

ing from 30th April. The date for holding first meeting of court of revision would also have to be extended.

1. Can a member of a Council qualify on personal property? 2. Can a voter qualify on personal property? 3. Is it necessary for a person to be assessed for \$100 real property in order to have a vote at elections in Algoma? 4. Are householders who are not assessed for anything except as householders entitled to vote at municipal elections in Algoma? A. R.

1. No. \$200 freehold or \$400 as householder is qualification as councillor. 2. No. 3. No. Voters in Algoma must be on the assessment roll as resident freeholders or householders, but the law does not state the amount they are to be assessed at. 4. Yes. An assessor would hardly assess any person as a householder or freeholder without some valuation, and the evident intention of the Act is to give all *bona fide* settlers in the new districts a right to vote, but not such persons as might be imported merely for voting purposes.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

The following letter was intended for the editor's private perusal only, but we deem it of too much interest to deprive our readers of its contents. W. McD. will, we trust, pardon us if we have taken too much liberty in that respect. We assure him that his criticism is accepted in the kindly spirit in which it is given. We want all our readers to understand, as stated in the first number of the MISCELLANY, that our object is to enable all clerks and local officials an opportunity to freely exchange opinions on the somewhat intricate laws they have to do with, as in this way many doubts may be cleared up. There are none among our readers more desirous to learn than the editor, and therefore we welcome contributions that may be for the general good from any quarter:—

In the last two numbers of the MISCELLANY in your explanation of the law, I see what I think are errors. I write you to call your attention to the same, to state wherein I differ with you, and to say how we understand the law around here. Although I differ with you I wish such difference to be a friendly one, and trust that you will receive it as such.

You say the assessment roll requires to be returned on or before the 30th day of April; that the last day for receiving appeals is the 14th of May, and the soonest the court of revision can sit is May 25th. Section 49 of the Assessment Act says that the assessor shall complete his roll on or before the 30th day of April, but section 50 says the roll is to be delivered to the clerk on or before the 1st day of May, so that the return day is May 1st. Then, allowing 14 days after the return day for notices of appeal to be given, makes the last day for filing such notices the 15th day of May; then, allowing 10 days as per section 60, makes the 26th of May the earliest date for holding the court of revision.

Re Ditches and Watercourses, March number. I read the law that any one interested can call the first meeting in Form B. The first meeting is generally but a matter of form, for they seldom agree. If no satisfactory agreement is come to at first meeting, then some one or more of the interested parties must notify the township clerk in Form C. Then the clerk sends a copy of the requisition he receives to the engineer, requesting him to name a time when he will attend to examine the premises in dispute, hear the parties, etc. The engineer then notifies the clerk of the

date or time when he will attend, after which the clerk notifies each one of the interested parties of the time when the engineer will attend. The engineer goes on and makes his inspection and survey, and files his plan and award with the clerk within 30 days. The clerk then notifies each party interested that the plan and award have been filed, and 15 days are allowed for appeal to be made by any of the interested parties. I don't think any one of the parties can call the engineer. In the case referred to in the question submitted to you, the parties and the engineer seem to have gone astray after the first meeting.

I notice also that you number the pages of your journal 1 to 8 on each issue. It would have been better had you begun with number one and continued on consecutively to the end of the volume, thus preparing an index for reference.

I hope you will not be annoyed at my criticism, but bear in mind that it is from one who wishes you success.

W. McD., Rockton.

In regard to the dates of return of the assessment roll referred to above, our correspondent has overlooked the amendment made in 1889 to section 50, which changed the words "on or before the 1st day of May" to "on or before the thirtieth day of April," and therefore the dates at which appeals could be made and court of revision held as given in the April number are correct.

"E. P.'s" question on page 4 of the March number reads: "Had the person who called (by requisition) for engineer a right to so call, he not being the one who called the first meeting?" We answered "Yes." We took it for granted that the regular form of requisition to the clerk (Form C) and the latter's notice to engineer had been complied with, especially as the question contained in parenthesis the words "by requisition," and therefore we did not enter into details of procedure, which had we done, would have been similar to those of "W. McD."

In reference to the continuous numbering of the pages of the MISCELLANY, we can readily see that the suggestion of W. McD. is a good one. Two or three of our correspondents have suggested certain changes in form of the paper. For instance, one of our readers says he would prefer the MISCELLANY to be 8 vo. as more easily filed, bound and for reference. Another correspondent recommended a broad sheet, and to contain more general reading matter, and thought that by devoting a portion of space to advertisements the difference in cost would be made up. We are rather pleased than otherwise to receive suggestions from our readers, as it betokens an interest in the success of the paper, and all such suggestions will receive due consideration before entering upon a second volume. When we commenced the publication we had no subscribers or assurances of a circulation; in fact, one or two in whose judgment we had considerable confidence and to whom we broached the matter, while admitting the need of some such journal, rather dampened our ardor on the score of support. We therefore deemed it unwise at the start to undertake more than we were disposed to risk of our personal means in order to carry it on for the year, and finding that about \$400 would do so on its present basis we undertook the venture, and thus far have no reason to complain of the reception accorded us. No doubt there are many others among our officials better qualified to undertake the publication of such a journal, and we will not be averse to making