

Mr. INGRAM. What does that amount to ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The offenders can be sent to jail.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not specify the length of time right here in the section—say, imprisonment for twelve months. A money penalty is not enough. I give notice that on the third reading, I will move something of that kind.

On section 113,

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). This refers to hiring rigs. Some amendment should be made here. While this has been the law for a number of years past, in our elections it has been absolutely necessary to hire rigs, and, practically, the law has been violated. It seems to me there should be a provision for hiring necessary conveyances on the day of election. That would not allow much latitude for bribery or wrong-doing.

Mr. WILSON. This section is openly violated.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Like all excessively stringent provisions—they are never observed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I scarcely share that opinion. So far as I know, this section of the law is fairly well observed. It may be that the county in which my elections are fought is smaller than most of constituencies, and that there is not the same necessity for conveyances. But, candidly, I do not see the necessity for conveyances to convey voters to the polls in a rural section. Almost every man has his own conveyance, and rarely has one to go more than three or four miles to the polling place. Besides, there is no difficulty in getting a ride with a neighbour who is going to poll his vote. I think this is an excellent thing for the candidates. It is a very serious matter to legalize the hiring of conveyances.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I know a constituency in which the first thing the candidate has to do when he presents himself is to plank down \$1,900 for carters, and I know other constituencies in which the same thing is done. It is done to evade the law. These people are hired a week or ten days before the election comes off, but with the understanding that they will drive on election day. I know that in the city of Montreal—and the members from the city of Montreal will confirm what I say—the first thing a candidate has to do is to hire half the carters in his constituency, or as many as he can find, and pay them an enormous sum of money. There should be a stop put to this. In these constituencies the elections cost \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 a side. The hon. gentleman says that these stringent provisions are not observed. Why? Because there is an understanding between

the parties to saw off contestations. In the amendments which I will propose later on as to the election expenses, I limit the expenditure in each constituency to a sum which is deemed to be sufficient for the organization of the election, and any money which is expended beyond that sum is an illegal payment. I go still further, and I say that we can only employ such persons, for instance, so many carters for so many polling divisions, so many secretaries, so many messengers, and these are the only men you can employ, and the employment of any man in any other capacity is a corrupt act. That is the way we are going to prevent all this. Now, there is another abuse regarding carters. In some constituencies every second farmer on election day becomes a carter to carry his neighbour to a meeting or to the poll, and gets paid for it.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). I think the explanations just made are correct. I think it is better to make it legal to hire the necessary number of carriages on election day than to have the candidate bled for two or three weeks to pay two or three prices for every team they get. Besides, we ought not to make the law so stringent that men will have to do wrong to get over it. I am strongly in favour of allowing the hiring of certain number of cabs on election day.

Mr. A. SEMPLE (Centre Wellington). It seems to me the prohibition of the hiring of conveyances on election day is the best protection a candidate can have. If they were allowed to hire conveyances, people would be coming by the hundred to the candidate to be employed, and they would be willing to throw in their vote as well. That would furnish an excellent avenue for all kinds of bribery, and it would cost the candidates much more to carry on an election. So far as I know, very few men accept any consideration for driving their conveyances on election day. They are generally plucky. The Conservatives get all the voters out they can and the Liberals likewise, and they are agreed to take the law as it is, and it is found to work admirably. It is a good thing also that the candidates cannot treat, otherwise crowds of thirsty men would be following them from one place to another.

On section 121,

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under this clause you cannot sue upon a contract, but you can sue for the delivery or the value of the goods. I suggest that you should debar a person completely from having any action at all. I think that would be a good way to prevent many unlawful contracts for the supply of goods during an election. If a man, for instance, hires a rig for election day, or he hires a rig with a corrupt motive for a considerable sum of money and he does not pay, he cannot be sued upon this contract. The contract is nil. But he can

Mr. FITZPATRICK.