of. I am not prepared to say so much against the present system; but I fully concur with the Commissioner in saying that the judgments of the Courts in contested election cases have not secured the respect with which their decisions in ordinary cases are usually received. I think this is enough to warrant us in saying that some other plan for deciding the merits of electoral contests should be devised, if possible. What plan will secure satisfactory decisions of the extraordinary issues which our involved election laws present, I am unable to conceive. Perhaps the disease has a deeper origin than the form of the tribunal, and that it is the outgrowth of an unwholesome system. Certain it is, we have a fabric of election laws which do not speak strongly in favour of the elective principle. These laws are evidently the product of jealousy and suspicion. They are sometimes carried out in the spirit in which they were framed. When an electoral offence is charged, it seems to be taken for granted that the party is guilty. So strange a violation of the principles of justice, naturally enough, is not applied uniformly, and the result of this wavering jurisprudence is distrust, perhaps calumny. The report only suggests a special tribunal. Those we have had were special enough. The difficulty is how to compose it. Whatever mode of dealing with these cases is adopted, it will be well to stick to known principles, and not to jump at uncertain conclusions.

The rapid augmentation of population, of commercial movement and of wealth, in these days, makes frequent change in the judicial organization necessary, and the government would be lacking in its duty, if it failed to supply sufficient opportunity for the despatch of legal business. But such changes should be by way of amendment, and not be made to air the vagaries of clever but unpractical people.

The condensed statistics prepared by Mr. Justice McCord form the sort of basis, on which changes should be supported. By his figures we learn that the great centres of legal business are Montreal, Quebec, St. Francis and Three Rivers. None of the other Districts has full work for a resident judge of the Superior Court.

It seems also that all the Superior Court work of the Province is under 4000 cases a year, or rather what is equal to that, for I count each case in review as being equal to three, as is done by Judge McCord.

This suggests the establishment of judges for that Court. Allowing 400 cases to each judge, ten judges should do the work of the Province; but as there must be a resident judge at Sherbrooke, and another at Three Rivers, and as the other judges must go on Circuit, if the resident judge system is abolished, I put the judicial establishment of the Province at 16 judges, instead of 27 as at present.

I should detach the smaller business from the Superior Court and leave it to be decided by District judges, who would be resident in their respective Districts.

Of the 16 Superior Court judges, eight should reside in Montreal, six in Quebec, one at Sherbrooke and one at Three Rivers. They should hold terms at the *chef lieu* of each district. By reducing the number of Superior Court judges to 16, a saving of about $33,000 a year would be effected, or nearly sufficient to pay for the District judges. By a proper understanding with the Dominion authorities, the local exchequer should benefit by this, or the charge of the salaries of the District judges should be borne by the Dominion.

Of course, this system could only be introduced gradually and as vacancies occur in the Superior Court; but this is a detail presenting no real difficulty.

With regard to Quebec and Montreal, I think the term system should be abolished both in the Superior Court and in Appeal. The vacation should therefore be made longer than it is, care being taken that matters requiring urgency should be provided for during vacation. To the tribunals it should be left to fix the time of hearing cases, so that the responsibility of arrears should primarily fall on them.

I think the Court of Review should be retained as it stands, and I would make it the only appeal in cases from $200 to $500.

The quorum in appeal should be left at four, and when there is an equal division the judgment of the Court below should be affirmed. There may be some difficulty in carrying this point, for there is a strong prejudice against it —a prejudice, be it observed—distinctly at variance with the Commissioner's presumed idea,