

is not satisfactorily made out. On the contrary, the testimony leads to the conviction that there would have been no employment if Roy had not been an unfriendly voter.

We have not overlooked Roy's statement that he was asked for his vote in Parent's presence, nor the fact that in that respect he was contradicted by Parent. Beyond question there was talk about his vote when Parent was present. And in all the conviviality and talking that went on, Parent may easily have missed some of the conversation, or Roy may have confused something that occurred in Demers's place, before they met Parent, with what took place afterwards.

The rota Judges, while taking a lenient view of Morreault and of his own account of his doings, were yet unable to accept his denial of Roy's statement that Morreault asked him for his vote. And in that we concur.

As to the other charges, the case is even clearer. The payments to Delargey are clearly shewn. One is admitted by Morreault, and one other he scarcely denies. He can only say he doesn't remember it. It is true that he endeavours to explain the admitted payment by saying that it was made in order to get rid of an importunate tramp.

But it is singular that this man should have singled him out and insisted upon him giving him money, even following him to the railway station, repeating his demands. But the real reason for the payment is explained by the other testimony.

Delargey and D'Aigle, both voters, came to Morreault's committee room, and he was told by Roy that they wanted to be kept or supported until the election was over. Morreault directed Roy to take them to the committee room of Mr. Kearns, another supporter and agent of the appellant. Roy accompanied the two men to Kearns, and told him that he had been sent by Morreault with these two men, who wanted to be supported until the election was over. Kearns sent them back to Morreault, saying that whatever the latter did he had authority to do.

They returned to Morreault's, and he then told them to stay and they would be satisfied — he would give Roy the money to pay them. Kearns was present and heard Roy give this testimony, but he was not called to deny or explain his part in the transaction, and the rota Judges accepted Roy's version.

We think the promise and payments to Delargey and the promise to D'Aigle well established, and we concur in the rota Judges' findings.