

qualification that the hon. gentleman possesses so far as I know, is that he is a son-in-law of the late regretted Sir Hector Langevin.

Mr. FIELDING: The law has made a distinction between the Senate and the House of Commons for a great many years. For example, the late Senator DeBoucherville, up to the time of his death, was both a member of the Senate and of the Legislative Council of Quebec. So it appears that while it is thought to be improper to allow a member of the legislature to sit in this House, it is not considered improper for him to be appointed to the Senate. Like my hon. friend for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I cannot see any reason for the distinction, but it has been the law and the practice for many years.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was not aware of it.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I would like to draw the attention of the Acting Solicitor General to subsection 2 (c) of section 39:

A shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of any public work—

As I read this section such an individual would be disqualified. Is the wording of this subsection the same as that in the old Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, it is.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: So that a shareholder in any company having a contract with the Government—

Mr. GUTHRIE: "For the building of any public work."

Mr. A. THOMPSON: No, that is excepted here. This says, as I read it, that an individual will be disqualified as a candidate if he is a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of any public work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the wording of subsection 2 a shareholder in any company, undertaking any contract such as is mentioned in the exception, is ineligible.

Mr. FIELDING: "Public work" means a work for the Dominion Government, I take it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: I would like the section to go further and include directors of all companies which have contracts with the

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Government, not only for the building of public works, but also for the furnishing of supplies of any kind. It might be a hardship to disqualify every shareholder, because some shareholders have only a small interest in the company. But as an illustration, I may point out that during the war some members of Parliament were directors of and shareholders in incorporated companies which had large dealings with various departments of the Government in connection with the furnishing of supplies. I would like to see the clause amended to include all persons who are directors of or have a controlling interest in any company which has contracts with the Government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In order to correct some clerical errors, I move that section 39 be amended by substituting the word "section" for the word "subsection" at the end of line 36 on page 28, and by striking out in the second line on page 29 the following words: "or shall disqualify any such person to sit or vote in the House of Commons".

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Were these words in the old Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They are in the House of Commons Act; they should not be in the Franchise Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the old Act the period of disqualification for corrupt practices was seven years; in this Bill it is eight years. Is there any reason for that change?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know why the change should be made. The Disfranchising Act provides for a period of seven years; I think it should be the same in this case. If the committee will agree, I suggest that the word "seven" be substituted for the word "eight" in line 41 on page 27.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DENIS: I have a few remarks to make which I am afraid will take me nowhere, but I cannot let this clause pass without making my views known to the committee. Paragraph (a) of subsection 1 provides that a candidate may be disqualified for a period of seven years if he is found guilty of any corrupt act. On the face of it, this clause appeals to any honest and straightforward man, because he is apt to say at once that any man who perpetrates an election fraud should be disqualified for seven years. But I have always