

second-place votes were added to the votes of the other two candidates, and when they were all counted, they indicated that the majority of people wanted the man who had finished second on the first count. I suggest that Canada ought to adopt the single transferable vote system. I admit that it would only make a difference in about four or five cases in a dominion election, but I think the standard of candidates would be improved, because they would have to attract the votes of followers of other parties.

Honourable senators, I have nothing else to say about this bill, and I would be willing to have it given third reading at this time.

Hon. G. P. Burchill: Honourable senators, I agree with what has been said by the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig). I have always been intrigued by the single transferable vote, and I think that it would improve our electoral system.

Honourable senators, I indeed regret that it is deemed necessary or desirable to drop the word "Dominion" from the title of this Act. I suppose it is just a matter of sentiment, and does not make any difference one way or another; but in the face of present world conditions I wonder if this is an appropriate time to drop this appellation. I belong to a class of people—perhaps it is too old a class, but at any rate it is a class—who cherish what they were taught when they went to school concerning the origin of the word "Dominion". When Canada was coming into being as a nation that word was proposed by a Canadian statesman who belonged to my native province—proposed by a Canadian, for Canadians—as the name of our country. The word was chosen from a passage in one of the Psalms:

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea . . .

That sentence is inscribed over the main door of this parliament building.

As I say, a liking for the name is perhaps just a matter of sentiment. But today many large industrial and commercial enterprises which are part of the fabric of this country have incorporated that word into their own names, and are proud of it.

I want to place myself on record in this chamber as regretting very much indeed that it was felt necessary and desirable to drop that ancient name to which we have all become so accustomed.

Hon. Mr. Marcotte: Are you sure that because the word is being dropped it will disappear from use?

Hon. Mr. Burchill: I am not sure of that. I am sorry that the name is being dropped.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Honourable senators, I take the different view with regard to "dominion," and am rather pleased to see

the disappearance of that word, ancient though it is, in favour of the simple word "Canada." The British North America Act does not call Canada "The Dominion of Canada." It says that this country shall be a dominion, called Canada. I like "Canada" better than "Dominion", with its connotations. So that feature of the bill does not offend me.

But there are two other points in addition to what was referred to by the leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), omissions from the bill rather than contents. The bill may be more important in what it leaves out than in what it takes in. I agree with him fully, as he knows, on this matter of the transferable vote, and I may tell him that the recent election in the Province of Ontario to which he referred this morning, might not have gone quite the way it did had the transferable vote been in effect. The election gave to the party which succeeded only 48 per cent of the total vote cast, but due to a division of it opponents, the government was returned by a sweeping majority of members of the House of Assembly. In constituency after constituency the successful candidate was elected by a minority of voters, and I submit this is an unhealthy thing. But the difficulty about getting the transferable vote made part of our electoral system is that governments like to see their oppositions divided, and so hesitate to adopt the transferable vote. Of course parties out of power favour it, but when they get into office they look at the picture from a different angle. I should like to see provision for the transferable vote in our Act, and I suppose that will come in due season.

Another thing which I should like to see at least considered when we are next dealing with the Elections Act is a limitation such as they have in England on election expenses. Elections have been becoming more and more expensive as years go by, and the outrageous sums—I do not think that term is an exaggeration—the outrageous sums which are expended on elections in this country are in fact a scandal. It is time that we adopted the English method and made it illegal for any candidate to spend more than a very moderate amount. Such a rule would improve the moral tone of our election campaigns and, I think, might lead to greater purity in governments after their election.

Another thing which I should like to see considered, and which of course is not in this bill, is some form of compulsory voting. As things are at the moment, that party wins which gets out its vote. In any close contest the party which actually polls its favourable vote will win over the side that has not the same efficiency in this respect. So elections frequently turn not on the popularity of the