

\$500 for the benefit of the successful candidate. I will move an amendment later.

Mr. OUMET. It seems to be admitted by the hon. leader of the Opposition that there must be some check on bogus candidates, since we have no longer open nominations. During the last contest I had an opponent in my county, who vanished before he could get twenty-five electors to sign his paper. But there were bogus candidates in the counties of Terrebonne, Two Mountains and Beauharnois, one in each who did not poll ten votes each. This abuse should be terminated. I think the deposit of \$200 not too high, as any *bond fide* candidate can raise it, either himself or by his friends. It would not prevent any good man from coming forward, but would prove a bar to bogus candidates.

Mr. MILLS. It would be rather extraordinary if the hon. First Minister supports this proposal to discourage the nomination of candidates, after expressing the hope at Toronto that his friends would permit no Opposition candidate to be elected by acclamation. We have two great parties in the country; but there may be a number of electors in various constituencies who do not agree with either when they wish to put a candidate in the field, not with the expectation that he will succeed, but in order to have their views proclaimed on the hustings and propagated throughout the country, and they ought not to be hindered from doing so. Now, this proposition is a proposal to fine men, who, though they should be in a large minority, undertake to express their views on the hustings, and before the candidates in the field. That would be a restriction upon freedom of election, and wholly at variance with the spirit and principles of representative Government. How is a candidate to know what the chances may be at an election, and why should he, if he does not poll a certain number of votes, be subjected to a fine of \$200. It is the right of a minority to nominate and elect a candidate if they can; and if there is any class that ought to enjoy the special protection of the law it is the minority. What was the object in requiring twenty-five electors to sign a nomination paper? To settle the *bond fides* of the candidate who seeks election. If twenty-five are not enough increase it to fifty or 100; but there is no reason shown for requiring a deposit to be forfeited if a certain number of votes are not polled. I believe the choice of the electors should be as free and unrestricted as possible. I am opposed to the proposition and will support the amendment of my hon. friend in preference. I am in favor of removing the provision of the law relating to money deposits, either absolutely or conditionally, from the Statutes.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member forgets that the law was enacted by the late Government.

Mr. MILLS. I know that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. According to this amendment the unsuccessful candidate must have one-half the number of the successful candidate. Suppose there are 1,000 votes and four candidates, and the successful candidate gets 501. These then will have 163 each, or together half the votes polled, yet each one would have to forfeit his deposit.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this late hour of the night I do not intend to occupy much time in placing this resolution before the House. The whole question is so thoroughly familiar to the members of the House, and is so fully set forth in the papers which have been distributed, and the subject, in one form or another, has so long engaged the attention of Parliament, that I do not think it will be necessary to detain the House very long in explaining the pro-

Mr. BUNSTER.

posal of these resolutions. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in 1871, a Commission, composed of gentlemen well qualified to deal with the question of trade communication, was appointed to consider the enlargement and extension of the canal system of Canada. That Commission, after very careful consideration, embodied their views in a report which was adopted by the Government and received the unanimous approval of Parliament. I do not now remember that any gentleman on either side of this Parliament took any exception to the conclusion to which that Commission arrived. I will remind the House that in proposing to enlarge the Welland, St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals their attention was directed to the question of the Baie Verte Canal. They divided the different canals upon which they reported into three classes—those that were considered most important in the interest of the whole Dominion were placed in the first class, those which were next in importance in the second class, and the others in the third; they placed the construction of the Baie Verte Canal in the first, as they regarded it of the greatest importance to the interests of the Dominion. I will read a brief extract from this report which will show the importance they attached to the construction of that canal:

"Inseparately connected with the growth of intercolonial trade is the construction of the Baie Verte Canal across the isthmus connecting the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

"The advantages that must occur, not only to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the Maritime Provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the Boards of Trade of all the leading cities of Canada, and by men largely interested in the development of our growing commercial interests, not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec, that it is superfluous for the Commissioners to do more than briefly to refer to a few features of the scheme."

Now, Sir, I may say that this question also engaged the attention of the Boards of Trade in the various cities referred to. Those of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and others took the question up, and having examined in the light of the commercial interests of Canada, resolved with great unanimity that it was of great importance to the trade and commerce of Canada that that canal should be constructed. The Government adopted the policy suggested by the Commission and brought it down to this House, and I believe it received the unanimous sanction of the House. In connection with other appropriations for the enlargement of the canals to which I have referred, \$1,000,000 was appropriated by Parliament for the commencement of the Baie Verte Canal. The Government had surveys previously made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost. Messrs. Keefer and Gzowski reported, after a very careful survey had been made, that it would cost between five and six million dollars to construct the canal on the line they proposed, a line that is absolutely the same as that which is now proposed for this ship railway. The Government, under the belief that the canal could be constructed for \$5,000,000, were planning to place that work under contract when a change of Government took place in 1873. The hon. member for Lambton, then at the head of the Government, embodied the views of his Government in the most formal and authoritative manner in the speech with which Parliament was opened in the Session of 1874, and a clause of that speech reads as follows:—

"Canal and harbor improvements are being regularly prosecuted with a view to ensure adequate accommodation for the rapidly growing trade of the country. The report of the Chief Engineers of the Department of Public Works on the proposed canal between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy will be submitted for your consideration."

Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of the Canals, as here stated, had been called upon to take up the estimates and survey that had been previously made. In the Estimates of that year \$1,000,000 had been voted, and that was repeated in