

Mr. Blake's) experience had not been such as to lead him to believe that they were calculated to afford opportunities for the political enlightenment of the people. He remembered that in 1867 he went a distance of 700 miles to attend his nomination, and the Returning officer allowed him ten minutes to enlighten his constituents with reference to his political views. The next time he was allowed twenty minutes, and the last time the Returning officer proposed, first of all, to give the candidates half an hour, but because the crowd clamoured very loudly for a longer time he consented to give them three quarters of an hour. He had himself seen no disturbances at nominations, but he knew there had been riots in Quebec and in Charlevoix.

He did not see why they should not, under the proposed law, practically obtain all the benefits of a gathering of the electors if they desired it. All that was proposed by the Bill was that the nomination should be in writing and in a certain form, and he did not see anything to prevent the holding of public meetings on the day of nomination. Meetings of the electors of both parties could, by mutual arrangement, be held on that day, if desired, but the principal objections he had to public nominations was that they afforded the opportunity of making sham nominations. These were made, he believed, by persons having an interest in bringing about a contest on account of certain incidental profits they would derive. Such persons could be thwarted by requiring those who nominated candidates to deposit a small sum, say \$100, or something like that, to be forfeited in case the candidate did not enter on the contest.

He believed that if a division took place on the leading features of the Bill, it would be found that they had, if not a unanimous, at least an almost unanimous support from both sides of the House. (*Applause.*)

**Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell)** said he agreed with a great deal that his hon. friend who had just sat down had said. He thought that if this Parliament were to give the people as liberal a franchise for this House as they had for their own local House, this Legislature would be the more likely to have their affections than if they did otherwise.

The only feature in the Bill to which he had any serious objection was the provision for voting by ballot. He had always considered this a sneaking, un-British mode of voting, and nothing which had occurred in connection with it in any other portion of the Empire had let him to change his opinion in this respect. He believed also that it would encourage corruption and dishonesty, because under that system a man would be able to take money to vote for one candidate, but go and vote for the rival candidate, and nobody but himself need know anything about it. (*Laughter.*) He held that the Bill did not provide for doing away with the property qualifications, for it was provided for by an Imperial Act that there should be such a qualification, and this Bill could not affect that provision.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** said that provision with regard to that point had been made in the original draft of the Bill, but in the law clerk's office the words had been left out.

**Hon. Mr. DORION** said the suggestion of his hon. friend would be acted upon.

**Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell)** went on to say he was opposed to doing away with the public nomination, notwithstanding any riots which may have occurred in Quebec or elsewhere. He thought it convenient to have a public meeting of electors of both parties on the nomination day, and he believed that if the people of Ontario were to be polled from one end of it to the other, they would be generally in favour of the nominations being conducted as they had hitherto been. He hoped his hon. friends in the Government would consider the advisability of allowing the system of nominating candidates to remain as at present.

He thought that too much discretion was allowed by the Bill to Deputy Returning officers, with respect to accepting or rejecting votes when the persons presenting them were not known to them.

He proceeded at some length to criticise the provisions of the Bill with reference to the liability of candidates for the corrupt acts of their agents. Apart from his objection to the ballot and the other objections to which he had referred, he thought the bill carried out very fairly the views of his hon. friend the Minister of Justice. He considered the ballot unmanly—did not believe it would prevent bribery, and should vote against that portion of the Bill.

**Mr. CAMERON (Ontario South)** was very pleased to hear the tone in which his hon. friend from Cardwell had discussed the bill. He was glad that they were at length about to have the ballot, which he defended from the attacks that had been made upon it by the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat.

**Mr. DYMOND** supported the bill, and replied to the charge of the hon. member for Cardwell that the ballot was un-British and sneaking in its character. He thought it would provide against bribery and corruption, and he read the letter of a man who professed to have been offered a dollar bill for his vote from the hon. member for Cardwell. (*The reading of the letter was received with hisses.*)

With regard to the abolition of the public nomination, he agreed with the hon. member for Cardwell. He could not remember any case, in Ontario, on nomination day of violence or bad conduct. He hoped the members who wished for that abolition would be content to have it in their own Province, and leave that of Ontario alone. With regard to the oath-taking, he suggested that the oath, which comprised a great many diverse articles, should be split into two, and that they should have one oath for identification and another for the purpose of providing against irregularity in the registry, which the returning officer was bound to administer to those who might have taken \$20, more or less, to stimulate their political bias.

**Mr. PLUMB** said there were certain portions of the bill in which they were all interested. The first of these was the provision abolishing duplicate voting. This, he hoped, would meet with the acceptance of the House, because it was unfair in principle and worked unequally. This, he also suggested, should be extended to local elections. He proposed that some means should be adopted to provide for an appeal from the voters lists taken from the assessment rolls, and for an examination of the assessment rolls, in order to prevent the names of persons not entitled to vote being put upon the rolls when in the hands of unscrupulous men. He