Commission.

Commission began its
l, Deal, on Tuesday.
W. H. Holl, Esq.,
s H. Jeune, Esq.,
, Ernest Baggallay,
ing the inquiry, said
to make a stringent
nces and details of all
ces which had existed
lwich, whether such
re of direct bribery, of
es, or for persons not
They should endeavour
of every transaction,
ey should have the co-
of every inhabitant.
portance that persons,
hould give as soon as
ners all the information
ight lead to a speedy
The Commission was
the borough, and the
occupy would depend
h which people came
oners were vested with
powers, and all persons
who withheld informa
to deal severely with
who disclosed all they
wer to extend a protec-
from any penalty they
ge was examined by the
Town Clerk of Sand-
numbered 2,116. The
100 in excess. That
s persons who were
2,000 would be a fair
nstituency. Sandwich
223, Walmer 311. The
freemen, occupiers, and
143, Sandwich house-
er. Deal 1,217, and 3
, all occupiers. The
ency in 1869 was 1,986;
essen was 933, Brassey
es polled 710 in that
r the Reform Act with
ow it was 309. The
pposed election, were—
99 17s. 3d. Sandwich,
industries of Sandwich
imports of corn and coal,
were no manufactories.
knew nothing only as a
actual leading Conserva-
d not know; he took no
Mr. Frank Baker might
es, a grocer in Sandwich,
There was no Liberal
ding Liberals he could
s Mr. Harrisson, a corn-
nd a nephew of his had
Mr. Richard Collard.
l or corrupt practices in
last election to his know-
umour of a great deal of
was evident to the eye in
ng and other decorations.
they were, and must have
This was much more
n Sandwich. Indeed, he
ring 20 years. He knew
s employed, and should
an excessive number in
much surprised at the
ion, and could not believe
May election on behalf of
ed for and handed in by
amount was £3,153 5s. 3d.
ceived by the Returning
880. He first received a
he Liberal candidate 20th
chers he handed in to the
which were called for by
ent petition, and impounded
al abstract of expenses was
amount reached £445 for
For Sandwich £443 5s. 11d.
ed for a return of the ex-
ne the witness did not know
went on at Sandwich. He
s. It was a very quiet elec-
vise as regarded riot and drink-
gs came out in 1854, and he
tom had grown much since.
was more employment of
he last than in any previous
orth, Mr. Roberts' private
mined.—Mr. Roberts consulted
e late election, and he put Mr.
erts into communication with
nothing whatever to do with
the election. He acted for Mr.
etition inquiry as his solicitor.
band in the brief the witness
bowed to the decision of the
took whatever responsibility
ter.] He could give nothing
corrupt practices, on the part
aid beyond rumour. He did
iry in that direction, as he
He made inquiries from one
ative to a case of subornation
Elliott. Lewis and Lewis, it
this man, a canvasser for the
was offered £30 if he would
ld consider about it, and subse-
o London and underwent an
s and Lewis's office, where he
n a promissory note. He did
follow up the inquiry, as Sir
he seat.
er, town clerk of Deal and
rates, said that at the last
on of Deal was 8,000. The
not very extensive, and it
ilding, in supplying ships
for preserving vegetables
ade, and brick making. The
s were not contested on poli-
ir local authority was the
n, and 18 councillors. In
4 fully-licensed houses. 14
grocers and wine merchants'
large number of flags and
ction in May; it was an
umber. Deal and Walmer
uated in respect to flags on
e number of flagstaffs which
anently there. Flags were
allest excuse. There were
about with boards. There
s going about on the day of
utmost distance of a polling
rt of the town was about a
at all for the difference in
last election?—I think it is
inion, but in many respects
ell represented us and were
This election was indepen-
lemen altogether. I believe
atives voted for Mr. Knatch-
cause he was very highly
uing, said that there was
drunkenness arising on the
It was particularly quiet
e was not surprised at the
ority.

Mr. R. J. Emmerson, clerk to the magistrates at Sandwich, and agent for Sir Julian Goldsmid, detailed the circumstances under which Sir Julian was introduced to the constituency and stated that Lieutenant-General Adye was at first a candidate, but on being told that £2,000 would be required to return him he declined to stand. Witness thought it was necessary to have £2,000 to fight an election for Sandwich on account of the large sums required for irregular expenses, such as expenditure for flags and employment of large numbers of persons. Witness told Sir Julian Goldsmid that he could not conduct it for less than £3,000. Sir Julian said he would not pay any other claim than legal expenses. Before the petition was presented witness had received £410 from Sir Julian, and afterwards £250 from Lewis and Lewis. There was no regular Liberal organisation at Sandwich, and only one man was paid for professional services. After the election they had public-house bills sent in to the amount of £89, which had not been paid. The sum of £40 appeared in the account, part of which was expended in paying bills which had been incurred daily in public-houses and part for rosettes. He thought the score of £89 had been run up by political friends who treated their friends in turn, and expected his party to pay. Small sums were paid daily in order to keep down expenditure. He was sorry to have taken the position, as he knew these payments of voters' scores at public-houses were illegal but he came to make a clean breast of it. To some extent these bills were paid daily in order to prevent the accumulation of bills in the election expenses. Seven publicans at Sandwich were paid £4 each for committee rooms and for canvassing voters. He also, in addition to the sum of £40 paid to Mr. Coleman, gave that gentleman £50. It was given to him to spend and apply in the best way he could to secure voters who had promised to support the Liberals. Coleman stated that voters on the other side could get any money they liked, and that £50 was necessary to secure votes already promised. He had reason to believe other sums were promised, but they were not paid. A Mr. Ford, a friend of Sir Julian Goldsmid, left witness £200 in gold, and on same day gave Mr. Edwards, of Deal, £1,300. Nothing was said about the expenditure, except that it was to be for the purposes of the election. This was the day before the election. He received a cheque from Sir Julian for £200 a day or so afterwards, and had now a balance due to Sir Julian after receiving the cheque from Lewis and Lewis, as the £89 had not been paid for drinks.

The witness was examined as to various items of accounts, after which the commissioners adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, October, 6th.

The Commissioners resumed the inquiry on Wednesday morning.

Mr. Spofforth, re-examined, said: Mr. Crompton Roberts thought of standing at the General Election, but it was concluded that Mr. Hugessen and Mr. Brassey were too firmly established. He was promised that if a vacancy occurred he should be communicated with, and on the 27th March he received a letter from Mr. Usher. My clerk, and Mr. Roberts came down and met some of the leading Conservatives, but it was not decided that he should stand until the 4th May, when he came to Deal and issued his address. I was engaged immediately after the petition was presented.

What day were the particulars served by Messrs. Lewis?—It would be about the 23rd July. After that I was down here looking after the particulars. I proceeded to find out how far the charges were likely to be made out. The brief was drawn up by me.

In the particulars I see this—"There is no doubt that bribery did extensively prevail, but not with the consent of the candidate." You knew that bribery did prevail?—I did.

I see this—that those who have red ticks against their names are those to whom money is believed to have been paid?—Yes, sir.

And I find this—It must be admitted that those names with red marks against their name are men that were paid money by James Ralph in the presence of Elliott?—I see nothing in the brief that enables me to point out the men who received money from Ralph. There is no other copy of the particulars to which this refers.

There is this—Where no money is paid "no" will be found against their names?—Yes.

I find that some have "no," and some "Liberal." I suppose the "Liberal" means that the man was a Liberal, and could not be bribed?—Yes.

Then I find colourable against some names, what does that mean?—Colourable employment.

Mr. Spofforth was here examined at length regarding the different marks in the particulars he drew up.

Examination continued—I find this, "All the men who bribed are staunch and they believe their men are, but some are afraid that Elliott will turn up. He is now believed to have started for America?"—I believed he had started for America, and the men believed those who had been bribed were staunch.

The ticks were the result of information given by a third party?—Yes.

Who was it?—I would rather not answer.

I must have it.—May I write it?

Yes. Name supplied.

Then it was upon his information you put "no," "bribed," or "dead"?—Yes sir.

Did you see any of the alleged bribers personally?—I don't think I did, with the exception of Ralph.

He told you what sum of money he had had?—He did not, nor to whom he gave money.

Names were named from which you concluded the charges could be proved?—I did, but I don't remember that he told me that any of the charges could be proved. I had an interview with William Frost Speers, Valentine Myhill, G. Philpott, Ralph, Elliott, J. L. Adams Jack Adams, Thomas Philps. These names I am giving because you asked me if I had seen bribers, (continued reading). S. Hooper and W. Lock. I think those are all the persons I saw. There is one name of Betts but I don't think I saw him.

There is this, "that all the bribers were entrusted with money, but only in three cases where their names had been coupled with the particulars." What does that mean?—I cannot say. I saw the men I have named and they gave me to understand that they had been entrusted with money.

Who entrusted them with the money?—I don't know; I never inquired.

Did you see any of the persons bribed?—I did not, I never inquired for them.

I suppose that what you mean by Elliott turning up was that he would split?—Yes; that he would give some information that would compromise the party.

And it was through Elliott that Mr. Lewis and the petitioner got on the track that bribery had been going on?—I concluded so from the information I received.

I see opposite the name of James Crippen "received £3 to vote for Sir Julian, the money was put into his wife's lap, she gave it to him and she can prove it."—Where did you get that information? I cannot say. I did not see any of the persons who were bribed.

There is this note, "To show how rackless the case has been got up there are two men named Adams, father and son, who are charged, and have never been paid a penny for voting; but they will swear, if requisite, that they have received the names of those they have paid."—That is information I received.

There is this, "that in order for a large quantity of fireworks was given to induce them to vote, but the fireworks were never used or paid for."—Who gave you that information?—I can't say.

Then there is this, "Mr. Edwin Hughes is charged that he gave an order for a large amount of bunting, £500. Hughes never gave this order but Usher did." That information you get from Usher I suppose?—I suppose so.

There is this "a charge for £15 paid for the Deal pier. Hughes states was for popularity and charged as personal expenses." I suppose you got that information from Hughes?—I did.

Then there is this "Smith L. Warden's bribees, not one of them charged," what does that mean?—That's those he had bribed were not charged.

Then this "W. B. Mackie in the Downs, not served, his wife to write and tell him to stay away." That means that if he was served his evidence would not be favourable to your side and you wanted to keep him away?—There is no use concealing the fact that was the intention.

There is this. "Hooper, Sandwich, safe." Does that mean that you had seen him yourself?—I cannot say.

But I find another note and I think it only just to you to say that it seems that you said he was safe because he could not be charged.

Can you tell me what this paper is?—That is Mrs. Steadman's bill, she is Mrs. Crompton-Robert's housekeeper.

But it seems rather strange to find The Velocipede Club in her bill. Then it is rather confusing to find such entries as these—Mr. C. R. £5, Mr. C. R. £20, and then a sum of £60, and then the whole sum is carried out to £104.

Can you tell me anything about that?—I may say that Mrs. Steadman holds a very responsible position in Mr. Crompton-Robert's house, and he supplied her with a large sum of money, and then, to avoid drawing a cheque, he goes to her for so much and she supplies him with it. That, no doubt, is how the money was supplied to him. I have no doubt that Mr. Crompton-Roberts was pleased to avail himself of her services, for he told me after he came back from Deal that he had been so bothered in interviewing voters and shaking hands with their families during the time he was down here, that when he got back he had to bathe his wrist with hot water for a fortnight.

I see that the total amount of her expenses is £514 for the week; that is a considerable sum for one week. I see that she gave Mr. Crompton-Roberts altogether £180, and I find she gave to a poor man 5s., and then again 2s. 6d. and so on, what does that mean?—I cannot tell, I knew that Mrs. Steadman had Mr. Crompton-Roberts' confidence, and any payment made by her would be sanctioned by him.

A long discussion then took place regarding the whereabouts of Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Spofforth could not say, all he knew was that he was abroad, and the last he heard of him was that he was in Paris. He could not tell when he would return. He was having his holiday, and usually took three months. He had known him to take five months. He, however, hoped the Commissioners would be able to do without his presence.

The President: We must have him.

Mr. Spofforth was directed to let the Commissioners have Mr. Robert's address, and they would communicate with him.

Mr. Emmerson, re-called and examined by the President, produced the correspondence between himself and Sir J. Goldsmid and Messrs. Lewis and Lewis, in reference to the election and to the petition. The reason that he did not mention to Messrs. Lewis and Lewis the £200 he had received from Ford was because Coleman had told him that he had made promises to voters to the extent of £200 or £300. Coleman had paid the £4 to each of the seven publichouses at Sandwich with his knowledge and consent. In his letter to Messrs. Lewis and Lewis he stated that he had called the accounts at the Bell Hotel "personal expenses" to prevent them passing through the election agents' hands. He had not taken that course because he thought that he would be dangerous for those accounts to get into the election agents' hands. The expenditure was not illegal, it was for breakfast, &c., supplied to Sir. J. Goldsmid's friends and supporters at the time of the election. and not for corrupting voters by givin them meat and drink. The "watchers" were set to watch their own voters to prevent them from being tampered with.

The President.—What possible use could these watchers be walking about the streets of Sandwich all night?

Witness.—It had a deterrent effect, and prevented our voters from being tampered with during the night. There were 16 watchers who received £1 each.

Is it usual to employ such persons at the Sandwich elections?—Yes, but not so many as sixteen.

Can you give us the names of any of your voters who were tampered with?—No; but I think there was a list at the committee-rooms.

How many messengers were employed at Sandwich?—Twenty-six, of whom nine were voters and 17 were non-voters, although the latter were probably connected with voters. That was a messenger to every 20 voters. They were sent about to different places. The number was not unusual. They were small tradesmen or artisans.

By Mr. Jeune.— It was not suggested to the persons employed that they ought not to vote. On former occasions men were paired off on each side for such purposes, but that was not done on the last occasion. Of the 200 sovereigns he obtained from Ford, he gave 50 to Coleman to be employed for illegal purposes. The inference was that the remaining 150 sovereings were to be employed in a similar manner. When he received the money nothing was said as to the way in which it was to be applied, but it was understood that it was to be expended illegally.

Does it appear to you that the ballot has had the effect of diminishing corruption at Sandwich?—No, on the contrary, I think that it has tended to increase it.

Has it struck you during the last election that secrecy of voting has tended to increase the expense of elections?—Certainly. Before, we knew which way a man voted; now we do not; and the consequence is that some voters take money from both sides. I do not mean to say that goes on to any great extent here, but they have the opportunity of doing so. and therefore I prefer the other mode of voting.

It is not necessary. now that you do not know which way a man votes, to throw money broadcast, so as to obtain as much influence as possible?—I cannot say that. I do not think, on the whole, that we are very corrupt at Sandwich. (Laughter.) Before the Reform Bill every freeman voting at Sandwich got his £1 or his dinner on the day of the election, and that idea has never been entirely eradicated from their minds.

Do they all expect that now?—No; but there are some who expect something.

Was the election of 1874 a pure one?—Yes.

David Coleman, examined by Mr. Turner, stated that he was a farmer at Sandwich and took an interest in politics. He received £40 from Mr. Emmerson to be applied in taking public-houses. He paid it on a running account for refreshments supplied to voters before the election. He paid £8 for rosettes. Some of the persons to whom he paid the money were voters. He had paid several voters sums varying from 15s. to £4 each for their votes. They all demanded the sum he paid them before they would vote for Sir. Julian. The payments varied according to the value a man put upon his vote. It was understood that the publicans to whom money was paid would canvass their customers. He received altogether £40 and £50 from Mr. Emmerson. The election price for rosettes was from 5s. to 6s. a dozen. There being no Liberal condidate in the field, the thing commenced by his meeting Sir Julian at the railway station. He lent his services to the Literals. He went round canvassing with Sir Julian. He had had very little to do with other elections. He saw that the Conservatives were very busy about, and that it was necessary to have money to meet the case. No money was given to him until he applied for it. When he saw the Liberal voters, they told him that they were pestered by the Conservatives to vote for them. He told them to wait a little and see whether they could get a Liberal candidate, and afterwards he told them that they could have a little refreshments. The owners of the public-houses who received the £4 promised to use their influence on the Liberal side. He used the £50 in keeping down the public-house bills. He got no bill; he just paid what was asked, £5 or £10 as it might be. Some produced their slates. He told them not to make it too heavy. (Laughter.) Some made out their accounts by simply taking stock before and after the election. (Laughter.) He got the father of a labourer named Ford to get him to vote, and promised to satisfy him if he did so; and he afterwards gave Ford £4, as he said others were getting it and he meant to have it also. (Laughter.) He did not know who was distributing money on the other side except from rumour; it might have been Locke or Hughes. He did not hear who had received money on the other side. He paid some of the voters on the day of the election and others the day after. He paid William Piddock, a voter, £14 for getting as many to the poll as he could. Piddock wanted £3 a man, and £2 for himself for expenses. Many of those to whom money was given had always voted Liberal at previous elections. He told them that he would do something for all of them if they would go to the poll. He bargained with some, but not with others. He paid them what he thought would satisfy them. He had made promises to the extent of £150. He stopped paying because he had exhausted his cash. All of the labouring class naturally expected to be paid for their votes. The witness gave a list of 49 persons to whom he had made promises for their votes. He knew of no corrupt payments or promises beyond those he had mentioned. He appointed watchers to find out if any of his voters were visited by the other side. The night before the election was very valuable at times. (Laughter.) The thing having been mooted, he had adopted it, because he thought it was necessary to do so. The watchers were principally labourers, though some were tradesmen; they each got £1.

The President.—That is as much as they would earn in a week, is it not?—Oh, they found no fault with the money. (Laughter.) Twelve of them were voters.

The President.—Perhaps you thought it as well to watch over them? (Laughter.)—Oh, no, they were all safe men. He would not have trusted them if they had not been. He knew of no corrupt practices on the other side, except that of the public-houses, which was patent to everybody. The other side engaged eighteen public-houses. Voters came to him and told him that they could get money from the other side, but they were very careful not to mention any names.

Samuel Olds, examined by the President, said that he was a carriage and cab proprietor at Deal. He had taken an active part in the May election on behalf of Mr. Roberts. Mr. Roberts came down himself, and he saw him on the 4th of May, although he was not present at the meeting held on that day. The same night he engaged several public-houses—he did so immediately Mr. Roberts arrived. Witness took the whole responsibility on himself. He did not discuss the matter with any one. He entered into preliminaries that night with 20 of them. He merely asked whether he could have a committee-room, and the price of it. He also wanted the windows and the outside of the house for posting bills. The price asked was £5. The next day he saw Mr. Hughes and he told him that the billposter wanted £50. Mr. Hughes authorized him to take as many public-houses as he could get for £5 each. Some wanted £10, and some £20 each, but he engaged as many as he could get for £5; altogether about 71 at Deal and Walmer. Some sent in to ask why their houses had not been taken. The receipt was identical in form in each case and was drawn up by Mr. Spofforth's clerk, who went round with him. No distinction was made in the price paid whether the house was a large one or a small beerhouse. Practically he had gone round and offered £5 for a room for a committee-room for the election, and for the right to post bills outside. The landlady at the Lord Warden at Walmer asked 20 guineas for her room, and said that at Swinburn her election bill had come to £250 She came down to the £5 at last, however. They would not accept the sum at the Queen's. It happened to be fine weather at the time of the election, and the meetings were held in the open air, otherwise they would have been held in the houses. Meetings were actually held at 14 houses. Every day a man and a boy went round to change the bills, and pens, ink, and paper were proved in case of the committee dropping in. Nearly all of the houses had a bill or a couple of bills posted on them. Many had a large blue cross, with "out" on it, painted on the walls. He could not say how much money he had received. After the election he had received the account of his receipts. He received the money from Simmonds, and he paid it out of the bag until the money was gone. He got so much a day in gold; he did not count it. He got £270 on the first day and £120 on the second day, making £390. The total paid to the houses was £355. He returned the balance every night to Mr. Hughes, with the receipts. He kept no account. He spent none of this except for the houses. Perhaps £26 or £30 was handed back. He had also received money on account of canvassers—altogether £240. He kept no account of the money so paid; he paid the money and returned the receipts to Mr. Hughes. He paid 41 canvassers. He destroyed the papers after the election, thinking they were of no value. Some canvassers might have been paid by other persons. The canvassers were employed from 10 to 14 days. Some of them were pilots who gave up their turn at sea for the purpose. They were paid £6 each for the whole time. They were employed for Deal, Walmer, and Sandwich.

The inquiry was then adjourned.

THURSDAY, October 7th.

Mr. Olds was recalled and said, in reply to questions from Mr. Holl, that it was all from memory that he gave a list of 37 canvassers; he could not account for the other four. He, himself, was a paid canvasser. He paid the canvassers a few days before the election—perhaps three or four days. Previous to the election he gave Mr. Hughes (of Sandwich) £10; altogether he gave Mr. Hughes about £45. Thought it was on Bank-holiday, the Monday before the election. He paid it in gold. He received it from a short, dark gentleman, whom he met in his room on the afternoon previous to the election. Had not seen him before nor since. He gave him £1,000 in gold. He asked him what it was for and was told it was for electioneering purposes, to be distributed amongst canvassers and others to the best of his judgment. Evans had £102, Solomon £24, Hayman £111, Ralph £120. That was all he could think of, but a man named Worels had some, £20 or £30. There was also a man named Thomas Barnes, who had about £12, and William Bushell, surveyor, £30. Messrs. Philps, Mackins, Redman, Rae, Porter, Spears, Mackey, V. Myhill, Jones, Wise, Wood, and others also received sums of money. I kept a memorandum of the list, and when the election was over I destroyed it. The man who brought me the money told me to distribute it as equally as I could amongst the canvassers and working men. I do not know who the man was. I asked him his name, but he refused it. He came down by the 3.27 train on Bank-holiday. He was a dark man with dark whiskers; he was not very stout. I should think he was about 50 years of age. I had had no intimation that the money was coming. I was frequently asked for money as I walked along the streets, especially by the working classes: I do not know who asked me. They simply asked me, "Is there any money about? Are we going to have anything this time?" These men were voters. They had seen me with Mr. Hughes. He had been stopped half-a-dozen times to know if there was anything "about." There always had been something before, and they were anxious to know if there was anything to come on this occasion. Messrs. Hughes and Giles stated what they would require, and stated that the number of men would be about 150, and that they required £3 each. He gave him to understand that he had spent more than £150, and wanted more money. Money was also distributed by gentlemen named Eastes, Locke, Hooper, and others. Witness did not know how much Hooper had spent; but they said they required some money. Three pounds a head was agreed to. Witness distributed the whole of the £1,000. The list of Giles and Hughes was chequed to see if they were all voters; but, as regarded Deal, there was no time to do this. When Mr. Hugessen was raised to the peerage the Conservatives "showed up" in their true colours. In previous years the Liberals had forestalled them, but in this instance he was determined to have the start. He believed that had not Mr. Crompton-Roberts spent a shilling he would have been successful. It was most important that public-houses should be engaged. On a wall a bill might be quickly pulled down, but in a window a bill would remain. Witness asked no one for his vote. He believed that many of those from whom he hired houses voted against the Conservative party. He believed that the dark man did not tell him how much there was in the bag. His calculations gave him about £1,000. Why he left this matter was that several came in for the money, and it was gone before he could take account of it.

Mr. Olds then handed in a memorandum he had made from memory. The gentleman, he said, was not in his room more than 20 minutes. To the best of his belief there was £1,000; but he did not count the money. He intended to do so, but was called out. He was under the impression, he said, that there was £1,000. The gentleman said, "Here's a bag of money;" and he was prepared to say positively that there was not £1,300: the bag would not have held it.

This witness was examined as to when he gave the money. He said he had his business to attend to. He could not positively declare what the bag contained. Had given no account to anyone as to whom he had given the money. Had had no conversation with anyone with the exception of Mr. Hughes, who said he knew nothing about the money—he said, "I know nothing about it; it is nothing to do with me." Witness told him he had distributed it as he had been told, but did not stipulate how it had been distributed. He thought that the money was paid on the same night, but some of it might have been distributed on the following morning Others applied to him for money, which was paid. He did not know who had told them to call. He paid for the public-houses and for canvassing, as he had stated in his previous evidence.

In reply to Mr. Holl, Mr. Olds said that he expected no money until he found the man in the house. There had generally been money sent down for electioneering expenses; but he had not the slightest intimation that the money was coming to him, nor that he was delegated to distribute it. Had had no conversation with Mr. Crompton-Roberts concerning money coming to him to be distributed. Mr. Hughes told him he did not want to know anything about the money.

In further examination by the Commissioners, Mr. Olds said that he had been led to suppose by Mr. Hughes that money would come, but Mr. Hughes objected to spending money unless it were absolutely necessary. He engaged several public-houses at £5 each to be used, if required, as committee rooms, and for placarding bills.

John Thomas Outwin said: I am a wine and spirit merchant. I first had to do with the election about the 8th or 10th of May. Sir Julian Goldsmid came down a few days before. I am a member of the Liberal Association. There is a committee, and I can produce a list of the names if required. I engaged several public-houses under the direction of Mr. Edwards.

Mr. Outwin then gave the names of several public-houses, etc., which had been engaged as committee rooms.

Witness further stated that he had authority from Mr. Edwards to act as he liked, and he hired as many private houses as he thought necessary. He paid £54 for public-houses, and to Mr. Woodman (of Greenwich), £15 8s. He paid the money out of his own pocket. Had received between £1,100 and £1,200. The money was distributed to different persons.

Mr. Outwin then handed in a document containing a list of the bribees.

Before Sir Julian Goldsmid came down he was in communication with two or three other gentlemen, who were rejected. [A bundle of telegrams was then handed to their honors.] Did not know why the Hon. Philip Stanhope was rejected. Mr. Frank Marshall, named in a telegram, was secretary to Mr. Davis. Witness wrote to him to see if Mr. Davis would stand, but he refused. Mr. Woodman came down on the 18th of May, in response to a telegram.

The way in which the money had been distributed was described as money paid to Messrs. Lambert and Marsh (pro Warner), Watts, Chittenden, Gibbons, Philpott, Joe Brown, Finnis, Norris, Else, Harris, Hancock, Potts, Allen, Riley, Ramell, Pritchard, Cox, Hobday, H. Millen, J. Millen, Ralph, Pettett, King, Tremere, Woodman, Norris, Hougham, Denne, Robinson, Redman, Willey and Theobold; committee room £54. Sundry amounts, as per book, £35 15s.; Budd, Bedwell, Flanders, Jordan, George Town, Roberts, Roberts, etc., etc.

Edward Thomas Rose, a draper at Walmer, stated that he had received altogether £640 in gold from Mr. Edwards, the Liberal agent, for the purposes of the election. He had distributed the money he had received in paying voters, with the knowledge of Mr. Edwards.

James Barber Edwards had acted as agent for Sir J. Goldsmid at Deal and Walmer. He told Sir Julian that a lump sum would be required for the purposes of the election, whereupon Sir Julian said that that was very unusual, as he had never paid anything before until after the election. The day after Sir Julian came down he got a cheque from him for £200. Afterwards he got two further cheques from him for £320 each. He also received £1,30 at Sandwich from a stranger named Ford. He said that Sir Julian's friends had sent the money, because Sir Julian had a great objection to paying money before the election was decided. The money was in gold, in bags. He certainly told Sir Julian that he had received the money. He expressed no surprise. He distributed the money among various persons. He had spent £490 more than he had received. He had been told that the money was required for bribery, but he had not told Sir Julian that.

The inquiry was then adjourned until Friday.

FRIDAY, October 8th.

Mr. Edwards was further examined: In reply to Mr. Holl, he said the statement produced was the whole of the claims with respect to Deal. About £500 had been paid, and about £1,000 remained unpaid. Ramell had money for flags, and Cornwell for money and clerks. These were the principal payments which had been made. Mrs. Jones, a very old Blue, had £18 on account. Mr. Hall was a solicitor in Deal, and the Liberal Association thought he ought to be retained. He had sent in a claim for 50 guineas.

There was £10 charged by a Mr. Goymer for a strike list. The charge had always been made.

A great quantity of rope was used for poles. There was a great quantity of flags. On the Prince of Wales' Terrace one flagstaff contained 50 flags.

Mr. Edwards was further interrogated as to the expenses, which lasted some time, and also as to money received from Sir Julian Goldsmid. He believed people wanted a change, which had a great deal to do with the election, but did not think political causes had anything to do with it.

Frederick Spencer Cloke said: I am clerk to the Guardians of Eastry Union. I was sub-agent to Mr. Crompton-Roberts, under Mr. Hughes. On Wednesday, the 6th of May, before ever I had had any communication with Mr. Hughes, I entered into the contest. I believe Mr. Crompton-Roberts was taken round the town and introduced to several voters. Mr. Hughes subsequently asked him to take the Sandwich district. I spoke to Mr. Hughes about the public-houses which had been hired, and that gentleman said it was perfectly legitimate to do so, and handed over £50 for me to pay for them. I paid £5 each for the hire of a room and for the display of bills. I hired eighteen, and one Central Committee room. There were no hoardings on which to place bills, therefore the public-houses were hired. No bills were displayed anywhere else. Mr. Hughes assured him that there was not the slightest illegality. He believed the houses were worth the money paid for them. At the least he knew of four of the public-houses, the occupiers of which had no vote.

The further evidence of Mr. Cloke lasted about two hours. He knew of no treating on the Conservative side. The charge of £20 6s. 6d. for carriages was by his hiring. It was necessary very often to come over to Deal. He did not think there was any excess of charge in this. Three men were paid £1 each as watchers. He could not say whether these watchers were voters. He did not engage the messengers; they were employed by the committee. There were 41. There was a great deal of "literature" going about.—We did all we could to educate the people. The messengers, I believe, in the great majority, were all boys, some sons of widows. We put up no flags until the opposition commenced. £31 was paid to canvassers; they worked hard, and he only considered it fair and reasonable they should be paid. He made no bargain with them before the election. He received £250 and subsequently the balance of account. Mr. Hughes sent me bills asking voters to vote for Mr. Crompton-Roberts with a large cross opposite Mr. Mr. Crompton-Roberts name; also announcing that there was to be a regatta. He knew of no one else but Mr. Olds who received money in the first instance for distribution. He had not the slightest idea who was the dark gentleman who left the money with Mr. Olds.

At the conclusion of his evidence, Mr. Cloke was informed he had given his evidence very satisfactorily.

Thomas James Usher: I am an auctioneer and surveyor. Took an active part during the election. I produced a letter I sent to Mr. Spofforth, also a letter I received from Messrs. Spofforth and Simmons, Mr. Spofforth's clerk, came down to meet Dr. Hulke, Mr. W. Nethersole and myself. Mr. Usher then mentioned, in reply to Mr. Holl, the names of several gentlemen whom he believed were on the Conservative side. When Simmonds came down to Deal he said that Mr. Crompton-Roberts was willing to come down as a candidate on the Conservative side, if agreeable. We had meetings and decided to accept Mr. Crompton-Roberts' as a candidate. He was shortly afterwards introduced to Mr. Hughe's, to whom he gave up the conduct of the election. And to whom he handed all over the papers. Mr. Hughes came down on the 5th and on or about Friday the 7th I undertook the flags and colours, stating he should leave it entirely in my hands. I undertook Deal and Walmer, but ultimately gave up Walmer, which business I left to Mr. Marley. He gave orders for certain goods, and so soon as he had incurred the sum of £100 he went to Mr. Hughes and got a cheque. About the 13th or 14th of May he had £100. On the 15th of May he had £100, and on the day before the election he had a third £100; afterwards £75, and £30. Altogether £754 10s. 10d. was expended, which sum included poles, cordage, etc. Chapman, draper, had over £80 for rosettes, etc. He was a voter; other voters had money for rosettes.

The Court then adjourned for half-an-hour, after which

Edwin Cornwell was sworn. He said he took an active part in the last election; in fact he considered he was private secretary to Mr. Edwards. He paid £124 16s. to messengers. They paid board boys 2s. a day, and those a little older they paid 2s. 6d. a day. There was a quantity of bills to go out and other things going on. There were no voters among them—he took particular notice of this. A man named Elliott was refused by him to be a messenger. He had £230 for this purpose. Mr. Edwards gave him the money. He paid £61 17s. 6d. for clerks, etc. Gave the clerks 7s. per diem, and on the day of the election he gave them 10s. T. C. Hall had £15 for out-voters. One or two had to come from Scotland. Thought he had expended about £9. Gave, he believed, Mr. Pilcher £5; Goymer had £12; Watts, £25. He paid altogether £297. Received no other money.

John Pettet Ramell said he received from Mr. Edwards, at different times, £208 in gold. Had a conversation at the "Star and Garter" Hotel. He was applied to for rope. He paid for putting up flag poles £118. He paid 30s. a pole. One pole was a large one. He put up about 80 poles in Deal. There was a complete forest of poles. The big pole at the Prince of Wales' Terrace cost £25. It took three days to put up this specific pole, and took thirty men to do the work. It was carried out by "W. H. Ramell:" my name is "J. P." Mr. Pockett came down to vote. I gave him a sovereign and he gave me a receipt. Hougham had £6. He looked upon it as railway fare there and back. There was the sum of £11 15s. in the items for money paid to watchers. Witness paid them, according to his memory, 5s. per night.

I did not get all the ropes back. Files had the arrangement of putting up this particular pole. I paid £2 for space on the "Seaman's Hope." This ground is used for boats.

W. H. Ramell, witness's brother, had, it appeared, £53 for making flags. I paid him (my brother) £25 on account. My brother sent in an account for £53. I believe my brother made between 300 and 400 flags. He is a painter. The £53 was for making and painting flags. My brother is a voter. The charge for every letter painted on a flag was not 9d He received £20 and £36 from Mr. Edwards; the £36 he gave to different persons to distribute. Some had £3, some £4, and others £5. He gave Mr. Smith £5, but he had an account against him for £4—which meant a set off of one. They were (witness said) to have more when it was to be got at.

Henry Speers: I am the proprietor of the Antwerp Hotel. I received a sum of money from Mr. Olds—£108.—I have made out a list and I produce it. I gave £3 to each voter whom I bribed. I was one of the canvassers and I received £6 from Mr. Olds. I spent that and a little more out of my own pocket. I received £5 for my house, but no more.

Robert William Jones, proprietor of the "Sir Sydney Smith," had £5 for the use of his house, £6 as a paid canvasser, and £39 to distribute among voters. He gave eleven persons £3 each, and returned the £6 to Mr. Hughes.

The Court then adjourned until ten o'clock this (Saturday) morning.

Deal Borough Petty Sessions.—At this court on Thursday last (before the Mayor, J. Iggulden and J. R. Lush, Esqrs), *Robert Mallett* was charged with cruelly assaulting and beating his wife. The poor woman appeared in court and exhibited several bruises, which she alleged, had been caused by her husband.—Mallett was sentenced to two months' imprisonment with hard labour.

The Registration.—The following is the result of the list of the voters for the borough of Sandwich:—Liberals struck off on objection, 13; Conservative householders' claims admitted, 30; Liberal ditto, 5; Conservative lodgers' claims admitted, 39; Liberal ditto, 6; giving a net Conservative gain of 71.

CANTERBURY.

St. Augustine's Petty Sessions.—James Amos and Henry Inge were each fined 5s. and 12s. costs for being on the premises of the First and Last beerhouse, Herne, during prohibited hours on the 19th of Sept.—Henry Smith and James Dunk, both of St. Mildred's parish, Canterbury, were each fined 5s. and 6s. 9d, costs for trespassing on land in the occupation of Mr. C. J. Wood, at Milton-next-Canterbury, for an unlawful purpose.—Charles Edward Filmer, who said he belonged to Durham, was sentenced to one day's imprisonment for stealing a perambulator at Patrixbourne on the 29th ult., belonging to Charlotte Stedman.—Annie Whitwell, 13 years of age, for stealing five pears from an orchard belonging to Mr. G. L. Gosselyn, Whitstable, on the 28th ult., was ordered to pay the costs of the summons amounting to 9s.

EASTBOURNE

On Tuesday evening an inquest was held on the body of the Rev. Samuel Henry Carter, of Jarvis Brook. The deceased preached at the Congregational church here on Monday morning, and after his sermon, whilst the congregation were singing a hymn, he fell down in the pulpit and died before medical assistance could be obtained. Deceased was sixty-nine years of age, and the cause of death was syncope.

CHATHAM.

On Tuesday His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge visited Chatham, accompanied by a numerous staff, for the purpose of holding a review of the troops in garrison, arriving shortly before twelve. On the ground were the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, the 31st Regiment, the Royal Marines, and the 52nd Regiment of Light Infantry, the whole numbering about 4,000 men. At the close of the proceedings the Duke of Cambridge took luncheon with General Sir Evelyn Wood, V.C., at Government House, and then inspected the whole of the recruits, drawn up for the purpose, on the general parade ground.

SITTINGBOURNE.

On Saturday afternoon an inquest was held at Cliffe-at-Hoo touching the death of Alice Amelia Ward, aged 18, daughter of the clerk of the works at a cement factory. The deceased appears to have been unhappy at home for some reason, and on Thursday, Sept. 30, committed suicide in a most deliberate and determined manner. She seems to have undressed, carefully washed herself, and put on clean linen, and then to have got into bed, where, placing the muzzle of a pistol (which she had previously loaded) into her mouth, she shot herself dead. The following letter, addressed to her brother was found in the room: "Dear Frank—You must not think it unkind of me for doing this. I am tired of my miserable and unhappy life, although I am only eighteen; but no one loves me in the world, so I will go to a better one. Give my last love to all my friends and tell them not to think of me when I am gone. Tell father I shall not be any more trouble to him any longer. I am very miserable and unhappy, Goodbye. I shall see you again some day. From your sister, Alice Ward." "P.S.—I found the key to fit father's drawer, it was in your cupboard in your room, so you will know where I got it (the pistol) from. I leave all my things to my sister Emily. Goodbye.—A. Ward." The jury returned a verdict of temporary insanity.

DOVER.

Robbery on the Folkestone Road.—A most deliberate and apparently well planned robbery was committed on Sunday at the house of Mrs. Dennis's, widow of one of the polots drowned by the sinking of the Edinburgh, off Dungeness, some time since. Mrs. Dennis resides in the Folkestone-road, and on Sunday went out, leaving the house without anyone in it. At about five o'clock a neighbour looking out the window saw a young man, about 24 years of age, go up to the front door ostensibly to deliver a letter he carried in his hand. Receiving no answer, however, he made his way to the back of the house, and the neighbour thought no more of the occurrence, believing the young man to be a *bona fide* person. When Mrs. Dennis returned home later in the evening, however, she discovered the back room window open, and on making a search found she had been robbed of a sum of about £15, a watch, and two chains

ASHFORD.

On Wednesday, at a meeting of the Royal Humane Society the silver medallion was awarded to William Chambers for the following act of gallantry: Aug. 25, a man named Garson was employed in sinking a well at Ashford, Kent, when he became insensible from the noxious gas. A fellow-workman, named Thomas Rogers, went to his assistance, when he too became insensible and fell across the well, becoming fixed in that position. Chambers, on hearing this, ran to the spot with all speed, and hastily descended, notwithstanding that he was perfectly aware of the risk he ran, extricated Rogers, fastened him with a rope to himself, and they were both drawn to the surface, and animation after a considerable time, was restored to Rogers. Chambers then again descended the well, which was thirty-one feet deep, and brought up Garson, but he was then dead.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

Folkestone.—October 5, the wife of John Underdown, of a son.

Walmer.—October 2, at Heath Lodge, the wife of the Rev. J. T. Harris, of a son, which survived its birth only a few hours.

MARRIAGES.

Ramsgate.—October 5, at St. George's Church, by the Rev. E. Ball, Frederick William Mitchell, to Louisa Annie Woolley, both of Ramsgate.

DEATHS.

Deal.—August 6, at 126, Beach-street, Henrietta Augusta, dearly beloved wife of Dr. Charles Forbes, of Rochester, aged 47 years.

Deal.—October 4, at Peter-street, William Fenn, aged 78 years.

Deal.—October 7, at 6, Grove Place, Henry Robert Bishop, (late Blackheath), aged 40 years. Much respected by all who knew him.

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.