

him if his evidence would have assisted the respondent. Roy's evidence, therefore, remains unshaken upon two vital points on which it was open to contradiction, and I must hold that charges Nos. 30 and 32 (the latter as regards payment of money only) are proved. I attach no importance to the payment of \$1 at the station. It was probably made merely to get rid of a pestering tramp. As to the Daigle charges, the first, as to the promise, is proved; the second, as to the payment, is not.

Charges 54 to 57 inclusive. Charge 54, that on polling day one W. H. Plummer, an agent, gave Wm. Turpin two bottles of whisky, to be corruptly given by Turpin to voters. It was proved that Plummer gave Roy, on Turpin's order, two bottles of whisky some time during the afternoon of the polling day, one of which Roy handed to Turpin, but there was no evidence that the latter treated any elector with that whisky. This charge and charge 56, similar to charge 54, substituting Roy's name for Turpin's, are both dismissed.

Charge 55, that Plummer gave Turpin a sum of money to be expended (1) in bribing voters, and (2) for the purpose of corruptly providing meat, drink, and refreshment to voters on polling day. Plummer's evidence was that, some eight or ten days before the polling day, he, on his own account, employed Turpin to act as a sort of detective to spy upon and report the conduct of the petitioner's party. That he was to pay him for his services \$24. Plummer's blotter contained two entries, one for \$6 paid "Turpin," and later "Turpin in full \$10." The remaining \$8 were not accounted for. That any of the money received by Turpin from Plummer was actually expended in bribery, there is no evidence, and, therefore, however, little confidence we may have that there was no unlawful expenditure of that kind, we cannot infer that the money given to Turpin was given for such purpose. The note or order (if Clapperton's evidence of its contents is true, and it was not denied by Plummer) contains a very damaging suggestion, and had there been any evidence of actual bribery by Turpin, it would, I think, have been difficult not to find the charge proved, apart from the question of agency, as an offence under sec. 159 (c) of the Election Act.

On the second branch of this item of the particulars, viz., the giving of meat, drink, or refreshment to a voter on account of his being about to vote, or having voted, etc., it was proved by Clapperton that he was a clerk in the grocery shop, or store, of one Gandreau, and that of the \$5 taken in by the witness on polling day for whisky or beer supplied