

from coming forward. He did not think \$200 too much, because if a man really wanted to get into Parliament, if he was a poor man, he could easily raise it, knowing that he was almost sure to get it back again.

Mr. BLAKE said that if any system was to be adopted he thought this was more likely than any, without interfering with the right of the people or the freedom of election, to accomplish the object in view. It was certainly an improvement over that which prevailed in the Province of Quebec. In the first place, \$200 was a considerable sum; in the second place, against a man with money, who knew that he would get his deposit returned, the amendment would be imperative, whereas the loss of \$50 might be some check upon him. The smallness of the amount and the simplicity of the arrangement imposed by the Bill were such as must commend the Bill over the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy.)

Mr. MITCHELL said he differed from the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake). During his (Mr. Mitchell's) own election, he was subject to the greatest annoyance by a candidate being started by a clique who said: "We will sacrifice \$50, and oppose Mr. Mitchell." The candidate was started and actually canvassed the county until within a day of the poll, not with any idea of seriously contesting the constituency, but simply to cause annoyance. If they could adopt a system which would not interfere with the freedom of the people or the choice of the electors, but would check such conduct as he had alluded to, they ought to do it. He believed the amendment was a step in the right direction and that it was calculated to put a stop to the annoyance that might now be visited upon the candidate whom the majority of the people wished to elect.

Mr. CARON said the strongest reason in favour of the amendment was that it would prevent a bogus candidate being nominated merely to have a contested election and to cause annoyance to the legitimate candidate. It would also save the excitement and disturbance of a useless contest.

Mr. MACDONNELL said he denied that it followed, as a matter of course, that, because a man did not get one-half the votes of his opponent, he was not a *bonâ fide* candidate. The principle of having to pay any money for the purpose of being nominated was a wrong one. Instead of extending the principle, it should be abolished. The hon. member for Quebec county said those elections disturbed public opinion. Well, public opinion required to be disturbed occasionally. There were men who had remained in Parliament a long time who would not have been returned were it not for the want of some opponent who would agitate public opinion, and bring to light facts which would change the public opinion.

Mr. PLUMB said the amendment secured, in a much greater degree, the principle recognized in the Bill, by providing for a deposit. It prevented the nomination of candidates who had no chance of election, and who were brought forward merely to cause the expense and annoyance of a contested election. \$200 was not a large amount to be deposited as earnest of the good faith and position of the candidate, and the money being returned to him if he obtained a respectable vote, and prevented any injustice being done in the way of preventing a contest. It was not desirable, in party interests, that candidates should be opposed who would otherwise be elected unanimously. He was not sure but that the proposition of his hon. friend might be amended by reducing the number of votes necessary to a defeated candidate to obtain back his money. He had no objection to have the whole system of deposits abolished, but if the system were continued, it ought to be made, as it had been intended to make it, a check on candidates.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he thought the amendment was not an improvement on the Bill. When the Act was passed the greatest check was considered to be the twenty-five electors who were required to sign the requisition. This amendment would act injuriously in those districts which returned two members. A man of good standing might be rejected and have less than one half the number of his opponents