

one distinct act of bribery of a voter through his wife. He also made lavish disbursements in his Ward.

*George Hiscox* was canvassing, I consider, with Respondent's knowledge. He admits distinct bribery.

*Marvyn Knowlton* had influence as a temperance man, and went with Respondent to canvass votes, and Respondent knew, I consider, that he was canvassing for him. He received about \$700 and paid \$500 to one *Robinson*, a foreman in a large oil refinery, as *Robinson* said he had much influence with certain voters, and would like to have \$500, and after consulting *Reaves* he gave him the sum. *Robinson* spent some of it in bribing, and I consider Mr. *Knowlton* in this transaction, if not in other reckless payments, acted corruptly.

*William J. Thompson* was canvassing for Respondent, and thinks (as I do) that Respondent knew it. He admits several distinct acts of bribery of voters.

*John E. Robinson*, the man who received the \$500 from *Knowlton*, and who admits having retained \$200 for himself, in my judgment, committed acts of bribery.

*Philip Cook* was Chairman of a Ward Committee: large sums passed through his hands, and he admits distinct acts of bribery.

*John J. Magee*, an active canvasser for the Respondent, received about \$900, which he paid away to various people for what he calls "Election purposes." He would give no definition of his understanding of the "purposes," but it seems impossible to suppose that he could have believed the money was to be spent otherwise than corruptly, and in my opinion he must, on these facts, be assumed to know it was corruptly done.

The very numerous acts of bribery proved with complete distinctness, must render it impossible to uphold this Election.

I have now to consider the evidence in which it is sought, to render the Respondent personally responsible. He admits having paid \$1,150 to Mr. *Dixon* for the expenses that he considered he would be lawfully liable for. There were seven Wards: the constituency consisted of several thousand voters, and he and Mr. *Dixon* consulted as to the amount that probably would be required. At first \$1,000 was considered sufficient. Mr. *Dixon* has given us an account of the expenditures of most of this money. Three hundred dollars went for payments to clerks and messengers; there were eight or ten clerks, and the work ran over nearly all January; messengers were also employed. Other items were for coal, furniture, rent of rooms; \$100 to a Mr. *McDonald* a lawyer, who sometimes acted for Mr. *Dixon*; and \$600 to \$700 was paid by him to Committees in the Wards for their expenses, rent of rooms, light, refreshments, vehicles, driving about, canvassing, etc.

I see no reason to think that Respondent or *Dixon* knowingly applied or intended to apply any of this money to illegal purposes. Respondent further admits having paid to the *Herald* newspaper \$100 for advertising; to the *Free Press* for the same, \$110; and to the *Advertiser* for advertising and for bills, posters and printing connected with Election, \$625. For ornamental canvass cards, \$20.50; stationery and books \$61.35, total \$946.85.

This would leave his admitted expenditures about \$2,100. It was not strongly pressed that such a sum would, under the circumstances, be extravagant, nor am I prepared to hold that it was.

I now turn to another branch of the case affecting the Respondent. Large sums of money were proved to have been received from *Thomas H. Smallman* and *George Reaves*. They were partners with the Respondent in a large oil refining business, called *Reaves & Co.* The Respondent was stated to have been not an active member of the firm. *Smallman* and *Reaves* were shown to have taken a very active and prominent part in promoting Respondent's return. *Reaves* is absent, but *Smallman* was examined. He admitted that between \$5,000 and \$6,000 passed through his hands in the Election contest; of this he himself furnished \$1,000. Mr. *Edward Harris*, a Barrister and Attorney here, belonged to a legal firm which did business for *Reaves & Co.*, and one of the firm was Respondent's own Solicitor.