

Mr. HARDIE: With respect to remote areas, not only the people in the Northwest Territories but, for instance, those in areas of northern Saskatchewan and northern Manitoba as well as northern British Columbia, there are cases where, if you were to follow these amendments out to the letter, the electoral officer would have to ship in people from other districts who are not familiar with the particular polling booths, to act as election clerks or deputy returning officers.

I feel that in these districts, in this sort of amendment there should be some rider in there dealing with remote areas where—well, for instance such as in the Hudson bay area where a British subject might come in too late to be an elector in that district, and some other person might act. Usually you will find that they are more familiar than anyone you could send in from any other part of the electoral district.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: I suggest that in 1955 the committee made an exception to permit clergymen to act as election officers in 21 electoral districts. Those are electoral districts that bordered on the Northwest Territories, Yukon and Hudson bay.

I would imagine that the committee would consider section 130 again, permitting northern electors to act as election officers in those 21 ridings where those problems do exist.

The CHAIRMAN: Meantime we hope there will be no election in the northern areas before that time.

Mr. HOWARD: Or the southern areas.

Mr. HARDIE: I do not care; any time at all suits me.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, have you agreed to that section, gentlemen?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, to move on—

Mr. CASTONGUAY: Form No. 13—

The CHAIRMAN: Form No. 13—

Mr. CASTONGUAY: And then form No. 32, and form No. 33.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): They are all the same.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Form 17 is a different principle.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: Yes, it is a different problem. That covers—those forms are to be amended.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): The proposed amendment to form No. 17 is to bring it in line with what I always thought was the situation.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Yes.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: This is a recommendation of Chief Justice McRuer, again as a result of the inquiry made into the revision in connection with the 1957 general election in the electoral district of St. Paul's.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): That was also the interpretation you always put on it, and gave as instructions to those who called on you, that it should be signed in the presence.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: We could not very well—

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): You could not enforce it?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: No, but it was suggested. But now Chief Justice McRuer makes this situation, that it is to be signed in his presence.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): It is difficult to see how anyone could take an oath that it was in the handwriting of the person, without it being signed in his presence, particularly when there is no qualification in the old affidavit—"to the best of my knowledge, information and belief"—or something to that effect.