

You have to have the time for regional enumeration and revision, whereas if you had a permanent list, you would only have the revision.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: I would say the most important factor with a permanent list is not the period of enumeration, but with a permanent list there is the bi-product of the absentee vote. That would be the answer—in many, many cases—of people voting who, necessarily, for any reason, have to be absent from home.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Quite.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: That would be, I imagine, the major consideration the committee would like to consider, because that is the answer to most of the representations made here to the committee. In my own view, the advance poll is not the answer, for the simple reason that in the province of Ontario they used to have the same restrictions as we do regarding persons voting at the advanced polls. I believe the vote then was 5,000. They had roughly around 220 advance polls, and then in their last election they permitted anyone to vote at the advance poll for any reason. That had the effect of nearly doubling the vote. I think the vote went to about 9,000; but it also had the effect of quadrupling the number of polls. From 220 that went up to 900 advance polls. Advance polls are expensive under our set-up; they run to a minimum cost of about \$155.

That has been the experience I have noticed in the provinces where they have removed all restrictions. So really, from those statistics, you do not feel—at least, I do not feel—that is the answer to the representations made here. You must remember that under the Ontario system their advance polls are on a Friday and Saturday, and their ordinary polling day is on a Wednesday or Thursday, so there is a greater gap to take people who have to leave, and yet the number of votes has only doubled. When I say “doubled”, it has gone to 9,000. Our advance polls ran to about 256, and there are around 11,000 people who voted, and in this country there must be 50 electoral districts where there are no advance polls, the answer to that would be a very expensive answer. It depends on the way the government lists are adopted. And if it is adopted in that way it runs to a great deal of money.

That is why I say if the committee wishes to consider a permanent list, then I think someone should make a study—not in the parliamentary library, but actually seeing these places where the system is in effect, and making a study of the mechanical side. I am not making a pitch for a trip to any of these overseas places.

Mr. HOWARD: I would be glad to go.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: I do not see how anyone could get reliable or authoritative information on a permanent list until someone makes a study of the existing system.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is it not true that no one could very effectively make such a study, except someone who had conducted an election? I am not trying to get a trip, but I am trying to be realistic about it. If you have never run an election yourself in this country, you are not going to have any standard of comparison.

The CHAIRMAN: I was wondering if Mr. Castonguay is suggesting that the committee should make the expedition!

Mr. JOHNSON: I wonder if it is on the record, that the hon. member for Skeena has agreed?

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): I had considerable experience.

Mr. CARTER: I am interested in the problem of missing ballot boxes, or delay in returning ballot boxes. I could not take my seat in the House of