Mr. DAVIES said that this Canal would be of great importance to Prince Edward Island. Still he thought the Government were exercising a wise discretion in pausing before engaging in this vast expenditure, since they already had two outlets in the Atlantic.

Mr. MOSS said he trusted the Government would not expend a dollar upon this work unless they were thoroughly assured that it was for the general benefit of the Dominion, and was worth the cost. (*Cheers.*)

Mr. SINCLAIR agreed with the last speaker. He believed this work would be of great benefit, and ought to be proceeded with if the Government could see their way to constructing it. He did not look upon the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick railways as Dominion works, and he thought no Government should attempt to act upon the principle that a certain amount of money should be spent in one section of the Dominion because a similar amount had been spent in another.

The item then passed.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

* * *

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS

Hon. Mr. FOURNIER, in moving that the House go into Committee on the Bill to make better provision for the trial of controverted elections of members of the House of Commons, explained the principal amendments he intended to propose. It was proposed to add the Court of Appeal of Ontario to the Courts having jurisdiction. It was also proposed to add to the definition of corrupt practices those which were recognized by the common law of Parliament. He was not averse to the proposal to require the securities to consist of deposits in money alone. Still, he thought they should not place too severe restrictions on preliminary proceedings. He proposed to render sureties who did not pay the amount for which they were responsible liable to imprisonment for contempt. It was also proposed to give a right of appeal in all the Provinces from the decision of one judge. This was the same process as proposed in the original bill for the Province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said section 68 seemed to limit the evidence to that against the candidate elected. He wished to know if evidence could be given against the defeated candidate.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the Bill gave power even to a successful candidate to claim that the unsuccessful candidate should be disfranchised for malpractice.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that when the unsuccessful candidate was not the petitioner there was no provision that the judge should try whether he had been guilty of corrupt practices, though it was provided that the judge must report thereon. He thought it of great importance that the right of appeal should be extended to all cases and he was of the opinion that the recognizances should be done away with and that the money should be paid. This would do away with the waste of time involved in the technical objection taken to recognizance. (*Hear, hear.*)

Hon. Mr. DORION said there was a great deal to recommend the substitution of a money deposit for a recognizance. It would prevent all the preliminary difficulties, and he had no doubt it would be adopted in Committee. There was a difficulty in making an issue where the unsuccessful candidate was not the petitioner, nor the seat claimed for him. He might be away, might know nothing about it, and might find that without any charge evidence was being brought against him. This might protract the trial for a very long time if the corrupt practices of the unsuccessful candidate were complained of there was a provision for their being tried, but on a new issue. He considered that the practice of producing evidence against the unsuccessful candidate, who did not claim the seat and was not petitioning, would be inconvenient in practice, and the greatest inconvenience would be that it would be an undesirable side issue.

Mr. MOSS said he was much impressed by the arguments of the member for Kingston (Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald). Under the present law he thought the unsuccessful candidate was placed in a more favourable position than anyone else, because under the 32nd clause any person was amenable to punishment for corrupt practices, but the unsuccessful candidate was not in an equal manner brought within the grasp of the law. The Judge was bound to report on the corrupt practices of every person, and, therefore, a defeated candidate should be liable to the same consequences.

He thought that either persons who were not candidates should not be liable to be charged on the report of the Judge or the defeated candidate should be. He was in favour of a deposit instead of a recognizance. He thought that in Ontario and probably in the Maritime Provinces the appeal might be from the Judge to the Court of which he was a member.

Mr. MacLENNAN was in favour of a deposit, and the provisions of the Bill as it stood were sufficient in relation to the trial of corrupt practices on the part of the defeated candidate. He advised that a petition be filed against the defeated candidate, otherwise no charge should be allowed against him. If this were not the law, he was placed in an unfair position, as it was enough for him to prove his own case without having a charge against himself of which he had not due notice.

The SPEAKER then left the chair and the House resolved itself into Committee, **Mr. GEOFFRION** in the chair.

On Clause 8,

Mr. MOSS said he had an idea that the Judge should have power to summon before him anyone against whom an allegation of corrupt practices was made, and decide summarily upon the matter.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the result would be to indefinitely delay the main issue.

Mr. DYMOND thought that those who had not been elected ought to have the same opportunities of defending themselves as the sitting member, and to give a Judge such a sweeping power as that suggested might deter persons from petitioning and frustrate the end they had in view.