

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the registrar is to perform the same duties as those performed by the enumerators under previous legislation, I would rather retain the name "enumerator," objectionable as it is. The word "registrar" connotes permanency and dignity which do not attach to the office of an enumerator. I think right through the Bill it would be much better to use the word "enumerator" than the word "registrar".

Mr. GUTHRIE: The trouble is that the word "enumerator" is not dignified enough. "Registrar" is a dignified term, and we want a dignified official. He is not necessarily a man who goes around the country counting votes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He goes around making up lists.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He does not necessarily do that. In the country districts, he accepts the provincial list, if it is not more than a year old.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not the case under the measure as it is framed now.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, if the provincial list is not more than a year old, he is bound to accept it. Then he adds to or takes from it.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not accepting it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He accepts it as a basis. The language of the Bill is that the provincial list shall be the list with the right to add to it.

Mr. ROSS: I still think a longer period than two days should be allowed for a list of those who are to act as deputy returning officers, etc., to be furnished to the candidate. If an improper man is appointed, I suppose the person to appeal to would be the chief electoral officer and that could not be done inside of two days. Is there any objection to extending the period to four days?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only objection is that sometimes those officials are not appointed four days before polling day.

Mr. ROSS: They should be.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Sometimes a man backs out or dies. In some outlying districts, it is very difficult to get such men at all. In section 114 of the old Act, the time was two days.

Mr. DENIS: Two days for deputy returning officers, but what about the registrars who are nominated weeks before?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The candidates will have knowledge of them twenty-nine days before this. They have to post notices, put up their names and make up lists.

Mr. DENIS: Subclause 2 reads:

All ballots shall be of the same description and as nearly alike as possible.

Why should they not be alike? I would have this subclause read:

All ballots shall be of the same description and alike.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That would not make sense. "Of the same description" does not mean "alike."

Mr. DENIS: Then, let us strike out the words "of the same description."

Mr. GUTHRIE: Everybody knows that the meaning of that is that they shall be of the same general description and as nearly alike as it is possible to make them.

Mr. DENIS: Different kinds of paper and of printing might be used.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is provided for because the chief electoral officer provides the paper, and the weight of paper and so on is dealt with in subsequent clauses.

Section agreed to.

On section 49—ballot boxes.

Mr. DENIS: This clause appears to be a little vague. It begins by saying:

The chief electoral officer may cause to be made * * * * such ballot boxes.

He may not, but I suppose it is compulsory, he really has to do it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Read the rest of the clause.

Mr. DENIS: He may cause ballot boxes to be made if they do not already exist. But who is going to inform the chief electoral officer whether ballot boxes should be provided or not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Part of his duty is to get that information.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Under this clause, has the general electoral officer power to give instructions to have ballot boxes made in any other district than the one in which he resides himself? At the last Federal election, notwithstanding the fact that I