sponsible parties or by professional men for the purpose of making money or even worse purposes than that. The idea was that in election cases there should be a bona-fide petition by men of substantial standing, and that a member should not be open to be pounced upon and victimized. The measure would help to get rid of the cry that had been raised in regard to "sawing off" petitions. In some cases where applications had been made for the dismissal of petitions the court had undertaken to read a lecture to counsel, and certain newspapers had expressed the opinion that there was something mysterious in the way that petitions were sawn off when there was no evidence to offer. There might be some "sawing off," Mr. Hardy thought, but not nearly so much as was charged.

Mr. Whitney thought the present security of $1,000 was quite sufficient. The proposal to compel the furnishing of three additional securities of $1,000 each would render more difficult the task of exposing corruption where it had occurred. It would be almost impossible to get four freeholders worth $1,000 to join with the petition, not the least reason being their fear of being held responsible for costs, and so on.

Hon. Mr. Ross thought that if four men in the riding could not be found to agree that there were grounds for protest, the protest should not be entered.

Mr. Whitney said it was not a question of getting four men to agree as to the propriety of entering a protest; they might get four hundred to do that, but it would be difficult to get four out of four hundred to risk their property by being connected with the petition. He thought that the number might at least be reduced to three.

Mr. Garrow thought it was a move in the right direction.

Hon. Mr. Hardy said he had no objection to adding an amendment requiring only three electors instead of four to file a protest.

The bill was amended as suggested.

Hon. Mr. Hardy explained that under another section the protest would be required to be filed in the locality where the election had been held. That would tend to still further diminish the wholesale launching of petitions at the heads of members by professional gentlemen in some central place. That there was need for this was shown by the fact that after the last elections only ten or twelve petitions were tried out of 72, and the only wonder was that so many cases came to trial.

Preliminary Examinations.

Hon. Mr. Hardy explained that under another provision of the bill members of the House would not be called upon to attend examinations while the Legislature was in session unless with their consent. Application might also be made to terminate an examination when it was deemed to have gone far enough. The object of this, Mr. Hardy said, was to stop the practice which had been coming into vogue of late of putting members on the griddle by keeping up their examination for many days, when a day or two would suffice, to the great detriment of their business and waste of much valuable time. Such a thing was a monstrous outrage, and a gross abuse of legal procedure.

Mr. Whitney said there were two sides to every story, and sometimes three. He had heard of a case where an honorable gentleman who had been called upon to submit to an examination had for days refused to answer, or to give a direct answer to any question. He did not think the proposal was at all a reasonable one. The ordinary practice covered the question.

Hon. Mr. Hardy replied that in case of refusal to answer or evasion counsel had power, as in all cases, to apply to the Judge immediately for ruling for an answer. He had in mind a member of the House who had been compelled to attend at a two or three days' examination. The same thing did not apply in ordinary civil cases, because there was no temptation there in the way of the $1,000 security.

Mr. Whitney objected to the clause providing that the plaintiff or petitioner pay the costs of the preliminary examination. It was very strange that the plaintiff, if he succeeded in the petition with the result that the member was unseated, should be called upon to pay such costs.

Mr. Garrow said that in nine cases out of ten little or no light was thrown by preliminary examinations upon the matter brought out at the trial. The clause was a proper one, and fully in accord with the growing opinion on the point.

Mr. Whitney considered that the House should hesitate before making so radical a change.

Mr. Foy thought the difficulty could be settled satisfactorily by providing that the costs for examination should be awarded on the order of the Judges.

Hon. Mr. Hardy could not see his way clear to accept Mr. Foy's suggestion. He was strongly of opinion that the provision would impose no hardships.

The bill was reported with amendments.

The House went into concurrence on the main estimates, a number of items being reserved for discussion at a later hour.

Ottawa Sunday Cars.

At the evening session the House went into committee on Mr. Lumsden's bill regarding the City of Ottawa. Hon. Mr. Gibson moved the addition of a number of clauses. He pointed out that the street railway operating in the City of Ottawa was in reality a Dominion railroad, and the House must be careful not to enact anything that would interfere with Dominion legislation. By a clause of the present bill they were excepting the railway from the provisions of the Provincial Sabbath observance act. One of the amendments provided that this exception should not relieve them from any future amendments to that act, or interfere with the working of the Dominion act. Other clauses provided for the protection of the employees of the railway in regard to their right to one day in seven. The amendments were adopted and the bill reported.

Estimates Passed.

On the motion for concurrence in report of the Committee of Supply Mr. Little moved that the resolution for the