

Mr. Goldie Produces the Telegram from Wilkinson,

BUT THE LETTER IS DESTROYED.

Messrs. Shields and Stimson Show a
Handful of \$1,000 Bills.

WHERE THE \$500 NOTES CAME FROM

The Draft Report of the Committee to
the House Adopted.

ROYAL COMMISSION TO ISSUE.

The Defendants Again in the Police
Court.

MR. BALFOUR ON THE STAND.

How Bunting, Wilkinson, and Kirkland
Worked Together.

THE PRISONERS SECURE BAIL.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections met on Saturday in the library at ten o'clock. Owing probably to the change in the hour there were only a few spectators present.

The first witness was Mr. Thomas Goldie, of Guelph, who was sworn. Examined by Mr. Mr. FRASER:—

Q.—Have you made a search for the letter and telegrams? A.—I have.

Q.—Have you found them? A.—I have found the telegrams but I think the letter is destroyed.

Q.—Will you produce the telegram? A.—It is here.

The telegram was read, it being from Toronto, dated Guelph, March 11, "Come down and see me if possible at the Walker House."—J. A. WILKINSON."

Q.—Have you searched for the letter? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you searched sufficiently to be able to say whether it is destroyed or not? A.—I am convinced it is destroyed.

Q.—When? A.—It must have been destroyed at the time I got it.

Q.—Have you any recollection of having destroyed it? A.—I am in the habit of destroying letters which are of no import.

Q.—You said on the former occasion that you were certain that the letter was in existence? A.—I have thought the matter over since, and I am now satisfied it has been destroyed. I can tell you what it had in it.

Q.—What was the nature of the letter? A.—It was dated from Cobourg, and he commenced by asking me about my health, that his health was all right. He said he had left Toronto, and he presumed for good.

Q.—Did he make any reference to his having failed in his efforts? A.—He did not.

Q.—What did you understand by his statement that he had left Toronto?

Mr. MEREDITH objected to the question being put.

Q.—What did you understand by the remark that he had left Toronto? A.—I didn't understand anything by it.

Q.—Did you not form any opinion as to what he meant? A.—I didn't think the letter of any import.

Q.—Did you have any belief at the time as to what the letter meant? A.—No.

Q.—Did you reply to the letter? A.—No.

Q.—Was there nothing in it to indicate that he had failed to carry out his plans? A.—No. There was nothing having reference to political matters at all.

Q.—Was that the only letter you received from him? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any knowledge directly or indirectly of any application having been made to your father to hold any letter? A.—No.

Q.—It didn't happen to your knowledge, and if it had happened you would have known it? A.—Yes.

Q.—No application or attempt was made to you to get you to hold any document? A.—No.

Q.—Why didn't you sign your letter to Wilkinson? A.—A number of persons have asked me this. I cannot say why or give any reason except that I wrote it in a great hurry. I had no intention not to sign it.

Q.—Then your explanation is that it was written in a great hurry and you intended to sign it? A.—Yes.

THE "MAIL'S" LIES.

Mr. FRASER said the *Mail* had charged him with having kept or suppressed some document produced in the Committee-room by Inspector Ward. This was the "round robin." He could

only say that he opened the papers in the Committee-room when he saw them for the first time, and he hadn't any knowledge of them until they were produced by the Police Inspector. The signed "round robin" certainly was not among the papers when they were produced in the Committee-room.

Mr. MEREDITH suggested that it might have been mislaid.

Mr. FRASER said Mr. Fenton had stated in the Police Court that he had examined the papers within an hour after they were taken from the prisoners, and it was not among them then.

Mr. BALFOUR said it had been asserted that the Registrarship of Regina could not have been promised to him, as it was not vacant. To this he would say that Wilkinson said that Dr. Dukes, who holds the position, was not discharging the duties satisfactorily, and the position was to be made vacant either by his resignation or dismissal.

Mr. MORRIS was here understood to ask the witness if Mr. McKim gave him the \$860 on the same Sunday as he received his \$1,000.

Mr. BALFOUR said no. Mr. McKim came into his room and showed him the money, which he asked him to count. This Mr. Balfour did, and handed it back with the remark that he had better give it to the Speaker. He stated that when he saw Mr. Harcourt in the reception-room on the night of the 14th, he denied emphatically having any knowledge of the affair or that the conspirators had at any time hinted to him that attempts were being made to corrupt members. He distinctly understood that Mr. Harcourt had nothing to do with the affair in any shape, and that he had never intended to have anything to do with it.

Mr. FRASER—There is no doubt in the mind of anyone who knows Mr. Harcourt that the bribers used his name without any kind of authority.

Mr. FRASER said it was intended yesterday to report to the House to-day, but the business not being through he now thought it would be better to wait till Monday. He stated that the sub-committee had decided not to make a final report, and read a rough draft of the report which it was intended to submit to the House on Monday. The draft sets forth that the Committee had met and taken such evidence as there was time for, and states that it would be impossible to fully and fairly complete the investigation before the close of the session, and they therefore recommend that a Committee composed of judges be constituted to make a full and searching investigation, and that the Committee be discharged. They further report that in pursuance of a summons issued by the Speaker Mr. Dwight had appeared and stated that acting under the advice of counsel and for the reasons set forth in his evidence he had refused to produce the copies and telegrams referred to.

THE \$500 BILLS.

Mr. GEORGE DUNSTAN called and sworn:—

Q.—What is your position? A.—Paying teller at the Federal bank.

Q.—How long have you been there? A.—Two years.

Q.—Can you tell me whether in the course of last week you paid out to any person bills of \$500 of Dominion issue. A.—We pay \$500 bills out every day.

Q.—By way of settlement? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you recollect paying large bills to any individual? A.—I remember changing some bills last Saturday.

Q.—To whom? A.—I don't know the man's name.

Q.—Have you received any information as to who the man is? A.—I don't know him.

Q.—Have you any reason to know his name? A.—I believe he is named Stimson.

Q.—Was anyone with him? A.—John Shields.

Q.—What transpired? A.—Stimson gave me two \$1,000 bills, and asked me to change them for five-hundreds, which I did. He then gave me another \$1,000 bill and asked me to change that, and I did.

Q.—Did he take five-hundreds for that? A.—Yes.

Q.—That was on Saturday last? A.—Yes.

Q.—What issues do you call the \$1,000 bills you received from Stimson? A.—Dominion of Canada legal tender notes.

Q.—What issue did he get in exchange? A.—The same issue.

Q.—What became of the \$1,000 bills? A.—I presume we paid them out in the ordinary way.

Q.—Of settlement? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know whether they are now in the bank? A.—They are not.

Q.—Did you notice the numbers? A.—No.

Q.—Did you observe in any way the numbers of the bills you gave him? A.—No.

Q.—Who produced the money? A.—Stimson.

Q.—Did he have any other money with him? A.—Yes; quite a roll of bills.

Q.—Can you tell of what denominations they were? A.—No; I think the outside one was a \$1,000 note.

Q.—And he had quite a roll? A.—Yes; a handful.

Q.—Did you observe if the notes he produced were consecutive to a running series? A.—No; I never looked at the numbers at all.

Q.—Were the bills new? A.—Yes; they were in very good condition; most legal tenders are.

Q.—Were they freshly issued? A.—I don't think they were.