nebulous by the absence of necessary explanation, and gloomy by a strongly charged statement of difficulties, which contains only too much truth, but does not, perhaps, contain the whole truth. This want of definiteness—for we do not think it want of grasp—is a serious defect in Mr. Cartwright's otherwise able and clear, if a little too discouraging, financial exposition.

While the Election Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice will effect many salutary changes, some of its provisions are open to criticism. Against the provision that the polling shall, as far as practicable, be simultaneous, there is nothing to be said; it will deprive the executive of the power of greatly influencing the elections by producing the impression on waverers, which often proves false, as to which is the winning side. The obligation to direct the writs to sheriffs and registrars, though not a new provision, deprives the executive of the means of influencing the returning officers. It was pointed out as an anomaly that these officers receive their appointments from the local Governments; but this is only saying they are in no way under the influence of the Federal authority. The abolition of the present mode of nomination, at which the different candidates can tell their story in presence of one another, under the guarantees for the preservation of the peace which the returning officer is able to afford, is a doubtful good. The old law does not seem to confer on the candidates any special rights of addressing the electors—it is one of those practices which have grown up without the aid of an Act of Parliament—and it will be very difficult for the new law to suppress it. There is still to be a nomination in a new form: a paper containing the names of the candidates, signed by a number of electors, is to be handed to the returning officer, by whom, after two hours, the proceedings may be closed. For anything there was in the old law, they might have been closed after all the nominations had been made; and the same right of making speeches, unless it be forbidden in direct terms, will continue to exist as heretofore. It would be going far to enact that on the principal occasion on which candidates and electors come together—for interest and curiosity will still bring them together—that their right of speech shall be denied. The formality of the customary nomination is not, we submit, attended with a degree of danger that calls for its suppression. Ward meetings do not afford the same opportunities for hearing both sides. They are not under the control of the returning officer, and they offer fewer guarantees for peace and fair play; when the different candidates meet together, there is less chance that they will all get a fair hearing. Practically, the nomination affords the only opportunity where both sides are at all certain to get an opportunity of putting their views before the electors. The abolition of the property qualification ought to meet general approval. The requirement had nothing to recommend it, while an election might come on in the absence from the country of an intending candidate, and it might be impossible for him to forward a declaration of qualification in the time required. In the adoption of all the varying qualifications of electors created by the laws of the several Provinces, with all their different scales, there is certainly something anomalous. The argument in favour of it is that it will save the expense of specially preparing a voters' list. Taking an average of years, these lists, estimated at a cost of $60,000 a year, would about double the expense of the elections. If the objection of expense can be got over, an uniform suffrage ought by all means to be adopted.

In adopting the ballot, the Government has done so in the most unreserved manner, by providing for absolute secrecy. In England and in Ontario secrecy is not carried so far as to bar a scrutiny of votes. The secrecy ends as soon as it may please