

by way of treats to various persons, about \$3 was received from Turpin for that purpose. This would mean, as the witness said, a treat of 30 persons, unless some were treated twice. Probably the money thus expended by Turpin was part of the money he had received from Plummer, and, assuming that the persons so treated were voters, it would be a corrupt practice on the part of Turpin. But I do not find any section of the Act which enables me to fasten it upon Plummer as the person who supplied the money thus unlawfully expended by Turpin, as in the case of a person who advances money to be expended in bribery (sec. 59 (c)), or for the purpose of betting (sec. 164 (2)). Indeed, this form of stating a corrupt practice is, to me, quite novel. But even if the evidence can be regarded as sufficient to establish what sec. 162 (2) calls "extensive or general or miscellaneous" treating, or the corrupt practice struck at by sec. 163 (1), I think that agency has not been made out on the part of either Plummer or Turpin. The former was present as a delegate at the nominating convention, though how or when he was appointed did not appear. Then he spoke on behalf of the respondent at one or two meetings, and looked in at some of the smaller meetings,—the committee meetings; but is not shewn to have taken any part in them. He appears, in short, to have been a sort of free lance.

Charges 78 to 81, inclusive, and charge 90, are, except charge 90, personal charges in respect of the \$235 paid to Morreault, of which \$100 was paid by the respondent himself; \$110 by one Hand, an agent of the respondent, and \$25 by one Thompson, another agent; and both of the latter were paid with the respondent's assent or knowledge. I find that none of these sums were paid with any corrupt intention or for any corrupt purpose, or with intent that Morreault should expend them or any part of them corruptly. Morreault was not a volunteer nor a voter. He was a professional man, and the sum received by him was not an extravagant payment for his time and expenses. But, although it was not a corrupt payment, it was, I think, an illegal one. I find no authority to include a payment for the purposes Morreault was employed for (taking them as a whole) in the personal expenses of the candidate or his other election expenses. It was, at all events, illegal as not having been made through the respondent's financial agent, as required by sec. 197, and there was, moreover, in respect of it, a distinct infraction of sec. 201 of the Election Act in the omission to include it in the detailed statement of the candidate's election expenses. The transaction was a blameworthy one, well calculated to