts that the Government had paid Richardson \$1,000 for camp equipment. Richardson stated that he did not recall that, but he was pretty sure that he had never made such a big sale.

Not Out of Government Money.

Mr. Richardson, in reply to Mr. Finlayson, stated emphatically that he had never paid McMahon or Kydd for farm work out of Government money. This concluded his evidence.

Mr. Sinclair told the committee that he had an affidavit from Mr. Gamble.

"You should have Gamble here," Mr. Finlayson declared.

"I could have given this to the papers,

but I offer to put it in to the committee," Mr. Sinclair retorted.

"Oh, put in what you like," Mr. Finlayson retorted. "If you didn't bring Gamble here it's your own fault. Put in the affidavit. We're not going to kick. You've kept the House over a week, but we've tried to be fair."

Mr. Sinclair maintained that the Legislative staff would have to be kept on the payroll until at least Tuesday anyway.

"If you hadn't forced this they'd have all been away," Mr. Finlayson replied. "You've cost the Province over \$2,000 for this farce."

Mr. Sinclair—You're getting \$2,000 extra.

Mr. Finlayson—You're the same.

Mr. Sinclair—Who's taking \$2,000 out of the Province?

Mr. Finlayson—You are.

Mr. Sinclair wondered who wouldn't say that the "exhibition" before the committee wasn't worth while for a few dollars.

"And," the Liberal Leader declared, "if the Minister doesn't prosecute some one he will be remiss in his duties. Either witnesses were perjuring themselves or there was a faked-up affidavit."

"Petty Matter."

Mr. Finlayson declared that when his department had been attacked he had made his investigation, and found that the case was based on "petty spite." He again said that Mr. Sinclair had been responsible for delaying the House with a petty matter.

"I don't give a continental for the responsibility," Mr. Sinclair replied.

"All I want to know, is my department clean or not?" Mr. Finlayson said.

"I have been examining witnesses under the most adverse criticisms," Mr. Sinclair said.

"Why isn't Gamble here?" a Conservative member shouted.

"He wasn't summoned," Mr. Sinclair replied. "There are 100 Tories here who didn't know enough to summons him."

"Why didn't you summons him? He's your President, your correspondent," Mr. Finlayson said.

Mr. Sinclair read what he introduced as Gamble's affidavit. In it Gamble stated that it was not a blank paper signed by Kydd and McMahon. He declared that McMahon and Kydd had signed it after reading it. This Gamble statement was sworn before Montfort on March 31. Mr. Sinclair handed the document to Mr. Finlayson.

Mr. Finlayson declared that it could not be an affidavit, as it was not in court, and that it was not a statutory declaration.

"Give it to me, then," Mr. Sinclair said.

"No," Mr. Finlayson replied; "we'll hold it."

Information in March.

Mr. Sinclair objected to Mr. Finlayson's suggestion that he had information last February. He stated that he got his information on March 11.

Mr. Finlayson suggested that the committee adjourn. He thought that the committee had been guilty of "a childish exhibition" and that a day had been wasted.

"If that's your idea, all well and good," Mr. Sinclair retorted. "Why be jubilant?"

"I'm not jubilant; I'm just sick of it," Mr. Finlayson replied. "We have found out that there was an attempt to get Richardson. It was a piece of spite-work."

Mr. Sinclair said that he might still have something to bring before the committee.

"I don't think you'll try again; but we'll investigate anything," Mr. Finlayson replied. So the committee adjourned sine die.