

we may proceed directly with the questions which any members of the committee may care to direct to Mr. Castonguay. You have all had these proposed amendments for some time.

Mr. HOWARD: Are we to deal with these seriatim as they appear?

The CHAIRMAN: I would think so, unless there is something of a general nature on which you would like to inquire.

Mr. HOWARD: I have one question with respect to the suggested change to Rule (23). This, as I understand it, will conform with the procedure with respect to other notices under the act?

Mr. N. J. CASTONGUAY (*Chief Electoral Officer*): Yes, it will, Mr. Chairman—the same procedures as the notice of grant of a poll and a proclamation.

Mr. HOWARD: In Rule (23B) you propose a new rule, that if the postmaster fails to post up this notice of revision, and so on, that failure to do so will be ground for his dismissal from office. Does that same penalty also apply if he fails to put up the other notices?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: That same penalty applies to the other notices. It is not a new provision.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Has the Postmaster General been consulted with respect to that particular provision?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: No, he has not.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Is it not unusual to put in an election act a provision for the dismissal of a postmaster?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: The committee previously recommended this to the house. They supported this particular thing. I do not know if there was any reference to the Postmaster General. It is not a new principle in the act.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): It is not a new principle in the act?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: No, it has been a long-standing principle in the act.

Mr. HARDIE: Why are you proposing this amendment?

Mr. CASTONGUAY: Under the urban procedure, the returning officer is required to post up two notices of revision in each polling division, and representations have been made by returning officers that parks authorities, hydro companies and telephone companies complain that our notices are there and endanger their men.

At the last election, action was even taken against some of our returning officers in Toronto by the parks committee—but the charges were withdrawn—about posting these notices there. We received similar complaints from the parks people in Montreal. It must be remembered that under the urban procedure we mail a copy of the list of electors in a polling division to each householder, roughly speaking. On that list of electors there is a notice on the top informing the householder where the revising officer is going to sit and the hours he is going to sit, so that the public will not be deprived of any information. Of these notices that are put up, some are torn down pretty fast, and I think the civic authorities, the hydro people, and the Bell Telephone people in general approve of this.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): As a matter of fact, they do not last very long in rain or in snowy weather in the winter, or anything like that.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): There is no change proposed in the procedure so far as the rural polling divisions are concerned.

Mr. CASTONGUAY: None at all.

Mr. CARTER: Did Mr. Castonguay say that notices are mailed to every householder in the rural districts?