

render assistance, and added, "You do what is right and I will do what is right." The respondent denied having used the words quoted, and said that he merely expressed his readiness and desire to assist, in such circumstances, any resident of his district to attain a proper object. His denial must be accepted. And the words said to have been used were too vague to draw from them any reasonable inference of corrupt intent.

At the meeting of the Conservative association, at Spencerville, on the 6th October, 1919, called to select a candidate for this election, and at which the respondent was nominated, there were 80 or 90 persons present. After the close of the meeting most of the persons present went for dinner to the local hotel, and the respondent told the hotel-keeper that he (the respondent) would pay for the dinners, and he did pay. The amount paid was said to be \$70. This was charged against the respondent as an illegal act.

Reference to secs. 168 and 169 of the Ontario Election Act, R.S.O. 1914 ch. 8; the North Ontario Election Case (1884), 1 Ont. Elec. Cas. 1; Prescott Election Case (1884), 1 Ont. Elec. Cas. 88, 93.

The circumstances, so far as brought out, seemed to preclude the idea that there was a corrupt intention so as to bring the case under sec. 169. The diners were, so far as appeared, all the friends and supporters of the respondent, and his act should be attributed rather to the desire to shew appreciation of the continued confidence of his friends than to any attempt to gain strength in the polling.

As to sec. 168, there being no evidence that any invitation had been given at or during the meeting or at the place of meeting, and the business having been concluded and the delegates dispersed, and, so far as shewn, the arrangement to pay having been made after the dispersal, the case was to be distinguished from the Prescott Case, *supra*, and the Muskoka and Parry Sound Election Case (1884), 1 Ont. Elec. Cas. 197. It was more like the East Middlesex Case (1903), 5 O.L.R. 644, where it was held that there was no breach of the section.

Since these cases the wording of the section has been changed by substituting "at a meeting" for "to a meeting." This would seem to limit rather than to extend the scope of the prohibition as to furnishing refreshments.

This charge failed.

The work of printing the proclamations for the nomination and polls and those for the voting on the prohibition referendum and also of the ballots for each and cards for the polling booths was given by the returning officer for the electoral district of Grenville to the Advance Printing Company Limited, of Kempt-