

the old Act in a slight degree, but not sufficiently to meet the present requirements. As to the limitation of the granting of certificates, we all know by experience, and it has been found by experience in Manitoba and other portions of the Dominion, that the issue of certificates to the scrutineers in the different polls has been abused, and I notice that the hon. gentleman proposes a remedy for that in his Bill. Then, again, there is one offence that I think has been overlooked by the hon. gentleman, and that is intimidation. There are only two means by which that can be avoided; one is to make the punishment more severe, and the other is to add a section to the Act as it now stands making a half holiday on every election day, so as to allow all persons to vote without being intimidated by their employers. I desire to draw attention to a difficulty that is found to exist under the present election law of Ontario and perhaps in other provinces. This Bill provides that returning officers have a right to divide a constituency into polling divisions. Take, for instance, East Toronto, which, at the last election, which was on the plebiscite, had 114 subdivisions, and in some of those subdivisions there were not more than three votes polled. I say that it is an unnecessary expense to the city. Take the east riding of Simcoe, we find there are 63 divisions, when in my judgment 50 would be ample. I complain of that because it is a source of expense to all the candidates. A returning officer receives \$30 for his services when there are not over 30 polling subdivisions, and \$2 for each additional polling subdivision above 30. Evidently you offer an inducement to the returning officer to create a large number of polling subdivisions. Now, what does that mean to every hon. gentleman in this House, and to every one who has been a candidate? In the constituency of East Toronto where there are 114 polling subdivisions, under the Franchise Act the charge for a copy of the voters' list in each polling subdivision is ten cents, which would mean to a candidate running in East Toronto \$11.40 for a voters' list. You will see that is a large cost for a man to pay for a special voters' list. In East Simcoe a candidate will have to pay \$6.30 for a voters' list. I say it is wrong to offer such an inducement to the returning officer. I think that in a large number of constituencies in the older sections of the country it would be better to pay a lump sum to the returning officer, thereby tending to reduce the number of polling subdivisions, and consequently the cost to the candidates, and to the public who have to pay for the additional officers and polling booths. I do not know what induced the hon. gentleman to change the form of the ballot. My idea always was that it was the duty of parliament, in framing legislation, especially of an election character, to try and frame that legislation in order to prevent fraud. To my mind this ballot which has

been used in the last election or two, is the best ballot we have ever had. I say that for this reason: No fraud can be committed by the use of that ballot if the instructions are properly carried out, because the marking of the ballot is confined strictly to the disc. But, the hon. gentleman has abandoned that ballot, and has gone back to the old form of ballot. Any one who understands or knows anything of the way in which elections have been conducted in the past, will know perfectly well that with this ballot a man who wishes to conduct a dishonest election, will have a large scope to do so. Take that ballot as we have it in the Bill here; you have a space between these two black spaces where the ballot must be marked, in order to be a good ballot, while under the system of the disc ballot, it must be marked in the disc to be a legal ballot. Instead of opening the door wider, by adopting this ballot that is proposed in the Bill, we should confine ourselves to the disc ballot, and make the directions more explicit, showing the form of the ballot and where it is to be marked. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to do all in my power to oppose going back to the old style of ballot. These are some of the things in the Bill, but there are some things that the hon. gentleman has not seen his way clear to incorporate in it. Proper directions should be given as to the form of the ballot, and provision should be made by the hon. gentleman as to the character of the parcels, how they are to be sealed, and instructions to that effect should be given. Next, provision should be made for the proper return of the ballot boxes. We all know perfectly well that days elapse sometimes without any reason whatever, during which officers, appointed by the government, neglect to return their ballot boxes. The hon. gentleman should have recognized that point and placed something in the Bill that would have done away with this delay. The next point I would speak of, is in regard to withdrawal of candidates. In municipal elections, there is no difficulty about a municipal candidate withdrawing after the lapse of a certain period, from the nomination. I do not see why a candidate for parliamentary honours should be allowed to remain in the field from nomination day, to four o'clock on polling day, and then be permitted to hand in his resignation. A man who is nominated, ought, within a certain length of time to withdraw, if he intends to do so; if not, he should go to the poll. The next subject that I wish to mention is the \$200 deposit. I am opposed to that. The province of Ontario does not require it, and I do not see that any suffering has resulted therefrom. I also object to the provision which requires a \$100 deposit for a recount. I see no use of it. Then, I submit in reference to the statement of deputy returning officers, that more attention should be paid to that, so that candi-