

At the same time I take the oath and I get a ballot. Now there is a provision that the ballot I get has a number on the back of it. That is for the purpose of identity. Every precaution is taken with regard to secrecy and everybody is sworn in connection with it.

Mr. ROSS: Why is it necessary to identify that man after he has been sworn once?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may subsequently be a question whether I have a right to vote or the other man. I might not be known at the polls.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot see any object in it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My vote may be questioned. How are you going to find the ballot unless there is a number on it? I come up and say: I am John Smith. The deputy returning officer tells me that John Smith has already voted. I deny that the right John Smith has voted, and I take the oath. Thus there are two ballots for John Smith. The numbered ballot identifies me in case of a recount. It may be that a man has fraudulently voted.

Mr. FIELDING: In that case is there any question of the bona fide character of the vote? And if there is none why identify it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may be honest and bona fide. I might be the proper one to poll the vote, or I might not be; I might be the fraudulent person.

Mr. FIELDING: That is to be established at a recount?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In case a recount became necessary. It is a thing that would not happen very often, but I think there should be some way of checking it up.

Mr. FIELDING: If either man has not been identified you have to identify the man who had the honest vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well identify one or the other.

Mr. CALDWELL: The first man to vote might not be the fraudulent voter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To my mind this is a safeguard but I am not going to press the point.

Mr. ARTHURS: It has always been the rule.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was copied from the old law. If any one objects to the provision, let it go.

Mr. CALDWELL: In case a fraudulent vote the identity would be discovered by the number on the back of the ballot?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The judge would identify the ballot voted by John Smith.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the ballot be thrown out?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If it were proven that John Smith voted fraudulently and was not the actual John Smith who had a right to vote the ballot would certainly be thrown out. If it was proven that the right man had voted on the numbered ballot it would be counted.

Mr. CALDWELL: Suppose the wrong man voted first what would be done about it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot help you there. We cannot stop up every gap for fraud.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Section 63 had better stand.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that section 63 stand.

Motion agreed to: section stands.

On section 64—peace and good order at elections.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is an error in subsection 2 at line 13. The words "Chief Electoral" should be struck out, and the word "Returning" inserted. I move that amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Subsection 2 of this section is entirely new, is it not? Is there any special reason for this addition?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is a new clause, and I think it is a very useful one. With the amendment I propose it would read:

Constables shall be appointed to act at polling stations only in cases where the returning officer fears that otherwise disorder will result thereat. In cities and towns returning officers may provide, and locate during polling day at convenient places, one or more posses of three or more constables each, as may be authorized by the Returning Officer, with means of information and of quick conveyance to any place where the services of such posses may be required.

This is just an extra safeguard. If anyone fears a riot or an unfair election there is power to take preventive measures.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister now suggests to make the clause read:

In cities and towns returning officers may provide and locate during polling day at convenient places, one or more posses of three or