

corruption, in which case they should not have been withdrawn, or the allegations contained in them are a libel upon the electors, in which case they should not have been filed. Nor can party leaders any more than party managers escape responsibility for this condition of affairs.

It is said as to the recent Ontario elections that the reason why a number of these petitions were filed was because the opponents of the Government had now taken the ground that election constables have no right to vote. This right has been exercised for many years without question, and the contention against it has not much merit, and the arguments in favour of the practice seem to be unassailable. But, after all, this only introduces us to another symptom of the disease to which we are calling attention, for we find a corresponding number of petitions filed on the Government side. It would only be reasonable that the latter should be in an equally good position when the turn comes for a "saw-off."

Now as to the remedy for these evils. The first and most effective would be for the leaders of parties to set their faces against any active interference in such matters, and allow those personally interested to fight their own battles, in which case the amount of the deposit, and subsequent liabilities, would be a sufficient deterrent against vexatious proceedings. Secondly, as that clause of the statutes, both Provincial and Dominion, which leaves the withdrawal of the petition at the discretion of the judge, is really inoperative against abuse, there being no means by which the judge can tell whether the withdrawal is the result of collusion, or of a corrupt arrangement between the parties, enact that the deposit shall be absolutely forfeited to the Crown unless, within a reasonable time, the case is not only brought to trial but proceeded with until the judge is satisfied as to the decision which ought to be arrived at. Some better remedy may be suggested by those conversant with the trial of controverted elections, but that some remedy should be found for such an abuse of the functions of the Courts as has recently arisen must be apparent to all who have any regard for purity of election, or respect for the law. Possibly a more effective remedy than those suggested might be to require a petitioner with his petition to file a statement, particularizing some definite acts of corruption, or stating other reasons for voiding the election, to be vouched for by the oath of the petitioner, but even this would be attended with practical difficulties.

The field which is opened up for discussion is a broad one, and a full consideration would introduce matters political, which a law journal might not care to take up, but the above is given as food for thought.