

Section 13 was agreed to.

On section 12 (re-considered)—conveyance of electors to polls, etc., for hire forbidden:

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, while the provisions of section 12 are suited to conditions in the rural districts, it is hard to find in it anything that would remedy its defect in regard to the cities. I have heard members of Parliament on both sides state that this clause could not be complied with honestly at elections in large cities. As to the country districts the prohibition to hire vehicles to convey electors is all right, because nearly every elector has a horse and cart, which under some pretext might be hired by one party or the other. But in the cities, where distances are great, the electors are often two, three or four miles away from their poll, and as candidates feel the necessity of getting the electors to the poll at dinner time or during the day, cabs are hired. The best of candidates, while making an effort to obey the law, will close their eyes to the fact that their friends step in and arrange for the hiring of cabs. It is said that there is not an election in a large city like Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg or Hamilton, which could not be annulled just because of the hiring of conveyances to carry electors to the polls. This is a clause under which the candidates in the cities suffer. Of course, we Senators have not to go through the mill, but I dislike to see this clause repeated without an effort having been made to prevent the abuse of the law in those large centres. This is honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Such a clause is necessary for the rural districts, but as to the large cities, while it would hardly be proper at this late hour to try to find a remedy, I desire to point out that the law will continue to be violated and treated with contempt.

Hon. Mr. SHARPE: What would you propose?

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: He does not propose anything.

Sections 14 to 18, inclusive, were agreed to.

On section 19—the Chief Electoral Officer:

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: It reads, "his Majesty's council."

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Would the honourable leader of the Government explain why the name of the Chief Electoral Officer is mentioned instead of the office itself?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I understand that my honourable friend's political friends in the other House insisted that the name should be mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: We have given them their own way.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Does that imply that the Commons have insisted upon having the appointment of the officer?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Well, it is very desirable that the officer appointed to this office should have the confidence of both sides of the House, and I understand that it was mutually arranged that this appointment should be made and that the name should appear in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Should not a change be made to correct what is probably a clerical error, referred to by my honourable friend from De Salaberry (Hon. Mr. Béique)? It ought to be "counsel," not "council."

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: It is only a clerical error.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: That will be corrected.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Does this mean that Mr. Biggar will give all his time to the duties of Chief Electoral Officer?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I understand that Mr. Biggar is acting as counsel for the Government and that he retains his other fees. He will continue to perform the duties that he has been performing for some time past.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: He is attached to the Department of Justice?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Not necessarily. He has been appointed Chief Counsel for the Government.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Under a retaining fee?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: He is paid a salary. I do not speak with absolute certainty about it, but I think he is receiving \$10,000 for that office and \$2,000 for this—a total of \$12,000.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Would it not be the reverse?

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Does the honourable gentleman mean \$10,000 for this?