

\$2,500 for any such a thing. I supposed it was for some rather intricate invention having reference to the ballot box, not to the mere slip that was placed in the box.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat must remember that the whole scheme of this ballot was brought down in a Bill which was submitted to every member of the House; so that the hon. gentleman must have had the Bill and must have seen that the change which it was sought to make was not in the machinery of the ballot box, but in the ballot papers. The amount of money which was submitted by the leader of the House at that time was also disclosed to the House. Under the circumstances it seems to me the hon. gentleman must recollect that the Bill was submitted to the House, and the form of the ballot was part and parcel of that Bill, as well as the amount of money which the Government was supposed to pay for it. Although hon. gentlemen have mentioned that one judgment has been rendered indicating that the improvement might not be as considerable as was expected, I say that one judgment would not warrant a change in the legislation on which now controls this matter. The whole thing was disclosed to the House at that time, and the fact that the sum of money needed was disclosed by Sir John Thompson, shows that the Bill was fully discussed and examined by every honest gentleman. It seems to me that under these circumstances we might allow this item to pass.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe this matter was brought up on 20th July, and the House rose on the 23rd; in other words, it was brought up at a time when everything was being rushed through at a rate infinitely greater than railway speed, and when there was no opportunity to discuss any of these details properly. I do not see that I took part in the discussion, nor that I was present in that committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We sometimes try to get things through when the hon. gentleman is asleep.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must take care that in Committee of Supply we do not recognize any of these implied promises. The money has not been paid, I presume.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not in Committee of Supply, that was in Committee on the Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but the point is this, that in Committee of Supply we are not bound, I think, to recognize any statement of this kind. What the Minister pledged himself to, I think, was to recommend the payment of that sum to Parliament. So far, I am with the Minister of Justice; but I do not think

it was quite proper to say that the Opposition should be held as concurring in any statement of that kind until we have had an opportunity of discussing it properly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think there is not much difference between us. We do not say that until this vote is passed we are bound to pay one dollar, and Mr. Durocher could not recover a sixpence without the sanction of Parliament. All we do say is that we came to you with the Bill; we told you we were going to adopt a certain form of ballot, and we said that if this section was proclaimed according to the provision of that Bill, we had agreed to pay the sum of \$2,500 for the use of it. Now, then, it is only to strengthen the claim for the \$2,500 that we mention the fact that Parliament raised no objection to that Bill passing in that form. But having taken power to proclaim a clause in the Bill, and having said that we as a Government intended to pay the money if we proclaimed it, subject, of course, to an appropriation being made by Parliament, then I say that when we come the next session for the money, the House is morally bound to pay it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I cannot admit it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, in all common fairness, bound to pay that amount. We submit that at any rate the committee has the facts.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to agree with the last statement of the Minister of Justice. I can understand that the Act, having been discussed and agreed upon, we are now not in a position to say that we will not pay the amount in question. There is, however, another point to which I wish to draw attention. The Act should be changed so that the mark must be made within the circular disk. If the Act is worth adopting, it should be made specific. This is necessary, I think, in view of the judgment given in the province of Quebec, which I hold is not correct. This Act should also be educative in its effects and be so framed that the people will rapidly learn its mode of operation. One of the troubles with the old Act was that it took some time for the people to learn its provisions. If the Act was amended so that the mark must be made only in one place, members of Parliament and the agents of the different parties would see that the people understood it; and once they understood it there would be no such difficulty as now prevails. I know a little about this matter in connection with the election in Antigonish, for I know how it worked there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It worked very well.