

candidate or of his cause, but on the effectiveness of his organization on election day, and that effectiveness frequently depends on the amount of money that he has to spend.

I think all politics would be better and purer and nobler if our election law provided for a compulsory form of voting, the transferable vote and a limitation on expenses of candidates. Perhaps when we get into committee we might get the views of officials as to how these changes could be carried out. The bill no doubt is a good one, but we have had very little time as yet to study it. We need more time for the important legislation that is going through our hands.

Hon. Gray Turgeon: Honourable senators, I had not the faintest intention of speaking on this particular bill, but because of some suggestions that have just been made and of the fact that the bill will be going to committee I do wish to say a few things. First of all, I am deadly opposed to compulsory voting, on principle. I am also opposed to the alternative vote, on principle. I wish to emphasize that the alternative vote is not worth anything unless voting alternatively is itself made compulsory. I am against the whole system of proportional representation. I listened to the illustration given by the leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), in which he pictured candidate No. 5 as the Communist Party candidate in an election campaign. He said he would not vote for No. 5, that that candidate would get the smallest vote. But the supporters of No. 5 would be the first to get the right to vote the second time; they could vote a second time while the supporters of those who got the most votes, but who did not get a majority, would not have the right to vote twice at all. The only persons who would vote a second or third time and have their vote counted would be supporters of the candidate who got fewer votes than the successful candidate did.

That general sort of system has been in effect in Europe, and what do we find there today? In the parliaments of France, Italy, and other countries aligned with us in the North Atlantic Treaty, representatives of parties which received the smallest support from the electorate are frequently in a position to prevent the carrying out of treaties entered into by the governments of those countries with their partners in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. I suggest that we should keep facts like that clearly in mind when we are considering changing our electoral laws as has been proposed today.

As to election expenses, I wish to call one matter to the attention of the senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck). I remember that some years ago a question

similar to that which he has just raised was brought up in the other house. Judgment as to the amount of expenses allowed was to be based upon the number of voters in the district. Perhaps in the area to which I refer I was an interested party, for I happened to represent the district of Cariboo, which extended from within ten minutes flying time of the Vancouver airport to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. The number of voters in that immense area was very small compared with the number in any of the several constituencies in the city of Vancouver. The amount of money suggested by the committee of the other chamber was so small that a candidate in that large area would be prohibited from spending enough money to enable him to visit the people whom he hoped would vote for him. That presents a problem which we should keep in mind. I am not objecting to a reduction of the moneys spent on election costs, but in the interests of the candidates who run in the rural districts, particularly in the northwest, where the voters are sparse, we should allow an amount sufficient to carry on the election campaign.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Honourable senators, I move that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Wishart McL. Robertson moved second reading of Bill 43, an Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

He said: Honourable senators, the purpose of these proposed amendments to the Civil Service Act is to provide that the salaries of the Civil Service Commissioners shall be set by the Governor in Council, and that the Governor in Council, on the advice of the Prime Minister, may retain the services of a commissioner beyond the age of 65 years.

The Civil Service Commissioners are, by statute, given the rank and standing of deputy ministers. The question of their continuation in office beyond the age of 65 years and of the determination of their salaries are not, however, subject to the same procedure applicable by statute to deputy ministers, namely, action by Governor in Council. As a consequence, increases in compensation granted to the Civil Service Commissioners have been authorized by means of an item in the estimates; similarly, to extend the