

Q. And had it not been for Mr. Campbell you would not have divulged what Mr. Forke said in the way you did?—A. I think in the first speech I gave a very clear indication.

Q. I am asking you if you would have divulged the statement that you knew the names of people and were prepared to give the names, had it not been for what Mr. Campbell said in his speech?—A. It is quite likely that on some future occasion—not that particular evening. My speech was done for that evening.

Q. Why did you not do it in your first speech?—A. It is pretty difficult to say six or seven months after something happened.

Q. I am asking for your answer on that. The fact is that you did regard this as sort of a private conversation and you did not feel in your first speech that you were quite justified in intimating that you knew the names of people, and it was after Mr. Campbell had rather cast some doubt on your statement that you made the second address?—A. No, I would not say that.

Q. Can you give us any reason for not having said what you said in your second speech in your first speech?—A. One reason would be this—

Q. There was one reason? What restrained you from saying it in your first speech?—A. One reason was this, that I was discussing the immigration policy on the whole, and I made a comparatively brief allusion in the first instance to this particular condition. I did not elaborate. That was the reason.

Q. Is the newspaper report of your first speech practically verbatim?—A. No. The newspaper report is substantially correct. By that I mean this, that it is written up in a journalistic way and there are portions of my remarks cut out between paragraphs or sentences.

Q. I am asking you if the report of the first address did not practically contain all you said on this subject of permits?—A. Yes.

Q. And you did not in that intimate that you knew the name of anybody?—A. No, I did not.

Q. I am asking you why you did not?—A. I think I have explained that.

Q. Will you explain it again? I am afraid I did not catch a portion of your explanation?—A. My speech was devoted to immigration as a whole. I made but a passing allusion to these conditions. I did not elaborate. I think you will agree with me that quite often when making a speech—

Q. Do not bother about what I agree with you upon. Let us stick to the facts. You said you made a "passing allusion"? Do you call this a "passing allusion":

A regular traffic was carried on at Ottawa of the sale of permits to admit men who were not ordinarily eligible for entry into Canada. These permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each. That went on for several years. I am not stating what I do not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay, it is not guesswork. I got that possibly from the highest source in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration.

You regard that as a passing allusion, do you?—A. You asked me why I did not, until Mr. Campbell spoke, say what I said? I was explaining why I did not say what I said later on; it was in further elaboration.

Q. You said that in your first speech you made a "passing allusion". I ask you again if you regard that paragraph as a "passing allusion"?—A. I was explaining that when making a speech one makes but passing allusions.

Q. Do you regard that as a passing allusion?—A. No.