## INDEX TO PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

has

try

of

ade

lis-

pt-

the

for

ure

, in for

the

ot-

he

ıid

iat

ed

bla

)n.

the

i a

a a

on-

lis-10t

er.

his

it

rds

No

he

d :

88-

80

ted

ich

8.00

ail

ing

on

nce

the

ing of A

ute 1. 289

ber a

the

.... 289

.... 289

.... 166

.... .243

..... 251

223

Dominion Election Act or 1874 .- One Good win, contractor, and George Good win, and Sutton his manager, employed about 100 men on the canal; and George Goodwin and Sutton were active supporters of the respondent. These two canvalued the men, and found that a large majority of them intended to vote for the respondent. On the evening before the poiling day, with the approbation of Goodwir, the contractor, they told the foreman to tell the men to come to their work as usual, and they would all be taken to the polls by the teams without distinction, whether they voted for the petitioner or the respondent, and be brought straight back again. And the men were given to understand that if they went and came straight back, nothing would be deducted from their pay, without distinction as to the mode in which they might vote. This had been the custom in all former elections as well municipal as parliamentary. Ileld :- That abstaining from charging the men for their time was, under the circumstances, an act of corruption sufficient to avoid the election. (Do.) ...... :-- Various charges were made, alleging the intimidation of persons employed upon the Government works, and the exercise of undue influence upon them, by threats of dismissal to induce them to vote for the respondent. Heid :-- That the evidence in support of these charges was wholly insufficient..... :-- One Robinson, a voter, who worked under Goodwin, was asked by Goods win if he would go up with him to vote, to which he replied that he would prefer not to do so, as he was a poor man and had friends on the other side who would be offended by his doing to, and he would therefore stay at work. Goodwin assented, and left him at work. After his time had been taken for the afternoon, one of Dr. Christie's agents coming up, Robinson

accompanied him to the poll, and voted, stating that he voted for Dr. Christie. Goodwin, meeting him on his return with the petitioner's caavaser, ordered him to be dismissed, and he was accordingly dismissed from the works. But the evidence was conflicting whether he was dismissed because he voted for the petitioner or because he had deceived his employer. Held --That the weight of evidence went to show that he was dismissed because he voted against the respondent, and that his dismissed was therefore an act of intimidation avoiding the election. 290

:-At one of the polls in Chatham, a certain number of persons had their ballots marked by the deputy returning officer, without having been made to take the oath that, they could not themselves mark their ballots; some of them voting openly by causing their ballots to be marked in the room where several persons were besides the returning officer and clerk, and the representatives of the two candidates. But all these took place ingood faith, Arrowithout the voters having been induced to act in that way by an extendition or corrupt practice, on the part of the respondent's agents, or of the deputy returning officer. The voters appeared to act in this way of their own will, and without having been asked or urged to do so by any one, and the returning officer also appeared to have acted in good faith. Held (1):-The votes so taken were irregular and illegal.