

for granted that he is a candidate who should not have run; that he is not a serious candidate and therefore should not be in the field. Otherwise I cannot understand the meaning of the law. Hence we must come to the conclusion that 169 candidates ran in the last general election who should not have run. For that reason I would make the suggestion that the deposit be increased from \$200 to \$500. I have pointed out the objections to making the field too wide. Are there any objections to fixing the candidate's deposit at \$500? I ask any member of the committee is there a candidate in this country who will not be able to provide himself with \$500 to make his deposit in the next general election? I answer No, because the candidate is not an ordinary man. If a man has no standing or has no friends, if he does not amount to anything, he will not be a candidate. I think, therefore, that in the interest of the maintenance of the good standing of elections generally and in order to avoid "fake" candidates, if I may use this term, I think the deposit should be raised.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Does the hon. gentleman think a man would have no standing in the community at all because he might perhaps not be in a position to make a deposit of \$500?

Mr. DENIS: I am very glad to answer my hon. friend. I ask him if, in his lifetime, he ever heard of a serious candidate who could not provide \$500 for his deposit?

Mr. SEXSMITH: I am not in a position to answer that question, but I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he suggests that the 169 candidates who lost their deposits in the last general election were undesirable persons?

Mr. DENIS: Not by any means, but I suggest that several of them should not have run. I am merely taking what is embodied in the law. If it is desirable for any one to be a candidate let us strike out the requirement for a deposit altogether; I have no objection to doing that. But the provision for the deposit either means something or it means nothing. If the former, let us deal with it seriously. If it does not mean anything I have not the least objection to propose striking out the requirement for a deposit altogether, in fact I would be one of the first if that is the wish of the committee. But according to the provision of the law the deposit does mean something. It means that a candidate must be a serious man, must be a man of some standing in the com-

[Mr. Denis.]

munity, must be a man with reasonable chance of winning the election otherwise he will lose his deposit. But taking the law as it is at present and accepting it in the sense that it purports to have, I say let us raise the deposit and make the law more effective. In so doing we are only following the tendency of the times because the \$500 of today is only equal to the \$200 of twenty years ago.

Mr. NESBITT: I am glad to see there is one member of the House who can raise \$500 as easy as he can raise \$200.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Denis) is entirely out of harmony with the spirit of the times. Instead of making it more difficult for reputable men who may not have sufficient money to become candidates in an election, it should be made more easy, if anything. There are plenty of good men in this country who are not too flush of money. If a man becomes a candidate he has to spend a certain amount of money in any case, and his position should not be made more difficult, to say the least.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Why has the change been made that at the close of nomination proceedings the returning officer shall forward by registered mail to the Auditor General of Canada the money or cheques so deposited with the names and addresses of the candidates who made the several deposits? Formerly the money was held by the returning officer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think in times gone by there has been some dissatisfaction in regard to the money being held by the returning officer—it has not always been very easy to get it from him.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The same thing obtains regarding the Auditor General.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But you are sure there.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: My experience has been that it takes six months or a year to get any answer from a department of the Government, and if the Auditor General's Department is not more speedy than the other departments I have had occasion to deal with, I think the returning officer would be just as satisfactory as the Auditor General in respect to handling these deposits.

Mr. SEXSMITH: My hon. friend (Mr. Denis) who sat down a minute ago implied that in order to be a serious candidate it is necessary to be able to put up five hundred dollars deposit. In other words, if a