

The evidence amply sustains their findings in respect of all the charges that have been held proven. We do not deem it necessary nor do we propose to review the evidence at any considerable length. There was, as there generally is in cases of this kind, a good deal of contradictory testimony from the principals concerned in the impeached transactions, and we must draw our own inferences, assisted of course by the opinions formed and conclusions arrived at by the rota Judges during the progress of the trial before them.

With regard to the Roy charges, the rota Judges, in spite of the difficulty they felt in accepting Roy as a truthful witness, came to the conclusion upon the whole testimony that his employment and payment were based upon a request for his vote and an understanding that he would vote for the appellant or abstain from voting altogether. It is urged that this finding is opposed to the direct testimony of Parent, in whose veracity the rota Judges expressed confidence. But Parent was not in a position to know all that transpired, and it is quite apparent that more did transpire than he was aware of. According to M. Morreault, he and Roy had been together and talking for some time before Parent came upon the scene. And Parent says that almost the first words he heard pass between Morreault and Roy were that Morreault asked Roy to work for him and offered him \$3 or \$4 a day, and that Roy's reply was, "I don't intend to sell my vote." Why should he speak of his vote unless something had been said about it previously? Is it not likely that something had transpired to make him think that his vote was being sought for?

At this time Morreault had been sent up to Sault Ste. Marie from Montreal by the party—as the appellant said—to help in the election. He was aware that Roy was a voter and opposed to the appellant and that he was out of work. What special reason had he for desiring to employ such a person to work as his assistant?

The work to be done did not call for any great amount of knowledge or intelligence. One would have supposed that, if needed, some person could have been found among the appellant's supporters who could speak English and French and was capable of performing the light labour that Roy was given to do.

If money was to be spent for such services, why spend it upon a political opponent? Money was paid by Morreault to Roy under circumstances calling for explanation. The explanation offered is that it was paid for the services, but this