

Q.—Have you taken part before this in a coalition Government? A.—No, but I have noticed their formation.

Q.—Are you a very extreme party man? A.—Oh no, I have not been considered so.

Q.—There was nothing very wrong trying to form a coalition Government, was there? A.—I think there was something wrong about forming a coalition.

Q.—Wicked? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it a crime? A.—Treachery.

Q.—Treachery? A.—Yes.

Q.—Would a combination of parties be treachery? A.—Without consulting the people I think it would.

Q.—Having told you what he wanted, being an honourable man you would have told him if you disagreed with him? A.—Well, I thought there might be some well-laid scheme that should be brought to light.

Q.—You began to be frightened? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then why didn't you turn tail and run? A.—That was not my business. To turn out the recognized Government of the people returned by them last year without consulting them would be conspiracy.

Q.—What was the conspiracy? A.—To be offered bribes.

Q.—Who was offered bribes? A.—I was.

Q.—How? A.—By offering me an office to vote against my Government.

Q.—Well do not politicians often get shelved like that? A.—Not by their enemies.

Q.—How was it you met him a second time?

A.—I had an interview with him the next day. It was in the Rossin House. I was with him half an hour or three-quarters of an hour.

TRAFFIC IN GOVERNMENT POSITIONS.

Q.—Do you remember during that time making any proposals to Mr. Meek? A.—I drew Mr. Meek out as well as I could.

Q.—Now let us hear what your proposals were? A.—I said I intended resigning on account of my ill health.

Q.—Had you applied for any particular situation? A.—I never applied for any position in my life.

Q.—Did you not apply for a shrievalty? A.—I never did, though I think I might have got it, if I had not been a member, had I wished.

Q.—Did not Mr. Meek offer you a position? A.—Yes; he offered me a shrievalty in Regina.

Q.—What did you say? A.—I told him that I did not think my health would stand the climate there.

Q.—What did he say? A.—Well, he told me I might get almost any position in British Columbia that I liked. I thought they were prepared to make almost any sacrifice to carry out the policy that "Mowat must go."

Q.—Did you complain to him that you had been badly used by your party? A.—Yes. There are sections of our party as there are in any party, and there is one of these sections in my constituency that treated me badly. This section, however, is not a winning one.

Q.—Did you almost accept any proposals that he made to you? A.—No.

Q.—Did you conspire to find out this plot to bribe members of the Government? A.—I knew nothing of the offers of bribery until last Monday. I felt that it was not very much of an honour to have this offer made to me.

Q.—It is not every one they would honour by making such an offer. A.—I hope they would offer such an insult to very few men.

Q.—Had you ever an action in which you sued for a promissory note? A.—No. I sued for libel.

Q.—What was the libel? A.—Such as generally occurs in a political canvass. Rumours which were set about with a view of damaging my character.

Q.—Then you brought an action for damages? A.—And lost it because there was a political division in the case.

Q.—Were not you charged with having forged a receipt? A.—I was accused of it during the campaign. The judge, in the suit that I brought on account of the charge, held that the people were privileged to make such charges against a candidate for Reeveship, member of Parliament, etc., while he was before the people.

Q.—Did you tell Mr. Meek that you had been offered an office by your Government? A.—No. I was disappointed, though, because a certain position should go to some man of the western part of our county. I had given the Government to understand in 1876, long before I was in the House, that it was unfair and unjust to dispose of all the positions to persons in the other riding.

Q.—Did you tell him that you had shaken your fist in Mr. Hardy's face and had sworn at Mr. Pardee about there giving you a position? A.—I told Meek that I swore to Mr. Pardee and because I understood that the shrievalty had been given to an East Elgin man instead of going to a west riding man.

Q.—Why did you tell Meek that you were forcing the Government to do what you wanted? A.—Mr. Meek has strained the matter; I did not tell him that.

SOME OF THE BRIBERS' FABRICATIONS.

Q.—Were you not telling him all your troubles, and telling him to find out if the other side would accept you? A.—Not at all. I am very well contented where I am.

Q.—Did not you tell him all this? A.—No; you are not telling the truth.

Q.—I am not telling— A.—The truth if you

report all this false conversation.

Q.—Did you not tell him that you had a written appointment? A.—Not at all. I told him nothing of the kind.

Mr. MacMaster—When you left him after the interview, did you part with him good friends? A.—Yes.

This ended Dr. Cascaden's evidence.

THE CHARGE AGAINST MEEK.

The Magistrate then read the following charge against Mr. Meek:—

"That the said Edward Meek on or about the first day of February, 1884, did unlawfully, corruptly, and wilfully propose and offer, and caused to be proposed and offered and given to John Cascaden, then being a member of the Legislature of Ontario, duly elected and sitting at the first session of the said Legislature, a bribe, recompense and reward, to wit, the sum of \$2,000 in money, and did further undertake to promise to obtain for him the said John Cascaden an office at Regina in the North-West Territory to produce to him the sum of \$80 per annum,—said office being an office in the gift and disposal of the Government of Canada—thereby corruptly to influence said John Cascaden, then being a member in said Legislative Assembly, to the end that the said John Cascaden being a member as aforesaid, contrary to his duty in that behalf, should vote upon any question arising or to arise in such Assembly at the said first session in opposition to the existing Administration of the executive government of Ontario known as the Mowat Government and against and in opposition to the members of said Assembly supporting such Government on the occasion of said vote; and the said informant, upon his oath aforesaid, further said that he is informed and believes that the said Edward Meek, on the 10th day of February, at Toronto, did unlawfully and corruptly propose and offer and cause to be proposed and offered to the said Robert McKim, then being a member of the above-mentioned Legislative Assembly of Ontario, a bribe, recompense, and reward, to wit, did undertake that the office of registrar of deeds at Edmonton, in the North-West Territory, being a valuable office in the gift and disposal of the Government of Canada would be given by the said Government of Canada to the said Robert McKim, together with the sum of \$500 for expenses connected with the opening of the said office, and that to assure the said Robert McKim of his appointment to the said office a promissory note then prepared and signed by the said Edward Meek and one J. A. Wilkinson for the payment of \$5,000 to the said Robert McKim, should be deposited by way of a guarantee and security with some third person to be named between them, for the fulfilment of the said undertaking, with a view thereby to corruptly influence the said Robert McKim in his proceeding; as such member in the said Legislative Assembly, to the end that the said Robert McKim, then being such member as aforesaid, contrary to his duty in the behalf of his constituents, should vote upon any motion arising or to arise in the said Assembly, at the said first session, against and in opposition to the existing Administration of the Executive Government of Ontario, known as the Mowat Government, and in opposition to the members of the said Assembly supporting such Government on the occasion of the said vote."

The information was laid by Mr. Thomas R. Wynn.

THE OFFENCE OF BRIBERY.

Mr. Denison asked for the statute under which this charge was laid.

Mr. Fenton said that it was laid under the Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Denison—That gives the Assembly the power to lay a charge, but it is not clear that it, the offence charged, is a crime, unless there is some Act before this making it an offence to offer a bribe. If it is an offence under the common law it cannot be tried here.

Dr. McMichael submitted that no crime was alleged.

Mr. Irving said that there was a crime alleged. Ordinarily speaking and generally speaking, the legal interpretation of bribery was that of offering a bribe. Offering a bribe to a person who was connected with the administration of justice was primarily an offence. The definition was wider than that. It extended to any class, which included members of Parliament. A person bribing members in the House of Commons in England had been punished, but it was not an offence in the common law. The case referred to had been taken up and punished by the House as a breach of privilege. There were cases, however, in which bribery had been punished under the common law. He quoted Roscoe, where a case of bribery for a corporate office was stated, and in which the briber was punished under the criminal law.

Mr. Denison—If the criminal law recognizes the bribery of a mayor or alderman it should apply also to an attempt to bribe a member of Parliament. It seems to me that this is an analogous case, reasoning from the other—

Dr. McMichael—I object that no crime is made.

Mr. Denison said—Reasoning from the other case that it was not made out he considered was sufficient information to hold this case good. If he made a mistake and threw out the case there was no way of going before the higher Courts with it.

Mr. MacMaster said he was not prepared to say that to bribe a member of Parliament was not an offence.

Mr. Denison said he would let the case stand till to-day. The Court then adjourned till 10:30 this morning.