Samuel v. Newbold, 22 T.L.R. 703. This case is more recent, and, of course, of greater authority than Carringtons, Limited v. Smith, but it does not seem to alter the conclusions there arrived at to any material extent. No one would have objected if our Canadian Act had laid down the principle stated in the head-note to Samuel v. Newbold, that "the rate of interest charged upon a loan may be so excessive as of itself, if unexplained, to shew that the transaction is harsh and unconscionable."

GOODWIN GIBSON.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO THE ELECTION LAW.

In the Weekly Sun, of Dec. 5, the "Bystander" has commented briefly upon the suggestion recently made in this Journal, that the time has come when it is expedient to convert into a specific statutory offence the attempt to influence constituencies as a whole, either by the present expenditure of public money, or by declarations, whether promises or threats, with respect to the future expenditure of such money.

The writer of the article in which that suggestion was made regrets that the opinion or his critic regarding the utility of the proposed legislation is distinctly unfavourable; and his regret is increased by the fact that this unfavourable opinion, having been expressed in a newspaper widely circulated among farmers, will find its way to that very section of the community which, as it derives the least benefit from the application of the funds of the state to those objects which most commonly furnish the opportunities and means for that particular form of corruption against which the proposed enactment would be directed, might reasonably be expected, merely on the ground of self-interest, to be the warmest supporters of such legislation.

The broad ground upon which the "Bystander" takes exception to the suggested addition to the statute books is that, "if people are willing to be corrupted, corrupted in some form they will be," a proposition from which he draws the pessimistic and uncomfortable inference, that it is not worth while to close