

Smallman says that he knew *Harris* was actively interested for Respondent, and he thought him the most likely person to go to for money, and he obtained from him \$4,000 in three or four sums. He never promised to repay it, took no receipt and gave no security; no one suggested his going to *Harris*; Respondent never mentioned *Harris* to him; nothing was elicited from this witness in any way to prove that the Respondent knew of the moneys advanced by *Harris*; or any communication between *Smallman* and Respondent as to Election expenses with which *Smallman* was concerned. He proved that Respondent and *Harris* were intimate. He said he paid *Reaves*, \$1,500; *Knowlton*, \$500; Dr. *Hagarty*, \$250; *F. Fitzgerald*, \$600; *John Campbell*, \$250; *Scandrett*, \$500; *W. J. Thompson*, \$100; Alderman *Magee*, \$600; Alderman *Partridge, jun.*, \$100; *Hiscox*, \$50; and spent himself \$150.

All this money he spent for "Election purposes," not asking the parties for what purposes they wanted it.

Mr. *George Harris* proved the great intimacy between his brother *Edward* and Respondent, and that he told his brother that the Election could not go on without money. *Edward* asked how much, and witness said \$5,000 would do. He (witness) said he would give \$1,000, but he has not paid any.

The Respondent swears positively that he had no knowledge whatever of any advance of moneys by *Harris*: that he never talked of financial matters with *Smallman* or *Reaves*, and had no reason to think that either was spending large sums in his behalf: never talked with *Harris* about money matters connected with the Election: never knew *Smallman* was in communication with *Harris*; that it is only within the last fortnight he heard of this payment by *Harris*: that he warned his friends not to spend money illegally or commit him: that he never treated, fearing to break the law: that he canvassed very diligently but never heard or knew anything from which he could suspect there was bribery on his side. He had sold stocks to Mr. *Harris* last fall, on which he still holds \$10,000 of his paper unpaid.

Mr. *Edward Harris* swears that he paid \$4,000 to *Smallman*, and \$2,000 to *Reaves*, for Election expenses. He had a strong feeling of resentment against Mr. *Carling*, and of friendship for Respondent. He had never before subscribed to an Election beyond \$5 or \$10. On the polling day *Reaves* got the \$2,000. He did not intend to advance over \$4,000, but he got excited. He was very intimate with Respondent: saw him every day during the canvass, but never spoke to him about money then or since the Election: does not think Respondent knew he had paid the money; that he has no claim whatever on the Respondent for any of this money, and no understanding whatever that he is to be repaid. He says that he never gave a thought how the money was to be expended. He did not go so far in thinking about it as to consider that it would go to buy votes. It was in the atmosphere that much money would be spent on both sides. On polling day *Reaves* came in and said their opponents were spending two or three dollars to our one dollar, and then he got \$2,000. Only a fortnight ago he mentioned to one of his partners that he had spent this money.

It is impossible to read the evidence without being convinced that this advance of money by Mr. *Edward Harris* was a most illegal and corrupt proceeding, and I deeply regret that a member of the legal profession should knowingly place in the hands of unscrupulous men a sum like six thousand dollars, to be used in debauching and corrupting a constituency. From his purse has been furnished nearly all the money which, in the course of this most startling enquiry, has been proved to have done nearly all the vast amount of mischief and wickedness resulting from extensive bribery.

It is pressed upon me with great force by Mr. *Robinson*, for the Petitioner, that notwithstanding the denials of the witnesses, it is impossible in the very nature of things to doubt: First, that the Respondent must have known that bribery was being extensively practiced: and, secondly, the source from which his partners in business must have obtained the money, that the Respondent could not possibly have