

corrupt practices. But he knows that if you claim the seat in a trial under the Controverted Elections Act, your opponent has the right to go into corrupt practices. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) cannot pretend that there is a simple way provided at present. But he knows that if the candidates having the smaller number of votes proceeds, under the Controverted Elections Act, his opponent can enter into charges of bribery and corruption, which would necessitate a long and expensive trial. Of course, if the hon. gentleman does not accept the amendment I propose, he has a large enough majority to carry out his wishes, but if that is his position, I hope he will introduce a Bill amending the Controverted Elections Act to meet the case. He himself has said that a man can go to the poll, and if he takes the oath, his vote is accepted and counted, and there is no remedy. No remedy is provided in this Bill, and so I say it is incumbent on him, as representing that province in this House, to submit a Bill that will be applicable to Prince Edward Island. Under the Controverted Elections Act, a man must be prepared to bear the expense of a long trial, and also to put up \$1,000. The hon. gentleman being a lawyer, that may suit him very well, but I think it will not suit the people of Prince Edward Island. The onus is thrown upon him, if he opposes these amendments, to propose a Bill that will be workable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) need not wax warm on this subject. We have had manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island for fifty or sixty years, and there has been no such trouble there as he conjures up. Every man there, *prima facie*, is entitled to a vote, though we may exclude a vote on some technicality occasionally. Between 1873 and 1885 we had this same system of voting, and nobody ever heard of any of these difficulties. You had general elections, and by-elections, and no difficulty arose. So little are these difficulties feared that the legislature has never made provisions for the special trial that he suggests. However, I shall be glad to sit down with him and the Solicitor General, or anybody else, and see if there is any better mode of testing these election votes, than the one which the Controverted Elections Act provides. I am as much interested as anybody in having proper machinery for testing the votes. I want to have an honest vote, and effective means of testing the vote after the election. But as I am at present advised, the Controverted Elections Act meets that case as well as any other law that can be provided. If I am wrong, I am willing to assist the hon. gentleman in making an amendment to the Controverted Elections Act. But I would call his attention to the fact that though we have had manhood suffrage for fifty or sixty years, and have had this system of voting from

Mr. MARTIN.

1873 to 1885, nobody has claimed that there was any wrong to anybody, and fewer petitions have been filed in Prince Edward Island than in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. If these are good reasons that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) has given, we have wasted the whole night in trying to perfect this Bill. He says it worked well in Prince Edward Island in 1873 and 1874. What are we making changes for, then? It must be to meet altered circumstances.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MARTIN. But there are difficulties that arise in Prince Edward Island also. When he simply says that the Act was sufficient in years gone by, it seems to me that his argument can hardly be serious. However, I have done my duty. I have proposed these amendments, and I think I have met fairly every objection that he has raised. I have laid the case before the committee as clearly as I could. The hon. gentleman does not say that a remedy is not required, but he simply appears to think that we cannot find a remedy, and seems to think that what applies to other parts of the Dominion, will apply to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. INGRAM. With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), if he will look at section 92, subsection 5, I think he will find it meets the point. That section will provide for the return of the papers by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. BERGERON. No, that does not meet the case. That will be discussed when we get to that section.

Mr. INGRAM. I have an amendment that I desire to propose. I propose to move this amendment on the third reading:

That subsection 1 of section 90 is hereby amended by striking out after the word 'votes' in the second line on page 23 thereof the following words:

And if the applicant deposits within the said time with the clerk of the county or district court or with the prothonotary of the said Superior Court in the said judicial district, as the case may be, the sum of \$100 in legal tender or in the bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada, as security for the costs in connection with the recount or final addition of the candidate appearing by the addition to be elected.

While the member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) wishes to have the deposit increased to \$300, he has shown tonight by his explanation of the way in which they conduct a recount in Prince Edward Island, that their system is much on the same principle as that on which we conduct a recount in the province of Ontario. It is a very expensive operation. In Ontario no deposit is necessary in provincial elections. But in case of appeal