

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Any returning officer who does not carry out his duties is subject to very severe penalties.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: That may be. But is there any possibility of proving that notices to Jim Sykes and Tom Jones did go forward as provided for in the Act, although those men may say they never received such notices and consequently did not know where to vote? My judgment is that the responsibility should have been left with the party organizations. They should be sufficiently interested to see that the voters are notified. It seems to me there may be a great deal more dissatisfaction under the new procedure than we have had under the old.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We cannot go further than impose severe penalties on any electoral officer who does not do his duty. I am not going to say that what the honourable gentleman fears may not prevail to a very limited extent, but I believe the great majority of those in charge of elections will carry out the law. We are getting further and further away from the old election ideas. The new provision is accepted as a very marked advance in election law. It does not prevent a candidate from sending out notices to the electors.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I admit that it looks the proper thing to do. I hope it works out as the honourable gentleman believes it will, but I fear it may not.

The Hon. Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the third reading.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Honourable members, we have gone over the Franchise Bill. I am referring to it by way of explanation as to what the House may decide to do with this Bill. These Bills have been reprinted since being passed in another place. Here is a reprint of the Franchise Bill. I do not know how many other copies are available. This is the House copy that was transmitted with the message to us, and the other copies are identical except that they are not initialed by the Clerk of the Commons. I think it can be safely said that the members of the Commons are intensely interested in the provisions of this Bill and desirous that they should be correctly stated. During the recess the legal gentleman who had charge of drafting of the measure, and I, made a careful check to see whether all the amendments made to the Bill last night or earlier were inserted. We found they were, with four exceptions which are not at all material. It is a question whether, when we come to deal with this Bill, we should put in these minor amendments that have been left out.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

As to the Elections Bill, probably twenty minutes would be time enough for us to go through it and see whether there is any major omission. From the discussions I have had with the lawyer who prepared this Bill, I feel sure that there is none.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: I understand that the honourable gentleman has in his hands several copies of a Bill which has not been distributed. It would be more generous on his part to give us copies.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: My honourable friend has misunderstood me. I have here simply the House copy, and if I had any other I should be only too glad to pass it to the honourable gentleman.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Would my honourable friend state what Bill he is referring to?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Bill 101, an Act respecting the Franchise of Electors at Elections of Members of the House of Commons. I am quite aware that we were dealing with another Bill.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I should like to ask the honourable gentleman if the errors to which he refers were with respect to amendments made by the other House.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Let me outline one of them. The right honourable Leader of the Opposition in another place moved an amendment to paragraph xii of clause 4, on page 5, dealing with the Doukhobor vote in British Columbia. I remember his making the amendment. With a view to greater clarity he moved that the words "in the province of British Columbia" be transferred from the position in which they now appear in that paragraph to the beginning of the paragraph. The amendment was agreed to by the Minister of Justice and carried, but it is not in here. There has been a slip on the part of someone who had charge of the Bill. Should we not make the necessary change here? If the leader of the Opposition in the other place finds that the amendment is missing, will he not be disappointed?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we should go into Committee of the Whole and at least put the Bill into the form in which the Commons intended it to be. I suggest that the motion now before the House be withdrawn, and move that we go into Committee on Bill 101, the Franchise Bill. I hope that while we are considering this measure the honourable senator from Saltecoats (Hon. Mr. Calder) will endeavour to give the same valuable service with respect to the Elections Bill as he has given on this one.