

amendments made in Committee on the Bill respecting the Legislative Assembly were concurred in.

Mr. HODGINS said the fifth clause went beyond the privileges claimed by the English House of Commons. The cases showed that the House of Commons exercised discretion in the case of the arrest of a member, instead of making it absolute as it was under this Act.

Mr. MOWAT said he thought it most just that members should be protected from arrest in civil cases. The cases referred to by the hon. member were in the nature of offences.

ELECTION BILL.

On the motion of Mr. MOWAT, the House went again into Committee on the Bill to further amend the law respecting elections of members of the Legislative Assembly, and respecting the trial of such elections.

The 26th clause was amended by striking out the words "or suspect."

On the 27th clause, Mr. MOWAT proposed to substitute \$1,000 for \$800, as the security to be deposited.

Mr. CAMERON said this would place obstacles in the way of investigation.

Mr. BETHUNE suggested that the amount should be increased to \$1,200 to \$1,500, and security allowed to be given instead of a deposit being made. The amount was certainly not large enough now. The costs in these cases had been largely increased by the wholesale way in which witnesses had been subpoenaed.

Mr. DEACON said more Conservatives had come out of the trials with clean hands than Reformers, and now the Government wanted to place obstacles in the way of investigation.

Mr. HODGINS said either the money should be deposited or the time for investigating the value of the security should be extended.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said the Government were on the back track. They had got into power on the cry of purity and had passed a stringent election law. They had, however, been found guilty of dishonesty and corruption, and now they proposed to tinker with the law again. No doubt the law was too stringent, and it was never intended that a man should be unseated and disqualified for eight years for taking a glass of beer on polling day. Now they were having another law, and the people could not understand a law which was so constantly amended. That was one result of changing legislation. (Laughter.) They now tried to throw obstacles in the way of proving the guilt of those guilty of corruption. The country would hold them to be hypocrites in the past, and to be unfaithful to their trust in the present. The hon. gentleman was going on to attack the member for South Brant when, at the instance of Mr. Currie, he was called to order. He then contended that security for costs should be given instead of a deposit being made. He denied that there had been general corruption in the country, as hon. gentlemen had alleged.

Mr. CURRIE pointed out that the laws passed by the Legislature had had the effect of greatly improving the mode in which elections were carried on. He believed the deposit of money should be required in the filing of petitions, to prevent fishing petitions being filed with the object of putting a large sum of money into the pockets of unprincipled attorneys.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that the effect of allowing the law to remain as it was would be to allow political organizations to put in petitions merely on a chance, and in some cases as a matter of spite or recrimination. The effect would be to deter good men from running.

Mr. PAXTON and Mr. MILLER thought \$1,000 was not a large enough sum.

The clause passed.

On clause 31,

Mr. CAMERON said he was of opinion that canvassing by committees and such organizations should not be allowed, but that the only means of communication which a candidate should have with the elections should be by public meetings, or in such a way that any corrupt offers could be discovered if they were made.

The clause passed.

On the 33rd clause,

Mr. MOWAT said he proposed to limit