

assisting you to the extent of \$1,000? A.—I may have spoken of it.

Q.—Did you tell him that you would prefer not to have that \$1,000? A.—No.

Q.—Did you tell Mr. Bunting on this occasion that you were not fond of politics? A.—No. He said I was a young man and, he believed, not a strong politician, and I replied that this was correct.

Q.—Did you tell him that it was not of much consequence to you on what side of politics you were? A.—I do not remember saying so.

Q.—Will you swear that you did not make such a statement? A.—I said I was not a very strong politician.

Q.—What made you say that? A.—His remark that being a young man I was probably not a very strong politician.

Q.—But you ran as a Reform candidate? A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the amount of your election expenses altogether? A.—I really cannot say.

Q.—But about how much do you expect they were? A.—From what I have learnt from others I think they were directly or indirectly about \$3,000 or more.

Q.—Have you any objection to saying what you are worth? A.—I may be worth as much as you are and worth just as much to my country. (Laughter.)

Mr. Macmaster withdrew the question.

Q.—Before you went to Mr. Bunting's office did you talk pretty freely to certain parties about your election expenses? A.—In the house where I am stopping we used to talk over this matter amongst others, and I always said when the matter was alluded to that the Reform party never paid my expenses.

Q.—Did you complain that you had very heavy costs to pay, and that they had not helped you?

Witness was about to give an explanatory reply, but the cross-examining counsel demanded a direct answer, whereupon Mr. Denison said it was fair to let the witness explain, as the question might be worded in such a way that a direct reply would convey a wrong impression. The question was repeated in a different form.

Q.—You admitted that your expenses were very heavy, and that the Reform party had not helped you to pay them? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it true that by way of complaint against your own political party you made this remark? A.—When they were speaking of a few dollars' expenses at an election on one occasion, I remarked that they had no cause to complain, as mine were so much more. Some of the Conservatives present accused Mr. Mowat's Government of spending money in Algoma, and I said that I wished they had come along to help me. But of course this was only a joke, and was taken as such.

Q.—Did you say that your own party did not help in paying your heavy expenses, and that they should have done so? A.—I said, when they spoke of so much money having been expended in Algoma, that if this was true they might have assisted me.

Q.—Did you go further, and say they should have assisted you? A.—I think not.

Q.—I suppose you are of opinion that the Government did spend this money in Algoma? A.—I am of opinion that they spent just

WHAT WAS RIGHT AND NO MORE—

about one-tenth of what your party spent. (Laughter.)

Q.—We can't discuss that here. Now, briefly to recapitulate—you say that you went to Bunting's office unaccompanied by anybody, and to Wilkinson's room, in the Walker House, unaccompanied by anyone save Mr. McKim? A.—Yes.

Q.—Lynch lived at your hotel, did he not? A.—No.

Q.—Indeed! Where do you live? A.—At the Continental.

Q.—And can you swear that Lynch did not live there? A.—I can say that I never saw him, and had he lived there I think I would have seen him.

Q.—But do you know he did not live there? A.—He may have been shut up in a room; I can say that I never saw him there.

The counsel put several other questions on this point, contending that his question was not satisfactorily answered by Dr. Dowling. At last Mr. Denison interposed, and decided that the witness could not give a clearer answer than the above.

WHAT BUNTING CAN RAISE.

Q.—Did Mr. Bunting say he could raise two or three thousand in two hours? A.—Yes; he said two or three thousand.

Q.—Did you not say it was \$2,000? Did he say "two or three" or a "couple" of thousand?

The witness could not swear whether he had said "two or three" or "a couple," but understood that the terms were practically synonymous. Mr. Fenon argued that the witness was correct. Mr. Macmaster contended they did not mean the same thing, and that herein lay hidden a very important point. After some discussion the stenographer's notes were appealed to, and Mr. Dowling was shown to have said that Mr. Bunting had told him he could raise "a couple" of thousand dollars.

Q.—What did you say he told he could raise when you gave evidence in Committee? A.—I think I said Mr. Bunting told me he could raise a couple of thousand dollars.

Q.—Is it true that you said before the House

Committee that he could raise \$3,000 in two hours. A.—I don't remember saying it.

Q.—Do you remember going to Mr. Bunting's office and saying that you were in favour of a Coalition Government? A.—I never said so.

VEXATIOUS QUESTIONS.

Q.—Will you swear it? A.—Yes. I never heard of a coalition until the Thursday I speak of.

Q.—Did you never hear of the proposal for a coalition until you went to Mr. Bunting's office; a coalition you know is a union of both political parties to form a Government? A.—Thank you. No; I never heard of it until I went to Mr. Bunting's office.

Q.—Will you swear that you did not at your boarding house, in the presence of Mr. Bastable and Mr. Wilmot, say you were favourable to a Coalition Government? A.—Yes.

Q.—You told us in your examination in-chief that you could not exactly remember what you had said to Mr. Bunting in your interview with him. A.—In reply to some questions I may have said so; I said very little, and do not remember everything I said.

The questioning on this point was kept up for some time, replies to the same effect being elicited from the witness, and the counsel contending they were unsatisfactory. At last Mr. Denison said this course of proceeding tended only to mystify the witness, and flung no light upon the enquiry. He had dealt with many thousands of cases, and had become so used to witnesses that he was generally able to determine when a witness was endeavouring to deceive the counsel or the Court. He thought Dr. Dowling was answering the questions put to him as well as he could. The question was then put once more by Mr. Denison himself, and answered to the same effect as previously. This concluded Mr. MacMaster's cross-examination.

Cross-examined by Mr. Murphy.

Q.—You have admitted that this is not the first bribery case you have been concerned in? A.—Yes.

Q.—And that Mr. McKim was the first to speak to you of this business? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he approach you for the purpose of getting you to sign? A.—He said that Mr. Wilkinson wanted to see me in the Walker House.

Q.—What was said by anybody about your changing your allegiance to your political party? A.—Mr. McKim said something was going on, and Wilkinson wanted me to go down and see him.

Q.—Mr. McKim then asked you to go down and see Wilkinson with the object of defeating the Mowat Government. Did you think from Mr. McKim's words that he was sincere? A.—I did not know.

Q.—Did you ever tell Wilkinson what your election expenses were? A.—I never saw him before the meeting I have told you of.

Q.—How then could he commence to talk to you about your election expenses? How did he know they were so much, and that the Reformers had never helped you to pay them? We contend that you have been putting your own words into Wilkinson's mouth, and telling us what you yourself said to him. A.—He said he understood that the case was as he put it. I am told that he had been told so.

Q.—Never mind what you have been told; were you not trying to draw out Wilkinson on the matter? A.—No.

Q.—Did you not do anything in order to draw him out? Did you not read a letter from your wife, in which she asked you to give up politics and stick to your profession, as you would do so much better? A.—I would like to explain.

AN ARBITRARY LAWYER.

Mr. Murphy—I must have a direct answer.

Mr. Denison—The witness must be allowed to explain.

Mr. Murphy—Then with all due respect to Your Worship, I must submit that you are not following the law.

Mr. Denison—I am very sorry. I suppose you mean your law.

Mr. Murphy—According to the law, in a question of cross-examination, in cases of this kind, the answer must be given direct; if an explanation has to be made it must be drawn out afterwards by the opposite counsel.

Mr. Denison—The witness may give you his answer, and I will ask for the explanation.

Mr. Dowling—I read part of the letter.

Mr. Denison—Now go on with the explanation.

The witness explained that Mr. Wilkinson had spoken of his (Dr. Dowling's) heavy election expenses, and in the conversation arising out of this he (witness) had said that he was urged by some to give up politics, and stick to his profession; he had then read part of a letter from his wife which touched on the matter.

Q.—Did you say that you had told Mr. Hardy that you did not care for the Government? A.—No.

Q.—Will you swear that? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you not say that you had told Mr. Hardy that you did not—to use your own words—care a d—for the Government? A.—I never said so.

Q.—Did you ever tell Mr. Hardy that you did not care for the Government? A.—No.

Q.—Did not Mr. Wilkinson speak about the dissatisfaction with the Mowat Government? A.—Yes.

Q.—And was it not a fact that such dissatis-