

thy with him as far as regards one aspect of this investigation. To this, as it concerns a lady, we do not care particularly to allude, except to say that the charge with which her name was coupled, appears to have been misconstrued—whether purposely or not we do not pretend to affirm—in such a way as to give an opportunity to those seeking it, of airing a good deal of virtuous indignation. There were other women whose names were bandied about with greater nonchalance, and it is a pity that some of the indignation could not have been spared for them. There were also stories of boys coming home drunk at three in the morning—in short, a picture of disorganization and want of discipline which forms a painful phase in the history of that most luckless of government institutions. The Committee had not time to pursue the matter to the end; still we might express the hope that we had heard the last of it, if we did not feel too clear a presentiment that, during the next fortnight, it will play a conspicuous part in election harangues.

Little need be said of the Rykert investigation. On the facts all are agreed, and there is no need to enlarge upon them. A curious doctrine, however was propounded by the minority of the Committee, to which we at once demur. If a legislator is to be acquitted of corruption because he receives his fee as a *post facto* gratuity, instead of haggling for it in advance, the evil will never be checked. Unless we propose Washington and Albany as our exemplars, the mischief must be extirpated root and branch. In order to do so, not only must the reception of any fee or reward by any member for legislative services be punishable, but partners of members must be forbidden to lobby on behalf of private bills. It is absurd to prohibit the former and permit the latter. Any attorney who happens to be an M. P. or an M.P.P., may continue to drive a thriving business under cover of a partner—a business quite as subversive of public morality, as if it were avowedly conducted by himself. We

would go further, and forbid members of the local legislatures managing parliamentary business at Ottawa, and *vice versa*. This practice may be lucrative, but it does mischief of a kind peculiar to itself. Finally, if it were possible—and we hope that it will be some day—we would prohibit lobbying altogether, and make the mere fact of approaching a member to solicit his vote for a particular Bill, punishable. It is constantly the case that members are button-holed, teased, cajoled or, perhaps, coerced into promising support without any knowledge of the facts, and with obvious detriment to the interests of the public. The House did well in not pursuing this particular case to extremities. It would have been unwise to make a scapegoat of the member for Lincoln. The probability is that he acted, as he often does, unthinkingly; and, perhaps, if the House possesses a collective, or perhaps we should say an "historical conscience," there may have been other reasons at which we do not care to hint. Ignorance, however, can no longer be pleaded, and if a similar case occur it should be treated with merciless rigour.

The *Ontario Gazette* announces that the nominations are to take place on the 11th instant, and the voting, should a poll be demanded, on the 18th. This will be the first general election held by ballot in Ontario; and, under ordinary circumstances, the probable effect of secret voting on the relative position of parties might be made the subject of speculation. The result of the experiment in England seemed to indicate that the ballot was essentially a disintegrating agent, and had a direct and powerful tendency to defeat organization and to loosen party ties by concealing breaches of party obligation. That secret voting favours individual, rather than collective, action, there can be no doubt. Those who are disposed to think for themselves and to exercise their electoral rights according to their own judgment may do so without fear of incurring