

**Mr. CARON.** I propose that we strike out of the Bill the words "or to the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada."

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** There may be something in the objection made by the Minister of Militia, but we discussed the same point last year and the House, after deliberating upon that very point, adopted the view which I take now, and in which I followed in the Bill passed last year. Of course, if the House does not desire to follow the precedent of last year, it may go back upon its former decision. Of course, I am in the minority and cannot dictate, but I desire to call attention to the fact that in the Bill of last year these very words are inserted and are the law of the land to-day.

**Mr. DAVIES.** I have no doubt that this Legislature has power to pass the Bill in the form in which it now stands, but, personally, I do not think it is a matter of good policy for us to interfere and to declare, with reference to elections for the Local Legislatures, that certain things shall be misdemeanours. We may have power to do it in strict right, but I object myself to any unnecessary interference with Provincial rights, and on that ground I am strongly inclined to support the objection taken by the Minister of Militia, although I think the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) is right in introducing it. As a matter of policy, I think it is not desirable.

Amendment (Mr. Caron) agreed to.

**Mr. MACMASTER.** The effect of the clause as it now stands would prevent a tenderer for a contract from being a candidate for Parliamentary election. Of course, it is undesirable, and it could not be, that a tenderer whose tender was accepted, could be a candidate at a Parliamentary election; but the effect of the clause, as it now stands, is to prevent every man who has put in a tender for any public contract from being a candidate for Parliamentary election.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** That is a very proper thing.

**Mr. MILLS.** I think it simply prevents him subscribing for the election, not from being a candidate. But it is a question relating to the independence of Parliament, as to whether he may or may not be a candidate.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** If he is a tenderer he cannot put up the \$200 under this clause.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** It seems to me that it is a very desirable thing. I do not think any man who is a tenderer for any public contract ought to be a candidate for Parliament. I think the amendment is a very excellent one.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. Now, suppose tenders are called for, and there are ten, or fifteen, or twenty tenderers. They send in their tenders and they remain there before the Government, who are not ready to decide. Or, suppose the Government wish, under this law, to prevent a man who has tendered from being able to run at an election, the tender might be taken into consideration and kept two, three or four months. He is a tenderer, and his tender is there and he cannot be a candidate. Surely the object of the Bill is the exact contrary of this. You do not wish to put the fate of a candidate, or of any man who wishes to be a candidate, in the hands of the Government of the day, but you wish him to be free. In this case, the man who has tendered might be not at all acceptable; he might have put in the highest tender; but the Government not having decided, but keeping the matter three, four or five months in suspense, he cannot become a candidate, even though he were the most desirable candidate of his party. That, I think, is not the desire of the House.

**Mr. CAMERON (Huron).** I do not see any particular difficulty. If the tenderer be a desirable candidate in the

**Mr. CASGRAIN.**

interests of the party, it is a very simple matter for him to withdraw his tender.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Then he will forfeit his deposit.

**Mr. CAMERON (Huron).** If he puts in his tender and insists on being a contractor, then he cannot be a candidate. If he prefers running for Parliament instead of getting a contract he can withdraw his tender, and I apprehend he will be relieved of all responsibility.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I say that it is not desirable that any contractor should be a candidate for Parliament. I take that stand at once. I think the difficulty raised is of a most infinitesimal kind. I think a great many men are more likely to be good candidates, on either side, than the small number of persons who would be tendering for contracts under the Government. That is, of course, a matter of opinion. I think the provision a very excellent one.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN** moved that the words, "or holding such contracts, and while such contracts are under the consideration of the Government, for acceptance or rejection," be struck out.

**Mr. MILLS.** I do not see that the provision touches the person's eligibility, and that is the question which the hon. Minister has raised. His own case is excepted.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** It is not excepted.

**Mr. DAVIES.** That would be met by inserting, "in any election except his own."

Amendment (Sir Hector Langevin) agreed to.

**Mr. CHAPLEAU.** There is something in this Bill which I think is contrary to our legislation, and that is as regards the punishment of the offender. I do not think the Bill is a good one, and I will vote against it as a whole; but if the Bill is to pass, I say that, considering the circumstances of the case, there should not be a minimum of penalty and of punishment. Let the House set the penalty as high as it deems proper, but leave it to the Judge to consider what less amount of imprisonment and fine should be imposed. A trifling offence might arise—for a nest of lawsuits will be created by this Bill—and hon. gentlemen opposite will not object to provide, as is done even with respect to felonies, that the penalty should not be more than a certain fine or certain term of imprisonment, leaving the application to the Judge. Such a provision would be more in accordance with our ordinary criminal legislation.

**Mr. BLAKE.** The hon. gentleman always forgets that Parliament intervenes and passes an Indemnity Bill.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I do not think the hon. gentleman should make that statement, as he himself passed a Bill to relieve a very large number of his supporters from penalties attached to violating the Independence of Parliament Act.

**Mr. BLAKE.** And you.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I never asked any consideration at your hands, or at the hands of anyone else. The statement made in regard to myself I knew was not correct, and I challenged the hon. gentleman and his party to test it in the courts, or anywhere else. When the hon. gentleman made that statement, he made an insinuation which I believe he knew was not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I apologize to the House, not to the hon. gentleman, who, I think, knew when he made the statement that he was stating what there was no foundation for stating. When hon. gentlemen opposite are so ready to talk about introducing Acts of Indemnity, they should look at their own deeds: they should look at what