

prominent member of the party occurred shortly afterwards. During the early part of February, when Mr. Gibson, of Hamilton, was on his feet, a gentleman, a member of the House, came to me and asked me to see him in the corridor, which I did immediately. We went out into the refreshment room, and at once came Bunting without my knowledge and alone. He at once alluded to the question of Mr. Gibson's alleged independence of the Government, and said it was no use denying that the Government was in a very uncertain position and that it would be a desirable thing to form a coalition. His coming into the refreshment room without invitation and alone made me suspicious, and as soon as he addressed himself to me on the question of forming a coalition I immediately connected it with Meek's request to me to see Bunting. I at once intimated that I connected him with the former negotiations, and suspected that he was attempting the same end. Upon this we had some unpleasant words, more forcible than polite.

By Mr. FRASER.

Q.—You said Meek was a personal acquaintance of your own? A.—Yes.

Q.—Had some knowledge of the county? A.—Yes, he is a native of it.

Q.—Is he the same Meek that is charged at the Police Court? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe that the offer he made you was made on his own behalf only? A.—From my knowledge of him I believe that he was telling the truth when he said he was authorized to make it. He told me that I could have a cheque for \$3,000 or \$4,000 at once. I know his circumstances well enough to know that he was not able of his own resources to make such an offer good.

Q.—He made some reference to some other supporters of the Government going over. A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he say "I have secured" or did he say "We have secured"? A.—I think he said "We have secured."

Q.—How many did he mention? A.—Six; he may have said five or six. I would not be positive about that, and he may have said "I have secured"; I took no note of it. He gave me the impression that that number was secured, and I would not say how they were secured.

Q.—He wound up the conversation by desiring the whole matter should be considered as personal to himself? A.—Yes.

Q.—That was when you had declined to consider the proposal? A.—Yes.

Q.—And he understood there was no chance of success? A.—Yes.

Q.—Not until then? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he more than once intimate that he had authority to make the proposition? A.—Not at different times; but he dwelt on the fact, and assured me that it was true.

Q.—Besides telling a member of the Government, did you tell more members? A.—Yes. I felt it my duty to do so for fear that others might be approached in the same way.

The Committee then adjourned, Mr. Fraser intimating that a report would have to be submitted to-day.

AT THE POLICE COURT.

The conspiracy trial at the Police Court yesterday attracted a great crowd of persons. The Court itself was full to overflowing, and outside on Court-street were numbers of persons anxious to witness the trial but unable to gain admission. Police Magistrate Denison first disposed of the ordinary police cases, and then at 11:30 a.m. the defendants in the conspiracy case were called. They were accompanied by their counsel. Mr. Wilkinson took a seat behind his counsel, Mr. Murphy, where he was screened from observation by the crowd of listeners who pressed eagerly forward. Messrs. Bunting, Meek, and Kirkland took seats on the south side of the barristers' table, facing the Magistrate, and in full view of the court.

Mr. Fenton rose, and objected to any invidious distinction being made between the prisoners, and insisted upon all of them taking their seats in a row facing the Court.

Mr. Murphy said that it was necessary for his client to sit by his side in order to instruct him in the conduct of his defence.

Mr. Fenton again objected to Mr. Wilkinson hiding behind his counsel in the crowd, and reminded Mr. Murphy that it was only a matter of courtesy that his client and the other defendants were allowed to come within the railing at all. Their proper place was outside the railing, where parties accused of crime usually stood.

After further cross-firing between the County Crown Attorney and Mr. Murphy, the Magistrate ordered Mr. Wilkinson to take his place in the row on Mr. Bunting's left hand.

The counsel engaged in the case were as follows:—For Kirkland, Dr. McMichael and Messrs. Cameron and Caswell; for Wilkinson, Messrs. Murphy and Wilkinson; for Bunting, Messrs. McMaster and Clark; and for Meek, Dr. McMichael and Mr. Neville. Mr. Fenton, County Crown Attorney, and Mr. Æmilus Irving, Q.C., were for the Crown.

Mr. Cameron, on behalf of his client Kirkland, asked if the Police Magistrate had decided to send the case to a higher Court or to deal with it summarily. He claimed the right of a separate trial for his client, who disclaimed any connection with or knowledge of the guilt of the other defendants in their conspiracy. He did

not wish to be tried jointly with them.

Mr. Denison—If I were to try the case summarily all four of the defendants must consent. I think it is a case to go before a higher Court. I am not bound to try them summarily. The Act provides that if the evidence is sufficient I have the discretion of sending the case to a higher Court.

Mr. Cameron—If there is evidence against the other defendants, will my client necessarily have to submit to a trial before a higher Court?

Mr. Denison—Oh, no; not if there is no evidence against him.

Mr. Cameron—I say we are innocent. We know nothing about the guilt or innocence of the other parties.

Mr. Denison—Do the other three defendants all wish to be tried by jury?

Mr. Clark—As far as Bunting is concerned, we wish to be tried by jury at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Denison—Then I understand that the defendant Kirkland elects to be tried summarily and pleads "not guilty," and that the other defendants, Bunting, Meek, and Wilkinson, all three elect to be tried by jury, and plead "not guilty."

Mr. Cameron—If there is no evidence against him, will my client, Mr. Kirkland, be tried with the other defendants?

Mr. Denison—When I have heard the evidence I shall be able to decide what will be done. I have made up my mind, however, that the case must be tried before a higher court if there is any evidence to warrant my sending the case there. Of course if there is no evidence against your client or any of the other defendants the case against him or them will be dismissed.

MR. ROBERT M'KIM.

Mr. Robert McKim was then called and examined by Mr. Irving. In reply to questions he said he was a member of the Provincial Legislature, representing West Wellington. The Legislature had been in session since January 23, and he had been in attendance the whole of that time save when he had taken a holiday for one or two days. The examination went on as follows:—

Q.—You board at the Walker House, on Front-street, a short distance from the Parliament Buildings? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know two gentlemen named John Wilkinson and E. Meek? A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you first come to know Mr. Wilkinson? A.—I first met with him on one of the boats on Georgian Bay about the time of the Algoma elections last fall; that was the first time. Q.—Had you seen him between that time and the 23rd of January? I had.

Q.—Did you have any special conversation with him? A.—Well, we had a conversation of some importance once when going to London.

Q.—Did it relate to subsequent events? A.—It related to a

REGISTRARSHIP IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Q.—When was this? A.—Some time since last fall and before the opening of the Legislature.

Q.—Where did Mr. Wilkinson board when at Toronto? A.—At the Walker.

Q.—You had frequent occasion to meet? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember on any occasion going to any building in the city where you saw Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Meek? A.—I do.

Q.—When was it? A.—It was on the day when the Speaker gave his first dinner at the Parliament Buildings.

Q.—On that day where did you meet Wilkinson or Meek? A.—In a room in the Mail building.

Q.—The Mail building is a large building at the corner of Bay and King streets, occupied as a newspaper office and a great many other offices. A.—Yes.

Q.—What brought about the meeting? A.—Mr. Wilkinson asked me to go and see him and Bunting.

B.—Did you at that time know Mr. Bunting? A.—No.

Q.—Do you know him now? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that the gentleman sitting at the table there? (Pointing to Mr. Bunting.) A.—Yes.

Q.—When did Wilkinson make the arrangement about the meeting? A.—In his room at the Walker House.

Q.—And when did he say you were to see him? A.—On the day I have mentioned.

Q.—Where did you go to in the Mail building? A.—I was directed to go into the Bay-street entrance, and to go up on the hoist, and the elevator man would show me the room. When I got to the room I met Wilkinson.

Mr. Denison—Did you tell the man in the hoist who you were? A.—The man asked me my name, and when I told him he said he had been told to take me to this room.

Q.—What time was this? A.—About mid-day.

Q.—Who did you find there? A.—Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Meek were inside. They had a lot of papers about on the table, and the room looked like a lawyer's office.

Q.—Mr. Meek is a barrister, is he not? A.—He says so.

Q.—What did they speak to you about, and who spoke first? A.—Mr. Wilkinson.

Q.—Had you seen Mr. Wilkinson before? A.—No.

THE PROMISSORY NOTE AND REGISTRARSHIP.

Q.—What was said upon that occasion? A.—Wilkinson and Meek were present in the room.