

In doing these acts Morreault was guilty of bribery under sec. 159 (a), as having promised money or valuable consideration to these voters in order to induce them to vote, and as having paid money to one of them, first, in order to induce him to vote, and afterwards, on account of his having voted.

These men intimated in terms not misunderstood by Morreault that unless they were supported or kept until election day they could not and would not remain at Sault Ste. Marie to record their votes. Morreault thereupon promised them that they would be satisfied,—that he would give Roy the money for them—and they said they would vote for the appellant. Afterwards, in pursuance of his promise, Morreault made the payments to Delargey which have been proved. It is clear that but for their promise to vote for the appellant neither the promise nor the payments of money to them would have been made.

These, as well as the bribery of Roy, were corrupt practices, within the meaning of the Election Act, sufficient of themselves to avoid the election.

Several acts of bribery having been established, it lay upon the appellant to discharge the onus of satisfying the tribunal that, notwithstanding such acts, the election should not be avoided.

To effect that it is necessary that the Court should be convinced that these corrupt acts were not only of a trifling nature in themselves, but of such trifling nature and of such trifling extent that the result cannot have been affected, or be reasonably supposed to be affected, by them, either alone or in connection with other illegal practices. There were other illegal practices not of a trifling nature which cannot be overlooked in considering whether the appellant has succeeded in discharging the onus.

It is not possible to say that the acts of bribery were of a trifling nature in themselves. They were committed under circumstances shewing deliberation and intent. In Roy's case the bargain with him was plainly designed not only to secure his vote, but also to gain the advantage to be derived from the apparent fact (which Morreault took good care to proclaim) that here was a known former supporter of the Liberal side come over to the appellant's side and working for him. How is the extent or far reaching nature of this transaction to be estimated?

The importation of Morreault from Montreal, and his participation in this election contest in the manner in which