

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well that is another subject.

Mr. NESBITT: The Act just gives three days to correct the voters' lists, and I want my hon. friend to give us five days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will try to see if it can be done. I find that since we met a calculation has been made, and I am informed that we can make the twelve days fifteen days. That meets the request which was made by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). The dates will be twelve, fifteen and five, whereas previously they were eight and two.

Mr. TURRIF: This, in so far as it applies to Saskatchewan, is practically the same law as we have been working under since 1896 in so far as Dominion elections are concerned. Instead of making the provisions that my hon. friend is making—and I realise that they are made for the protection of the Opposition—it would be better to make another change and follow the old system. My suggestion would be that in all cities of 5,000 and over in the West there should be a judicial revision of the lists during the fifteen days prior to the election. In so far as the rural polls are concerned, we would prefer that the law which we have had since 1896 should remain in force. There is practically no effort made in the rural districts to bring in doubtful voters who will take an oath and secure a ballot and vote when they are not entitled to. In the rural parts we never have had any difficulty along those lines. But in the cities it is quite possible that there will be trouble. I would suggest that in cities the judicial revision be made before the election instead of after and thus avoid the necessity of putting so many ballots in the envelope. We have never had that system in Saskatchewan in connection with Dominion elections. But I can see where an unscrupulous scrutineer or enumerator might easily tie up such a large number of votes as to make it very difficult for the candidate to bring the men concerned forward and have their ballots counted in a recount. In rural districts I do not think any revision is necessary at all. The Act worked well in the past, and the fact that no man can be denied his right to vote has always been a safeguard. It is proposed in this Bill that a man whose name is not on the list can go up, take the oath, get his ballot and vote. I do not think any one need be afraid that

in so far as the rural polls are concerned any wrong-doing will take place under that system. If my hon. friend could see his way clear to making the change I suggest it will prevent a great deal of work and bother after the election in the event of a recount, and it will certainly make it easier for the enumerators and the officials carrying out the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have finished the answers to the notes I made yesterday. Included in them was a reference to the subject introduced again by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). The principle of this distinction is quite sound. There is undoubtedly more difficulty in cities than in the rural parts. There is no possibility of either plugging or disfranchisement in the rural parts of the country. In the cities it is different. But we were faced with this difficulty, that in the three western provinces there is no machinery for this revision. In Ontario, where we adopt it, there is the provincial machinery already established and in operation, and it is a very complicated matter to establish new machinery and to fit it to the needs of individual provinces. We set about, then, to avoid the necessity of doing that because we thought it could be avoided without taking any very great risks. The posting up of the lists so long a time before election day and the virtual closing of the lists five days before election day will be a very great protection in itself. Secondly, the judicial revision afterwards is an enormous protection and the one that I chiefly rely on. In that connection, there is a great deal in what the hon. member says, namely, that an unscrupulous scrutineer acting for a candidate might make the opposing candidate's position difficult if he were ready to challenge a great number of voters who should not be challenged. But, we have put this check upon that: Hereafter voters cannot be challenged in the ordinary way, as they are in the provincial elections in Alberta, merely by a challenge. We do not allow that. The scrutineer must take his oath that he believes that a man has no right to vote, that he believes the cause and the cause must be sufficient to disfranchise. I think scrutineers will hesitate before they expose themselves to the risk of going before a judge under cross-examination with affidavits in their faces that were manifestly false. They will have to go and show that they have ground for the affidavit and I think that scrutineers will hesitate a long time, and will be advised to hesitate by