PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SUBJECT OF

Proportional Representation

AND THE SUBJECT OF THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE
OR PREFERENTIAL VOTE

No. 1.

21437—1

Library of Parliament
CANADA
JUNE JUIN 21 1972
Bibliothèque du Parlement

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

ORDER OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, April 4, 1921.

Resolved,—That a Special Committee be appointed to consider the subject of proportional representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote, and the desirability of the application of one or the other or both to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, and to report thereon to the House, and that such Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath.

Attest.

W. B. NORTHRUP,
Clerk of the House.

Ordered,—That the Special Committee appointed this day to consider the subject of proportional representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote, and the desirability of the application of one or the other or both to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, consist of the following members: Messrs. Blair, Calder, Crowe, Currie, Davidson, Denis, Harold, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Pardee, Sexsmith, Simpson, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Thomson (Qu'Appelle) and Whidden.

Attest.

W. B. NORTHRUP,
Clerk of the House.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, April 8, 1921.

The Special Committee appointed to consider the subject of proportional representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote met at eleven o'clock a.m.

Present.—Messrs. Blair, Calder, Crowe, Davidson, Denis, Harold, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Sexsmith, Thomson (Qu'Appelle and Whidden.—(12)

On motion of Mr. Davidson it was

Ordered,—That leave of the House be asked to reduce the quorum of the Committee to seven members, also empower it to report from time to time and authorize it to have its proceedings and such evidence as may be taken printed from day to day for the use of members of the Committee and that Rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

The desirability of obtaining such information as will facilitate the work of the Committee in relation to the matters referred to it for consideration was discussed and it was after deliberation on motion of Mr. Sexsmith

Ordered,—That Mr. Ronald H. Hooper of the Department of Labour, who has had considerable experience with respect to proportional representation, be invited to address the Committee thereon at its next meeting.

On motion of Mr. Thomson (Qu'Appelle), it was

Ordered,—That a sub-committee, composed of Hon. Mr. Calder, McMaster and the mover be appointed for the purpose of considering what statistics relative to both Federal and Provincial elections, maps, etc., will be required with a view of furthering the work of the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned to the call of the Chair.

J. A. SEXSMITH,

Chairman.

Attest.

L. C. PANET,

Clerk of the Committee.

WEDNESDAY, April 13, 1921.

Ordered,—That the quorum of the said Committee consist of seven members, and that the said Committee be also empowered to report from time to time, and authorized to have its proceedings and such evidence as may be taken, printed from day to day for the use of the members of the Committee, and that Rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

Attest.

W. B. NORTHRUP,

Clerk of the Committee.

THURSDAY, April 14, 1921.

The Committee met at eleven o'clock, a.m.

Present.—Messrs. Blair, Calder, Currie, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Sexsmith, Simpson and Thomson (Qu'Appelle).—(9)

Mr. Calder, who was chosen chairman at the last meeting having stated he would, owing to his time being fully occupied, be unable to act in that capacity, proposed that Mr. Sexsmith be appointed chairman.

Mr. Sexsmith thereupon took the Chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. Ronald Hooper who, at the request of the Committee was in attendance, addressed the Committee on the subject of proportional representation.

The Chairman of the Sub-Committee appointed at the last meeting for the purpose of considering what statistics relative to both Federal and Provincial elections would be required, presented the report of the said committee recommending that certain material be procured for the use of members of the committee.

On motion of Mr. Currie the foregoing report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Calder it was

Ordered,—That Mr. Hooper be requested to attend the next meeting of the Committee and resume his address in relation to the subject under consideration.

The Committee then adjourned to the call of the Chair.

Chairman.

Attest.

L. C. PANET,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

COMMITTEE ON PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
THURSDAY, April 14, 1921.

The Special Committee appointed to consider the subject of Proportional Representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote, and the desirability of the application of one or the other or both to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Sexsmith, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Ronald H. Hooper here this morning. I understand, to explain and demonstrate the system of proportional representation, and we would be very glad to hear him.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: This morning I would suggest that as quite a number of members of the committee are absent Mr. Hooper just give us a general outline without going into minor details, so that he would not have to go over the whole thing twice.

Mr. HOOPER: I came prepared to speak for perhaps an hour giving the arguments of those who believe in the necessity for this electoral reform and to explain in detail the mechanism and the probable effects of it and how it would remedy the anomalies of the present system, and to deal with certain specific questions which might be asked me, such as the formation of groups and other questions of that character. I am not attempting to make a case for proportional representation now, but merely to explain it. I am not now offering an argument for the adoption of proportional representation; that is another matter. I think we all have a very good idea about the evils of the present system. Admitting for the moment that the evils of the present system of single member constituency elections are serious, I claim the remedy is well within our reach. In order to secure a proper representation in parliament of the various parties within the country, and in order to secure the highest type of parliament where the members may represent the opinions of people rather than acres, mental rather than geographical constituencies, it will be necessary to make but two changes of a comparatively simple and practicable nature in our electoral machinery. First, we should abolish the single member constituencies and substitute in their place much larger electoral districts electing several members.

Mr. CURRIE: Why?

Mr. HOOPER: I will explain that. Instead of dividing a city like Toronto, for example, into a number of single member constituencies, we should throw them all in together and elect the representatives for Toronto from the city at large.

By Mr. Currie:

Q. That is what we did fifty years ago, and we found that we had to come down to single member constituencies.—A. I can easily explain that. If we used the "Block Vote" system, that is, allow each elector to mark an X on the ballot paper against as many candidates as there are representatives to be elected, it would be possible as in the city of Victoria at the last British Columbia provincial elections, for a bare majority of electors to elect all the candidates leaving minorities entirely unrepresented, which would certainly be no improvement over the present system. On the other hand, if we allowed each elector one rigid vote only, it might frequently happen that a party,

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]

by lavishing too many votes on an exceedingly popular candidate would fail to elect the number of representatives that it was entitled to; or, by distributing its votes over too many candidates, might even fail to elect any one of them. This brings us to the second point. We should then adopt a voting system known as the single transferable vote.

Q. Why would you?—A. I am coming to that. Under this system each elector shall have one vote, and one vote only, but that single vote shall, under certain contingencies, be transferable from one candidate to another as the elector himself shall decide when marking his ballot. This system of voting at once makes it possible to effect a just and proper distribution of the representation among all the more important political parties in proportion to their voting strength; and it further insures that the best man of each party shall be elected. Perhaps I had better repeat this. The first step—the combining together of several adjoining single member constituencies into one large electoral district electing several members. The second step—the use of the single transferable vote, that is, each elector shall have one vote, but that one vote shall be transferable under certain contingencies from one candidate to another in strict accordance with the voter's wishes: In order to illustrate this let us take the city of Toronto as it was divided in 1911 for the federal elections. Toronto furnishes a good example; I might have taken Quebec, but perhaps Toronto furnishes the best illustration for my purpose. In 1911, Toronto was divided up into five single member constituencies. There were about 50,000 voters in the city at that time of which 30,000 approximately were Conservatives and 20,000 were Liberals. The Conservatives were in the majority in each of the five constituencies and elected all five members. Under proportional representation Toronto would be considered as one large electoral district electing five members. Then by using the single transferable vote the 50,000 voters at that time in Toronto would have been able to group themselves into five groups of approximately 10,000, each group, or "quota," electing one member, so that the 30,000 Conservatives would have formed three groups and elected three members, and the 20,000 Liberals would have formed two groups and elected two members. As I have explained the Conservatives elected all five members. This illustration might work the other way in the province of Quebec.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. Do you advocate the grouping of rural constituencies in the same way?—A. That of course depends to a certain extent upon circumstances. The least that it is advisable to have for a proportional representation constituency is three members. By grouping three sparsely populated rural constituencies you might make a large area and practical considerations might make that inadvisable. It depends on the density of population.

Q. See where you land yourself. In Toronto, in the election of 1911, there were 30,000 Conservatives and 20,000 Liberals, and you say that the system should be so arranged that each of those large groups should get their representation so far as the city is concerned; but when you come to rural constituencies you may find exactly the same difference, so many Liberals and so many Conservatives. Would it be proper to adopt the system that you advocate in the cities when you would find it inadvisable to use it in the country constituencies under the circumstances you mention?—A. If it be admitted for a moment that the present system is unjust—

By Mr. Currie:

Q. But it is not. You are attacking our present system and you must justify that statement.—A. I can do so by starting at the beginning as I understood was the original intention of this morning's session.

Q. First of all it is necessary to prove that. We had better go into the fundamentals before proceeding to discuss your proposition. Allow me to ask you a few

questions: I suppose you know that when you come here proposing that we should adopt proportional representation you are striking at one of the fundamentals of our Government?

The CHAIRMAN: This gentleman has not come here of his own accord; he has been subpœnaed.

The CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE: He has been invited to come, and explain the system.

Mr. CURRIE: That is all right. I am entitled to examine him. You are striking at one of the fundamentals of our system of government are you not?

Mr. HOOPER: I do not admit that.

Mr. CURRIE: Every one else who discusses this subject from your point of view does. What would the adoption of proportional representation mean?

Mr. HOOPER: It would mean that parliament would be as nearly as possible a reflection of the opinions of the people, which is the principle of democracy.

Mr. CURRIE: Are we not representatives? Are we not a representative body?

The CHAIRMAN: We are not likely to get anywhere if we proceed this way.

MR. CURRIE: Mr. Hooper is not going to be allowed to lecture this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hooper was invited here for a definite purpose, and I think the committee has a right to say that Mr. Hooper shall be permitted to proceed with his statement.

Mr. CURRIE: I am entitled to question him. How many forms of proportional representation have been tried?

Mr. HOOPER: Only two. The British Commission on Electoral Systems which sat in Great Britain in 1909 made a general statement that there were probably some 300 systems, but that in reality there were only two systems to be considered, one used in continental Europe and one used in the British Empire, so for all practical purposes we can adopt the report of the Royal Commission in England which studied the question for several months and on which were representatives of all the parties in Great Britain. So there are two systems the List System and the Single Transferable Vote.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What is the List System?

Mr. HOOPER: In Belgium the government of the day wanted to introduce proportional representation in that country in order to avoid a revolution. The electoral system in Belgium was based on the scrutin de liste, that is the "Block Vote," system. The results under that system were grossly unfair to the minorities in Flanders and Wallony. They therefore adopted the List System, which was the easiest to superimpose upon their electoral machinery. The people had been very much in the habit of voting a party ticket, so each devised a list of candidates and the party voter was asked to cast his vote at the top of the ballot for his particular party and leave it to the party to use the vote as it pleased. Of course the ballot might be used for a candidate that the voter himself would not have supported. The British Royal Commission studied the system and were opposed to it as being in conflict with the democratic ideas that prevailed in Great Britain, that a voter should control his own vote, and they rejected this system and endorsed the single transferable vote as being more in accordance with British democracy.

By Mr. Currie:

Q. Representation originally in this country and in the United States was founded on the town meeting. You have been a close student of those things have you not? —A. I try to study such matters.

Q. That is a system by which every elector had his say. Then they got more members to represent blocks, and they proceeded to have a block like a county which elected four or five members. That was the development of the voting system. Then they cut down these large blocks into smaller districts—you understand the system in the United States and Canada. Originally they elected the members of Congress by blocks, and afterwards by constituencies. Why do you think it better to go back to the old system when it would involve increased expense in carrying on a campaign? —A. I am prepared to deal with that later.

The CHAIRMAN: If you are going to make any progress you will have to let Mr. Hooper continue his statement.

Mr. CURRIE: Do not try to save him.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interfere between the hon. gentleman and the witness but I do want to make progress.

Mr. CURRIE: I am trying to get at the proposed system of voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not see any sense in going back into history just at present. We have Mr. Hooper, who has been invited to appear before the committee. He is in the hands of the committee, and if the committee wish to question Mr. Hooper to-day I am satisfied.

Mr. MCMASTER: I think we are cross purposes. Mr. Hooper at the beginning of his remarks expressed an intention to show how the system of proportional representation works out. What he had better do is to begin at the beginning and deal with fundamentals, showing wherein he considers the present system is lacking, and the difference between the present system and proportional representation.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I think it would be better to let Mr. Hooper get through which his statements before starting to cross-examine him. That is a good rule of law as well as common sense.

Mr. CURRIE: He assumes that we have adopted the system.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I think it is only fair to let Mr. Hooper continue his statement.

Mr. CURRIE: I take this position: The witness has been called as one of the exponents of proportional representation to give evidence before this committee, and I propose to examine him on this whole business. I do not want him to proceed on the presumption that I have adopted his idea. He may claim that he has shown that the present system is wrong and that the system which he advocates is the only practical one to be adopted. Now, as I have said, there are 300 such systems; this is only one. I am quite willing that Mr. Hooper shall speak his piece but not that he shall cram his views down our throats.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): He should be examined to the limit, but he should be allowed first to state his case.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the object of the committee is to make progress. Mr. Hooper has been invited here by the committee to make his statement and to answer any questions which may be asked, but in order to make progress I think Mr. Thomson's suggestion should be followed.

Mr. CURRIE: Everybody is quite willing. Tell us how this thing started.

Mr. HOOPER: As the Honorary Secretary of the Proportional Representation Society, naturally I am an advocate of the system and I am prepared to state my case and then shall be happy to answer questions. But it is difficult in the middle of the statement to answer questions which often do not bear upon the point I am dealing with.

Mr. CURRIE: You are not talking to a lot of labour delegates. We are members of Parliament and not accustomed to being lectured. Go ahead with your statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Allow the gentleman the common courtesy to go on and develop his case for a few minutes anyway.

Mr. HOOPER: In order to demonstrate the advantages of the system which we believe in, I think it would be advisable for me to point out in some detail the anomalies of the present system, in order to show that proportional representation will correct those anomalies. For the purpose of ascertaining the people's will, we have at the present time a method of election known as the single member constituency, under which the country is divided up into a number of arbitrary geographical divisions called constituencies; and all the voters within one of these constituencies are entitled to elect one member to represent them in Parliament. But there are always a number of questions of prime importance before the electors at every general election. Nevertheless, the theory is, that one man is competent to express an opinion and vote in Parliament upon all these questions for all the citizens who happen to live within one of these geographical areas. That one man is he who polls a fair majority of the votes. But now when three-cornered contests are becoming far more common, the elected representative need poll only a bare plurality of the votes, which might be very much less than a majority. Thus he can only hope to reflect in the crudest possible way the political opinion of the district from which he comes. The single member constituency, or "Majority" system probably served its purpose sufficiently well in the past, when education was regarded almost as a luxury and when the franchise was restricted generally to what were called the upper classes, and when parliaments were engaged only in dealing with the general rights of the people, as for example freedom in religious beliefs, the right to trial by jury, and other questions which affected all classes of citizens equally; but to-day, owing to the spread of education and the enormous extension of the franchise, parliaments are giving increasing attention to economic questions, to the adjustment of differences between capital and labour and the settlement of industrial questions arising out of the Peace Treaty and the Washington Conference, and it is conceivable that governments, which operated equitably enough when universal rights only were concerned, might not operate fairly where there is a conflict between particular interests. I will now give you some examples of the injustices that occur under the present system. Frequently minorities obtain no representation at all and are as completely disfranchised as if their names had been struck off the voters' lists altogether. There are some instances I might mention. At the Federal election in 1904, in the province of Nova Scotia, the Liberal party polled 56,000 votes and the Conservatives polled 46,000 votes.

Mr. CURRIE: Was that due to the method of voting or to a gerrymander of the constituencies?

Mr. HOOPER: It does not matter whether it was due to either. What I want to show is that by adopting this system you make gerrymandering practically impossible. The Liberals only polled 10,000 more votes than the Conservatives, but they elected 18 representatives while the Conservatives elected none. In the Federal elections in 1911, in the province of British Columbia, the Conservatives polled 25,000 votes and the Liberals 16,000 votes; the Conservatives won seven seats and the Liberals none. In the British Columbia provincial election in 1912 I understand no Liberals were elected.

Mr. CURRIE: Another case of gerrymander.

Mr. HOOPER: Possibly; it is possible under the present system. The cry "one man, one vote" is meaningless unless we have at the same time one vote one value. The present system is responsible sometims for injustice done to a majority. There are instances where the party polling the least number of votes has elected a majority of the candidates. In 1886 Gladstone was hurled from power by a minority, though he had a majority of 55,000 votes throughout the country. His opponents had a majority of 104 seats in the House.

Mr. CURRIE: Another case of gerrymander.

Mr. HOOPER: We will admit that, if you will, and I am prepared to show that the present system was responsible for it. As a result of that, Gladstone retired to the Opposition benches and the Home Rule question, which was the issue of the election, has since obstructed the political progress of Great Britain from that day to this. Col. Amery, the present Under-Secretary for the Colonies, recently made the public statement that if Gladstone had won that election the Home Rule question would have been settled and all the present bloodshed avoided. In the Canadian general election in 1896 the Conservative party polled 11,000 more votes than the Liberal party; nevertheless the Liberals obtained a majority of 30 seats in the House of Commons. In the last Ontario provincial election the Conservatives polled over 386,000 votes and the Farmers party, not including the Labour party, polled 256,000 votes—30,000 votes less; nevertheless they obtained 20 more seats than the Conservatives. In the British Parliamentary elections of December, 1918, there were 76 contested seats in Ireland. The total votes polled for Sinn Fein candidates was 495,760, and for Unionists and National candidates 515,578—20,000 more; but the Sinn Feiners won 47 seats, and the Unionists and Nationalists only 29. In the recent British Columbia provincial election the government polled a minority of the votes. One seldom realizes that under the present system minorities are not only disfranchised, but actually penalized. Take Toronto, for example: in 1911 there were enough voters in Toronto to entitle the city to five members. The five members elected were all Conservatives. But about two-fifths of the voters were Liberals. Now if it were not for the presence of these Liberal voters in the city, Toronto would only have been entitled to three members, who would, of course, have been Conservatives. My point is this: that the presence of those Liberal voters in Toronto added two seats to their opponents.

By Mr. Currie:

Q. I suppose you know that some years ago in Toronto we had a system by which the minority was enabled to secure representation?—A. I do not know what that system was.

Mr. CURRIE: There were three members to be elected but each elector was only allowed to vote for two candidates with the result that Mr. Joseph Tait was the Liberal member for some years. That was about 1896, but that system was abandoned after a trial of some years, and the old system which is now in existence was reverted to.

Mr. MCMASTER: I think in courtesy to Mr. Hooper, who is our guest, he should be permitted to continue his statement.

Mr. HOOPER: As I was saying, the presence of those 20,000 Liberal voters in the city of Toronto added two seats to the number held by their opponents. Now it would have been better for the liberal party of Canada if the Toronto liberals could have been blotted out of existence; the very fact that they lived in Toronto gave two seats in the House to the conservative party. The present system is also responsible for what has become known as the "Swing of the pendulum." Under the present system of election a slight change over of votes within the country often has a tremendously disproportionate effect upon the representation in the House. I try to be fair to both parties and will give illustrations working both ways. In the Canadian Federal election of 1908 the liberal government had a majority of 49 seats; but the government won 49 of its seats by majorities amounting in the aggregate to only 6,543 votes. So that if slightly more than half that number of voters in these particular constituencies had voted differently, the liberal majority in seats would have been wiped out. On the other hand, in the 1911 election the conservative party secured a majority of 47 seats in the House of Commons; but the conservative party won 47 of its seats by majorities amounting in the aggregate to only 5,094 votes. These figures mean practically this, that in 1908 some 6,000 odd voters were able to

swing the balance of the liberal party being returned to parliament, while in 1911 some 5,000 odd voters effected the overthrow of the liberal government and the creating of a conservative regime. In Australia in 1910 a similar thing happened; a slight change over of votes wiped out the anti-labour party, which was a coalition of liberals and conservatives, and swept labour into power with an overwhelming majority. Lord Selbourne not long ago predicted that the same thing may happen in England, although it seems less likely to happen now than it did at the time Lord Selbourne predicted it. Such exaggerated change-overs as these do not make for continuity of policy in the government of a country. All these anomalies can be traced to the same course; that in a single member constituency the whole of the representation must of necessity be awarded to a majority, or even a bare plurality of the electors, whether that majority or plurality is large or small. It directly follows then that the election results depend, not so much on the actual strength of political parties, as upon the manner in which that strength is distributed over the country and that very fact places a premium upon gerrymandering. It unfortunately happens that a suspicion, justly or unjustly, nearly always attaches to all redistribution Bills. I have pointed out some of the injustices due to the system and I will now try to point out what we consider to be the foolishness of the system. In choosing a country's parliament we do not want to have certain acres of its land represented; we want to have the political opinions of its citizens represented. The basis of representation, it seems to us, should, as far as practicable, be brains, not geography. Does our system enable us to attract the political opinions, the brains of the community? We take a certain geographical area and we say to all the voters in that area, liberals, conservatieves, labour men, capitalists, socialists, women, men who believe in free trade, others in low tariff, others in high tariff, men who believe in public ownership and those who don't, we say to them all: try to get together on some common ground and elect one man to represent all of you in parliament. Now the common ground, the common understanding, of a constituency of people is bound to be extremely limited. Take two professional men, their education has been along similar lines, their environment all their lives has been much the same, their mental outlook is much the same, and consequently the ground of common understanding is comparatively large. To these two professional men let us add a labourer, and immediately the ground of common understanding shrinks, not because the labourer is any less intelligent, but simply because his outlook upon life, and perhaps his political viewpoint, is different. To these men add a grocer, clergyman, garbage collector, a woman, and immediately the ground of common understanding has shrunk almost to a pin point. About the only thing that this conglomerate mass of people can agree upon is the necessity for a new post office or something of that kind, and outside of the straight party platform, that is about the only thing a candidate discusses or cares to express an opinion about; for, to get elected, a candidate must be acceptable to or, may I say, amenable to, the various minorities embraced in the crowd. As Senator Turriff once said, "to get elected the candidate must be prepared to promise anything up to the Kingdom of Heaven to the various groups within his constituency." These are serious evils. By this means we do not tap the brain of the community. Another serious objection to the single member constituency is the fear of splitting the party vote, which limits each party to running one candidate only. This limited choice affords the voter no opportunity of giving expression to his views upon questions other than straight party issues, and we believe this to be the reason why so large a proportion of the electors of Canada never exercise their franchise; it is of little use urging electors to use their intelligence if on the day of the poll they have no means of doing so. Now I have stated some of the evils for which the single member constituency is responsible, evils which Lord Selbourne has stated are seriously undermining the authority of our constituted form of government. But, to once more go over the earlier part of my statement, while the evils are serious, the remedy is within reach. In order to secure in parliament the proper represen-

tation of all considerable parties, and in order to secure the highest type of parliament, it will be necessary to make but two changes of a simple and practicable nature in our election machinery. First we should abolish the single member constituency and substitute in its place much larger electoral districts electing several members, that is, as I said earlier, instead of dividing a city like Toronto into a number of single member areas, we might throw them all in together and elect the Toronto representatives from the city at large. That brings up the method of voting to be used in such a constituency. If we used the "Block Vote" system and allowed each elector to cast for as many candidates as there were members to be elected, it would be possible, as frequently happens under such conditions, for a bare majority of electors to elect all the candidates, thus leaving minorities entirely unrepresented. On the other hand, if we allow each elector one rigid vote only, it might frequently happen that a party, by lavishing too many votes on an exceedingly popular candidate, would fail to elect the number of representatives it was entitled to.

Mr. CURRIE: Why do you confine the block system to the cities? Why do you not apply it to the whole province?

Mr. HOOPER: When you speak of the block system in this sense I presume you mean the multi-membered constituency, not the method of voting. There might be practical difficulties in the way of applying it universally; that is for the Committee to decide. The second step necessary is this: We should adopt the system known as the single transferable vote. Each elector shall have one vote, but that one vote shall, under certain contingencies, be transferable from one candidate to another as the elector himself decides when marking his ballot. The combination of the multi-membered constituency with the single transferable vote at once makes it possible for a just and proper distribution of the representation to be made among all the more important political parties in proportion to their voting strength; and it further ensures that the leading men of each party shall be elected. These are the two changes that are necessary. To illustrate the working of the system, take the case of the city of Toronto which in 1911 was divided into five constituencies containing about 50,000 voters of whom approximately 30,000 were Conservatives and 20,000 Liberals. The Conservatives elected all the representatives. Under proportional representation the city would be considered as one large electoral area and the Conservatives could form three groups of 10,000 approximately and the Liberals two groups of 10,000 each and each group would have elected one member.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Why do you speak of three groups of Conservatives and two groups of Liberals of 10,000 each?

Mr. HOOPER: I will try to visualize it for you in a general way.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: You propose one constituency for the city of Toronto?

Mr. HOOPER: Yes, and the members would be elected in this way: Imagine the candidates to be spaced out at intervals on some large open space, and imagine each elector, as he arrives, walking up to and standing beside the candidate he most prefers. Now it is comparatively certain that one candidate will be outstandingly popular and that a large number of supporters will soon be gathered around him. It will be seen that he has a sufficient number of supporters to secure his election, and therefore other electors, who might still desire to vote for him, will be asked, not to waste their votes upon one already elected, but to select a second choice from among the other candidates still in the field. In this way then, we will ultimately have all the electors grouped around the various candidates of their choice. But so far we have only elected one; we desire to elect five. The next step then, will be to declare defeated the candidate who has the fewest numbers of supporters. The voters gathered around such defeated candidate will be asked not to lose interest in the election and go home defeated and sullen, but to make a second choice among the other candidates available. In this way the lowest candidates will be eliminated one after another, and their

supporters will be asked to make other choices until, finally, five candidates only will remain, each of whom will have a quota of supporters standing beside him. In this way five groups would be formed of the electors of Toronto, each of which would obtain a representative in Parliament.

Of course, the voters are not actually asked to walk out and group themselves in this manner; but what they are asked to do by means of the single transferable vote amounts to practically the same thing. Each voter is asked not only to vote for his favourite candidate, but also to mark on his ballot paper his second, third, and other choices, so that in the event of his favourite candidate either receiving more support than he needs, or receiving so little as to have no chance of election, that then the vote shall be transferred to his second choice, or if he does not need it, to his third choice, and so on. In this way the grouping is done automatically, while at the same time the secrecy of the ballot is preserved and, most important of all, no ballots are wasted. The voter's duty in all this is extremely simple. He simply takes the ballot paper and places the figure one against the name of his favourite candidate, the figure "2" against the second choice, and so on. That is all that the voter has to do; the returning officers will do the rest.

Mr. SIMPSON: Is it necessary that he shall indicate his choice for more than one candidate?

Mr. HOOPER: No, not necessarily, but plumping gives him no advantage because his ballot will not be used to help a second choice until it is found that it cannot possibly help his first, so by plumping the voter simply partially disfranchises himself without helping his favourite candidate.

Mr. CURRIE: What is the difference between giving a man five votes and allow-him to apply them as he likes and the system which you have described?

Mr. HOOPER: There is a tremendous lot to be said against that. I can give you British authorities on the subject of the cumulative vote. I could read you the evidence on that point in this report of the Royal Commission on Electoral systems. In order to show that there is no difficulty in the way, I can mention the number of spoiled ballots in the election which took place in Winnipeg, the largest constituency under the single transferable vote system that has so far been formed. In that election 76·2 per cent of the voters on the voters' list turned out to vote, which is the highest percentage they have ever had in Winnipeg, so I was informed, and the percentage of spoiled ballots was 1·72, less than even in an ordinary election before that time. The proportional representation system was used in Ireland in 1920 for the election of city councils in 120 municipalities, all of which occurred on the same day. Earl Grey reported on that in a letter to us and said that the percentage of spoiled ballots in the whole of Ireland was less than 3 per cent. It was less than 2 in urban constituencies. In rural constituencies where the average of education was not as high, the percentage was greater. So there is no difficulty on that point if the voter is properly instructed.

When a voter marks second, third, and other choices, he is actually giving his instructions to the returning officer. The voter practically says this: If my first choice candidate already has enough votes to elect him, or if he has no chance of election, then, so that my vote shall not be wasted, transfer it to my second choice, or, if he does not need it, to my third choice. Under this system the voter can mark his first choice exactly as he feels, without having to consider whether his vote will be wasted on a candidate who has no chance of election. The voter will know that if his first choice is defeated, his ballot will be used for his second. The abolition of the single member constituency and the substitution of large electoral districts electing three, five, or more members, will mean that we will no longer have a member striving to the best of his ability but nevertheless very imperfectly representing a geographical constituency in which men and women of divers views merely happen to

live together; instead of this, each member will truly represent a unanimous group of people who think alike on the more important political questions of the day.

Now, with your permission, I would like to deal with the effect in one or two respects of proportional representation where it has been adopted. There is much evidence on record to show that it invariably results in cleaner elections. Professor Dupreiez, of Louvain university, when speaking in New York in 1915, said that since the introduction of proportional representation into Belgium in 1900, "electoral campaigns have gained in dignity; corruption is almost entirely eliminated, and that now one scarcely ever sees the rioting and violence with which elections too often used to end in the larger Belgian cities." We have had practically the same experience in Winnipeg. The Manitoba Free Press, in its issue of July 7, 1920, said that it was the cleanest and fairest election that had ever been held in Winnipeg. The Grain Growers' Guide in its issue of July 14 said the same thing. The reason for these claims is fairly obvious. In the multi-member constituency one candidate is not pitted and thrown against another in such a manner that to win he must necessarily defeat an opponent, for the simple reason that every candidate who has the following in his district equal to the necessary quota of votes is certain of election. The success of one candidate does not necessarily prevent the success of another. Neither must party crush party. All parties will be successful in proportion to their polling strength, so that there will be neither the temptation nor the power to purchase enough votes to materially affect the election. Under the single member system a hundred corrupt electors in a closely contested campaign can decide the representation for the constituency. Under proportional representation, with its multi-member constituency, the most that a hundred corrupt voters could do would be to help slightly in building up a quota for one member out of many members. Few dishonest agents would care to expend their principals' money with such a slim chance of getting any benefit from it, particularly when it is considered that the principal might get the benefit of the second choice ballots of other candidates within his party.

I believe that proportional representation will assist the Bon Entente movement between Ontario and Quebec. If it is true that history repeats itself, then there is every reason for believing that proportional representational would do much to assist in breaking down the barrier that unhappily appears to exist between Quebec and the rest of Canada. In order to substantiate this claim of assisting the Bon Entente, I will give you the case of Belgium.

Mr. CURRIE: We have heard a lot of that and I think we should clear that situation up. You know that in Belgium, France and the United States, members are elected for a definite term which cannot be shortened by a vote in the House. They are elected for four or five years, as the case may be, and that term cannot be shortened by a vote against the Government. With us, if the Government is overwhelmed by a vote taken in the House, we have to go to the country, so of necessity there must be some form of the group system in these countries and it has led to the formation of groups.

Mr. HOOPER: What has led to the group system?

Mr. CURRIE: It has led to the group system in Belgium.

Mr. HOOPER: They had groups before they adopted proportional representation. In France they have used the single member constituency, with the second ballot, and the single member constituencies have given rise to the formation of groups. The French Government introduced proportional representation last year for the purpose of trying to reduce some of these groups.

Mr. CURRIE: You are dodging away from the question.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): We have decided that this gentleman is to be allowed to make his statement without interruption.

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]

Mr. HOOPER: I was trying to show how the adoption of proportional representation would help to bring about a better understanding between Ontario and Quebec and I was about to give an illustration from the history of Belgium to show what had happened there. Previous to 1899, the non-representation of minorities in Belgium accentuated the racial, religious, and language differences between Flanders and Wallony. Flanders was represented by Catholics only; the French-speaking districts by Liberals and Socialists. This resulted in much internal strife, and in 1899, according to a statement by Count Goblet d'Alviella, Vice-President of the Belgium Senate, "Belgium was on the eve of a revolution, a revolution which was only avoided by the immediate and complete introduction of proportional representation into parliamentary elections. Since its introduction, members of all three parties have been returned in both areas, and this result has brought in its train a great national advantage, the political consolidation of Belgium. Political questions now cut across racial and religious differences, and, in so doing, have assisted in the process of unification"—a unification that Germany has always done its utmost to prevent.

It is on that experience of Belgium that I base the claim that a better understanding between Ontario and Quebec would be brought about if we had better representation of the minorities in those provinces. Proportional representation gives freedom and elasticity in elections and consequently increases the general interest. The use of the single transferable vote gives this freedom by removing the bogy of the split vote. With proportional representation a party may run a number of candidates in one of these multi-membered constituencies, and by so doing will strengthen rather than weaken its forces. If a party should be divided itno two wings it could run candidates representatives of either wing, and a voter could mark on his ballot his first and second preferences for these candidates in the order in which he prefers them with the absolute certainty that his vote will finally help to elect one of them, for nothing can prevent the party from getting the representation to which it is entitled. The voter will then naturally take more interest in elections, and of course if the voter takes more interest in political matters he will be less amenable to corrupt influences. The reason for this was well put by a voter in the Johannesburg municipal elections when proportional representation was used there for the first time. A similar expression of opinion was given to me by voters in Winnipeg. This particular voter in Johannesburg stated that the new system of election had put him on his mettle, that he had never experienced so much pleasure in the act of voting; he had been able to use his intelligence in discriminating between the claims of the various candidates. There seems to be no doubt that once proportional representation is properly understood by the voters it will have the effect of greatly increasing their interest in elections. In the case of the Winnipeg election last year, we took pains to see that the system was understood. The result was that 76·2 per cent of all those on the voters' lists turned out and recorded their preferences for the various candidates. This, I was informed, was a record for Winnipeg.

In Sligo the first Irish city to use proportional representation, the returning officer publicly reported as follows:

"In the past, owing to lack of interest on the part of a large number of the electors, the polls were small. In the present instance, nearly 80 per cent of the total registered polled."

Earl Grey (son of the former Governor General of Canada), writes of the municipal elections of January, 1920, in Ireland as follows:

"The number of electors participating in the election was nearly 68 per cent of those on the register, a record for Ireland, and a figure rarely if ever reached in municipal elections in Great Britain."

The elections were held in 120 municipalities.

The present system of election affords no reasonable security of tenure to our elective representatives. Proportional representation on the other hand does afford reasonable security.

Mr. CURRIE: That touches a fundamental principle of our constitution.

Mr. HOOPER: We hear much to-day of the desirability of continuity of employment, and there is no doubt that a man becomes more skilled at his work or profession when he has had a few years of experience. This, of course, is true in the political sphere also. If a man has for some years devoted his time and energy to public life, and if in his parliamentary career he has proved himself sincere and trustworthy, he ought to have some reasonable assurance of remaining in public life, provided of course that he desires to do so. Under such conditions he could pursue his political career more firmly; he could concentrate upon it; he could do better work than if he were liable to be dismissed from public life at any moment, and to be dismissed, not by the bulk of his supporters, but by a handful of electors whose sudden and perhaps ill-advised change of opinion overnight might determine the result of an election in a single-member constituency. Under the present system members of the highest distinction and capacity find it increasingly difficult to re-enter political life. Victory at the polls depends not so much upon the services which a statesman, however eminent, may have rendered to his country, as upon the ability of his party to maintain its electoral majority in the particular constituency in which he happens to run. Under the present system many of the world's finest statesmen have been compelled to spend more than half their political lives outside of Parliament altogether. May I give you a historic instance of this. When Mr. John Morley (now Lord Morley) during the election campaign of 1895 received a deputation of socialists, he, with his characteristic frankness, explained to them the ground on which he could not support their claim for an eight-hour day. Lord Morley was a Liberal but the eight-hour day was a pretty radical proposition in those days. The socialists withdrew their support from him and to punish him voted for the Conservative candidate. Mr. Morley lost his seat and the British Parliament was deprived for many years of one of the finest intellects of the time. A similar honesty on his part cost him his seat in 1906. In a multi-member constituency the thousands who wanted Mr. Morley as their representative could have elected him, and the socialists would have been quite powerless to prevent it. Political history is full of instances where men who ought to have been in Parliament have been cut off at a time when their matured judgment on political questions would have been of the greatest value to their country. There are some interesting Canadian examples of this. At the last Ontario Provincial elections Sir William Hearst, the former Premier, was defeated in his constituency. All fair-minded Liberals and farmers will agree that Sir William Hearst ought to be in the legislature to-day. The same with respect to Sir Adam Beck. The Federal Parliament in 1911 lost the services of the late Hon. Sydney Fisher—

Mr. MANION: I personally would like to hear Mr. Hooper explain the mode of election under the system which he has described.

(Mr. Hooper here pointed to a couple of charts, and by means of them illustrated the working of the system.)

Mr. MOLLOY: You said something in your remarks about representing a number of acres; say in the West we bulk four or five counties together, the first difficulty we would find would be that it would be impossible for a candidate to go over all the ground.

Mr. HOOPER: He would not need to.

Mr. MOLLOY: My experience is that he has.

Mr. HOOPER: Shall I develop this point. For a simple illustration let us suppose that the city of Winnipeg is divided into ten single member constituencies and that there are exactly one hundred voters in each constituency. Under the present system

to get elected it is essential that a voter shall poll fifty-one votes out of this one hundred votes in one corner of the city. Under proportional representation these constituencies would all be grouped together as one constituency with one thousand voters in it. To get elected it would only be necessary for a candidate to poll ninety-one votes out of one thousand in the whole city. Which is the easier to poll, fifty-one votes of one hundred or to poll ninety-one out of one thousand? I leave it to you. To show that the expense is in all probability reduced, I will quote from evidence that was prepared in connection with the Speaker's Electoral Reform Conference in Great Britain, which says, "Wherever proportional representation has been tried the poorer parties have nearly always been the first to demand proportional representation, and after they have obtained it, to press for its extension. The Labour party pressed for proportional representation in such a wealthy city as Johannesburg. At its first entry into the municipal field the expenses of the three Labour candidates and of the Labour organization amounted to £52 8s. 6p. They polled two quotas of votes and they therefore obtained two members. The very large sums spent by their opponents could not prevent Labour obtaining its proportionate share of representation, one member for each quota."

Mr. MANION: Take Toronto, which is a closely populated centre: say Colonel Currie is a candidate and I am another in a group of five or six people to be elected together. Suppose Colonel Currie has a million dollars and I haven't any and we are running on the same platform. Suppose he is rich and I am poor; it makes the electorate to be appealed to much larger and the appeal more expensive. Mr. Currie can spend a vast amount of money in advertising personally and sending out circulars which will reach a large number that I cannot afford to expend money to reach in that way. Is not that a disadvantage which will arise under proportional representation? It has always appeared so to me.

Mr. HOOPER: The practice adopted in Winnipeg was for the parties to make up a slate. The Liberal-Conservative candidates opposed to the Norris government got out this card containing in alphabetical order the names of all the parties' candidates, and on the back of it the voters are asked to mark the figure 1 against the candidate on that slate that he preferred, to mark the figure 2 against the second choice and so on. The expenses were grouped in this particular manner and so were very much reduced for every candidate. The Manitoba Free Press mentioned that many thousands of dollars had been saved to candidates in this manner.

Mr. CURRIE: In England it was suggested that each candidate put up a large sum of money before his name could appear on the ballot. Otherwise everybody in the place would have his name on the list.

Mr. HOOPER: It was mentioned in the Royal Commission's Report that the amount should be limited.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, to £750. How many of us could put up that much money?

Mr. HOOPER: The election expenses are limited.

Mr. CURRIE: It is not a question of election expenses; it is a deposit that any candidate has to put up before his name appears on the ballot.

Mr. HOOPER: In Winnipeg each candidate has to put up $200.

Mr. MOLLOY: Has proportional representation tended to form groups in parliaments?

Mr. HOOPER: That is a very long question which I cannot go into at this moment.

Mr. MOLLOY: I have heard it said that proportional representation is the last word in favour of the agitators. If it tends to make groups in parliament I am opposed to it. I believe it is fair, but if it tends to the making of groups we have enough now and do not want any more.

Mr. HOOPER: That is a very long question. I have my answer to that question prepared at some length, and the purport of it is to show that it will not have that effect.

Mr. CURRIE: The gentleman said he wanted every party and group represented.

Mr. HOOPER: All phases of political opinion.

Mr. CURRIE: That makes for the formation of a number of parties. It has proved so in Belgium.

Mr. HOOPER: On this point I will give one striking quotation from the speech delivered in London by M. Georges Lorand, the leader of the Radical party in the Belgian parliament:—

"It has been stated," he says, "that proportional representation would lead to the splitting of parties but it has had the opposite effect; parties, far from splitting into fragments, have brought their ranks closer together; but within those ranks they have found room for such diversity of opinion as may exist, nay, as is essential within any living and active political force." Monsieur Lorand spoke from experience. The Liberal party in Belgium, which before the introduction of proportional representation had been divided into Moderates and Radicals, and which had been nearly excluded from parliament under a majority system, at once united its groups, and in the very first parliament elected under proportional representation, took a strong position in both Houses. The split vote had no terrors for them under proportional representation.

The CHAIRMAN: What are the main objections to grouping rural constituencies?

Mr. HOOPER: The main difficulty appears to some persons to be the extent of the ground that the candidates have to cover, but, as I have pointed out, it is not necessary for him to cover, or even attempt to cover, all the ground. I can see, however, that there might be a practical difficulty in getting all the ballot boxes together in a short time. They must be all brought together before the ballots can be counted.

Mr. MOLLOY: It might cause some difficulty of that kind?

Mr. HOOPER: Yes. The whole state of Tasmania is about the size of New Brunswick and is divided into six constituencies, one of which is about the size of half of New Brunswick. They have no difficulty there in counting the ballots though it takes a week to get the result of an election.

Mr. MOLLOY: How about counting the votes?

Mr. HOOPER: That, of course, is a process that requires considerable care.

Mr. MOLLOY: Would you not have trained officers to do that?

Mr. HOOPER: You would need about three trained men.

Mr. CURRIE: I notice a pamphlet from Milton Hersey, copies of which have been sent to all the members here. It is written by a Mr. Mullen. I suppose you know Mr. Mullen?

Mr. HOOPER: I have had correspondence with him; I do not know him personally.

Mr. CURRIE: This is issued at the instance of your body in Montreal.

Mr. HOOPER: No, we have no body in Montreal.

Mr. CURRIE: It is so stated here. Paragraph 57 reads as follows:—

> 57. The "Red" and "White" Terrors: The "Red Terror" is always preceded by a "white Terror" and, if the "red terror" temporarily fails, as in Poland, Siberia, Hungary, Germany and elsewhere, it is invariably followed by a reign of "white terror," which makes the "red terror" look just like pink by comparison. The "red" Russians under Lenine and Trotzky were so far outdistanced by the "white" Poles under Mannerheim that it makes the former pair look like a pair of Sunday School teachers.

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]

He goes on again, paragraph 58—

"We want neither Terrorism: If we do not want the "red" then the voice of wisdom dictates, even if conscience does not, that we avoid introducing the "white." The "reds" are already pointing out that in their opinion the "white terror" is already quite advanced in the United States and Canada, especially the former; and, sad to relate, they have some facts with which to support their contention. The persecution of the "reds" had already gone so far that such reputable organs of Conservatism as the *New York Times, Tribune* and *World*, and others, are crying out in alarm."

By Mr. Currie:

Q. You have read that pamphlet?—A. I have seen it.

Q. Do you approve of that kind of stuff?—A. I do not quite get the sense of it.

Q. Perhaps you will get the sense of this. This is paragraph 80. (Reads) "There are dangerous times ahead of us." This is a warning to us.

"There are dangerous times ahead of us. Something is happening in the world which very few people understand, and great changes seem to lie directly in our path. What these are to be, and where they will lead, probably no one of us can even guess; but all of us who are really democrats want these changes, whatever they may be, to be accomplished peaceably by force of argument and not force of arms. We have had enough of bloodshed; besides, there is never a way of telling whose blood will flow."

Do you approve of that sort of stuff?—A. I do not see that this man's opinion has anything to do with me at all.

Q. This man is associated with your organization, and has published this; it is published by the *Municipal Journal*. It has an article in favour of proportional representation, one of the strongest arguments in favour of it. All along you have been pointing out to us that by this system of proportional representation every class of thought would be represented.—A. Provided it can poll a quota of votes.

Q. And you pointed out that under the present system the party that was in the minority might be elected.—A. It is possible they might be returned to power, yes.

Q. Do you think it fair to put forward that argument where the district is gerrymandered. The majority rules. They gerrymandered the city of Toronto so that they got all the votes, and do you think it fair to blame that on the present system?—A. Of course, men are sometimes tempted to do dishonest things, but the present system of election puts a premium on gerrymandering.

Q. What difference would it make if instead of taking the whole district we made three proportional representation districts in Toronto, and you got three of them overwhelmingly Conservative or Liberal. You would get your gerrymandering just the same?—A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. Who was in charge of the election at Winnipeg?—A. The returning officer was Mr. Monkman and the assistant supervisors on the proportional representation end were Mr. C. C. Ferguson, General Manager of the Great West Life Assurance Company, Professor McLean of Manitoba University, and Mr. Parker, editor of *Canadian Finance*.

By Mr. Currie:

Q. Who puts up the money for your propaganda?—A. Anybody who is interested. If you are sufficiently interested you could contribute $1.

Q. You are carrying on a very expensive propaganda.—A. Some give $5, some $10. Our treasury is nearly empty now.

The Committee adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SUBJECT OF

Proportional Representation

AND THE SUBJECT OF THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE
OR PREFERENTIAL VOTE

No. 2.

21824—1

Library of Parliament
CANADA
JUNE JUIN 21 1972
Bibliothèque du Parlement

The Committee met at eleven o'clock, a.m.

Present:—Messrs. Sexsmith, Chairman, Blair, Calder, Crowe, Davidson, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Thomson (Qu'Appelle), and Whidden.

The minutes of the previous meeting were taken as read and confirmed.

The Clerk informed the Committee that the Provincial Secretaries of the Provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick had, as requested, sent the required official record of votes cast in the elections of the above provinces held during 1900 and since that date.

Mr. Ronald H. Hooper, who was in attendance, resumed his address.

On motion of Mr. Manion, it was
Ordered, that Mr. Hooper attend the next meeting of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Harold, it was
Ordered, that a sub-committee composed of Messrs. Calder, Molloy, McMaster, Sexsmith (Chairman), and the mover be appointed to select witnesses to be called before the Committee.

The Committee adjourned to the call of the chair.

Chairman.

FRIDAY, April 22, 1921.

The Committee met at eleven a.m., Mr. Sexsmith, Chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I think we have a quorum present, and so we will proceed with the business of the morning.

The CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE: I have, in reply to inquiries sent out, at the suggestion of Mr. Calder, received communications from the Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick, and the Ontario Government, enclosing the election returns for the two provinces.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the Committee in regard to these communications?

Mr. CALDER: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the returns from these two provinces should be handed over to the committee which is preparing for us the series of statistics.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. You mean the sub-committee which was appointed at the first meeting?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

The Clerk of the Committee:

I may say the Deputy Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick in reply to the letter addressed him states that the information asked for can be obtained in the Journals of the New Brunswick Legislature, copies of which are in the Parliamentary library, but as there are no Journals for 1920 he encloses copies of returns of election for that year.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have Mr. Hooper with us again this morning, to continue his address and I think, if the Committee is prepared to go on with this discussion, that we will be glad to hear further from Mr. Hooper at this time.

RONALD HOOPER, recalled.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Hooper, will you resume your address you commenced at the last sitting? —A. I think, gentlemen, it might be well for me to briefly run over the statements in regard to Proportional Representation, which have already been given, showing how they work out, and in doing so, I will try to answer the question which was brought up at the last meeting in regard to gerrymandering. It had been suggested that the anomalies of the present system were due to gerrymandering of the constituency and not to the single member of the constituency itself.

This (indicating) is an illustration of an area as it existed in Australia some few years ago. It was an Industrial centre of Australia in which were grouped twenty thousand voters in the centre section, and on the outskirts were thirty thousand non-labour voters. This area was entitled to have five members to represent it. This would suggest this at once to our minds, that if fifty thousand voters are entitled to elect five members, ten thousand voters should be entitled, if they think alike, to elect one. But they have the single-number constituency system in Australia, and not Proportional Representation.

In dividing up that area, therefore, into five single number constituencies, it could be done in this way; they could "hire" the labour in one constituency and then distribute the remainder of the labour voters in such a manner as to be in the minority in the other four, but as a matter of fact, what they did was this: They divided the area into five segments in such a manner that labour was in the minority in every one, and the result was disastrous to those who did it, because at the next general election labour gained a little additional support in every constituency, and won every one of the seats. If proportional representation had been in force in Australa they would have polled this as one large electoral area, electing five members and if fifty thousand voters are entitled to elect five, it is reasonable to presume that ten thousand, combined, all were of one mind, should be entitled to elect one.

I will show you by these charts how these groups of ten thousand voters would be formed. The names of the candidates are marked on the ballot paper in alphabetical order. In the case of the Winnipeg Election they adopted the practise of putting the names in party colours. I do not know whether that is a good thing or not. The voter marks on the ballot they figure one against his first choice, they figure two against the second choice, the figure three against his third choice, and so on. The ballots will all be assembled at the central counting station—no, the first choices for each candidate can be counted at the various polling stations, and then the ballots are all assembled at the central counting station, and the returning officer would ascertain in that Mr. Asquith had been marked first choice on fifteen ballots, and Mr. Branbury on five, and Mr. Lord Robert Cecil had ten of the total number of ballots cast with the clearly distinguishable figure one opposite the name of the candidate. There were one hundred and fifteen valid ballots cast. Now, we are going to elect five members—so one hundred and fifteen—

Mr. CALDER: Explain why you divided that one hundred and fifteen by six? That is to get a quota?

The WITNESS: You divide the total number of ballots by one more.

By Mr. Crowe:

Q. Why one more?

A. First of all there is a mathametical reason but it would take some time to explain that. The simpler explanation is this. If you are going to elect one candidate you would not expect him to poll one hundred per cent of the votes. If he polled a fraction more than one half, he would be elected, or if you were going to elect two candidates if any one candidate polled a fraction more than one-third, or if you were

going to elect three candidates if any one polled a fraction more than one-fourth, and so on,—that is the way it works out. In this particular example the quota is the lowest number that five candidates, but not six candidates, can get. Five times twenty is one hundred and that goes into the one hundred and fifteen.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. You get the quota by dividing the number of votes cast by the number of the electors.—A. No, one more.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. Will you give us that mathematical explanation, if it is not too long?—A. I am afraid it is too long, but the argument is this. It is possible if you use the direct quota as they call it—if you divide it by five instead of six, it would be possible—supposing the two parties were evenly balanced,—for the minority, by very careful management, to elect a majority of the representatives.

By the Chairman:

Q. That is just to divide by the actual number of members?—A. Yes. It is then possible that when the two parties are evenly balanced for the minority to get the odd seats. I have a memorandum prepared on that subject and I will send each member of the committee a copy.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. I wish you would give that mathematical explanation, because I think the members would be interested. I do not understand that now, and I would like to see it worked out. Perhaps you could prepare a memorandum on that and supply a sufficient number of copies so that we each could have one.—A. Yes.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. I think I understand this, but I am not dead sure. Supposing you are electing one member out of two, a little more than one-half then would do it, but if you were electing two, it would take a little more than one-third, and you have gone on up to five. Will you follow that up a little bit?—A. If you are electing three it would take a little more than one-quarter, and if electing four, a little more than one-fifth, and if electing five a little more than one-sixth and so on. I will prepare a memorandum on that quota.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Let me ask one other question here. Is that the quota that is usually where proportional representation is in operation?—A. Yes, that is the quota that is used in all countries where the single transferable vote system is in operation.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. You could take five instead of six that would give you twenty, and add one——A. No, five would give you twenty-three and then as I said, if the Conservative and Liberal parties had been nearly equally balanced in voting strength, it would be possible for the minority, by careful management, to get the majority of the seats.

By the Chairman:

Q. But it would be very improbable?—A. Yes, but still possible.

Then there is another point: There is another advantage in having this slightly reduced quota. It leaves a little margin for votes which later on have to be thrown out as non-transferable. That is a good practical reason for it.

Q. Then, having ascertained the quota, the number of votes necessary to secure election. We find that Bonar Law has fifty ballots. He only needed twenty; so he has thirty more than he needed. If the election stopped there these ballots would be wasted to the Conservative party, and thrown away, so we transfer the surplus in a mathematical manner in order to do strict justice to all the candidates marked second choice. We do it in this way. First of all we will note the number of surplus votes of Bonar Law. He has thirty more than he needed, and the number of transferable votes he has is fifty——

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Each one that he has first choice on—has he the right to second choice too, when he is over the quota?—A. The fraction to be transferred is three-fifths, that is you have to transfer thirty out of fifty.

Q. Just one moment. Take Bonar Law. He got fifty first choice; he only required twenty first choice to be elected, consequently thirty of his first choices are taken away from him and distributed amongst the candidates of his party?—A. As indicated on the ballots themselves.

Q. As indicated on the ballots?—A. Yes, and the way in which you select which thirty are to be transferred is shown on this sheet.

Q. Is it not thirty of his first choice?—A. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON: They are all first choice.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Let us understand this thing. Bonar Law has fifty first choice. He only requires twenty first choices to be elected. Do you take his thirty first choice and distribute those amongst the candidates of his party?—A. Yes, you take thirty of the fifty.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysborough):

Q. As indicated on the ballot?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. If there are thirty of his first choice and you distribute them as indicated on the ballot—how can they be indicated on the ballot?—A. By second choice.

By the Chairman:

Q. You give them to the voters second choice of the same party.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. Are you not assuming there are fifty second choices also?—A. Yes, I am assuming that each of these ballots were first choice for Bonar Law, and second choice for somebody else.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. It is not thirty of his first choices?—A. No.

Q. But if on thirty of these ballots the second choice is for a candidate of the same Party, then you distribute the second choice as indicated?—A. Exactly. Supposing you had a bundle of fifty ballots in front of you from which to take thirty to distribute. It is conceivable that the second choices or the thirty you take would be different from the twenty that you retained. In order to overcome that and do justice to all we adopt this manner of transferring. The fraction to be transferred is three-fifths. We find that Branbury was marked second choice on ten, Cecil on fifteen, and Chamberlain on twenty-five. To Branbury, we transferred of those ballots

on which he was second choice, three-fifths, leaving two-fifths to make up Bonar Law's quota, and then we transferred three-fifths to Cecil, leaving two-fifths, and Chamberlain three-fifths, leaving two-fifths.

By the Chairman:

Q. In other words, you transferred the number one ballots to the number two choice that is indicated by the voter to every candidate?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. If Mr. Chamberlain was the second choice on all those thirty that you took away from Bonar Law you would have to give them to Chamberlain?—A. Yes, but on Bonar Law's fifty ballots Chamberlain was marked second choice on twenty-five, so he gets one-half of the surplus. To show how accurate the system is Chamberlain was marked second choice on one-half of the ballots, therefore he gets one-half the surplus, which is the right proportion he should get. Then pointing to chart we transferred these figures six, nine and fifteen. As a result of that transfer it gives Chamberlain a quota, so Chamberlain is declared elected. Now we have only two elected——

By Mr. Manion:

Q. Before you go any farther supposing, as Mr. Sinclair suggested, fifty second choices had been for Chamberlain, there would be thirty of those—supposing they had all been marked for Chamberlain?—A. Yes.

Q. He only needs a few?—A. Yes.

Q. What would you do then?—A. First of all you would give them all to Chamberlain. That would give Chamberlain what we call a secondary surplus, and we would transfer them in the same way that we did the others.

Q. You would go on and finish with the ballots?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Before we get any farther with this. Bonar Law got fifty ballots first choice. Now those who gave him this fifty first choice may have spread their second choice over that whole list. You are going to select twenty of those and set them aside for Bonar Law?—A. Yes.

Q. What are you going to select? Are you going to select out of the thirty who gave their second choice to the other Conservative candidates?—A. No, we would take the whole fifty ballots and resort them into bundles, according to the second choice, and as we have to transfer three-fifths of the whole fifty we would transfer three-fifths of the ballots from each of these bundles to the particular candidate for which they were marked, and put the other two-fifths back to make the quota.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. And have the twenty ballots for Bonar Law?—A. Yes. This whole system is explained fully in a pamphlet which I sent to each of the members of the Committee, but perhaps you have overlooked it.

We have only elected two, while we desire to elect five. Now we have no more surpluses to be distributed. The next step is to elimate the candidate at the bottom of the poll, the one who has the least amount of support, in this case it is Harcourt. We take Harcourt's four ballots and re-examine them to see who were marked the second choice. We find that Lloyd George was marked second choice, on one and Asquith on three, so we simply give these ballots to them. The result is we still have no further candidate elected.

We now drop Snowden and re-examine the Snowden ballots and find that the second choice was marked for McDonald. There is an interesting point in connection

with those two. Snowden and McDonald are two labour leaders in Great Britain, but different in policy, one is an extreme socialist, and the other is not. Now, the Labour Party in this election only had strength enough to elect one candidate; but owing to the transferable votes system they were able to run the leaders of the two sections, knowing perfectly well if the labour voters marked their first choice for one and their second choice for the other, in whichever order they pleased, the votes would pile up for the candidate desired, so this was an election within an election; it not only determined that labour shall have only the one seat to which it was entitled, but it determines which of the labour men shall hold that seat. It removed the bogey of the split vote which is always present in the single member constituency system. There was an example of that in a recent by-election where split-votes came in and had a very bad effect. Pardon me, I am not a politician, I was speaking from my point of view. I do not know whether it was bad politically or not.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. You are speaking of a theoretical election?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. What candidate shall be regarded as being eliminated?—A. Those who have the lowest number of ballots. The candidate who has the lowest number of ballots to his credit shall be the one eliminated.

Q. It is possible under your system to have no first choice at all and still be elected?—A. It would be possible, provided he gots ballots as the result of the transfer of a surplus. You do not start to eliminate until you get rid of all your surpluses.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. If Chamberlain had no first choices but got all the second choices he would be elected?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Denis:

Q. Take the case of this kind. Supposing the Prime Minister was running with another prominent member. The voters would all vote for the Prime Minister first and then give second choice to that particular member. In that way both would be elected?—A. Yes. If you stopped the election at the first stage the Prime Minister would be elected, and there would be thousands of votes wasted on him which would be of no use.

As a result we now have three elected. We then drop the next lowest Lloyd George. We re-examine all of Lloyd George's ballots and we find that Asquith was marked next choice on six, and that two of them had no next choice marked. The returning officer had no instructions what to do with these ballots so he puts them into the non-transferable. That illustrates the disadvantage arising by plumping. That question was asked at the last sitting as to whether a voter gained any advantage for his favourite candidate by plumping. He gains no advantage because the ballots will not go to second choice until it is found that it cannot possibly help the first choice, so that by plumping the voter only runs the risk of disfranchising himself.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Coming back to Bonar Law. He gets fifty first choice, and if there were twenty of those ballots upon which no second choice was made, then all that you would have to distribute would be ten—if there were twenty out of the thirty?—A. No, that twenty would be retained to make up the quota, and transfer all the remaining thirty.

Q. You would take twenty ballots upon which there was only one vote, and that for Bonar Law?—A. Yes.

Q. And distribute the others?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Denis:

Q. Mr. Hooper, did you ever think of having all these rules written down in a concrete form. Do you know what I mean?—A. Yes.

Q. For instance, the questions that have been asked, taking each case separately, and then giving the definitions for each case?—A. A Bill was drafted in Great Britain giving it in minute detail, with a very clear explanation of exactly how it works, I have had several copies of it, one of which I have given to the Parliamentary Library which gives it in very great detail. There is also the Manitoba Election Act.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. Supposing Bonar Law had fifty plump votes? What becomes of the thirty surplus?—A. The returning officer would have to throw the thirty into the discard because he would have no instructions on the matter.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. If out of the fifty ballots he had twenty plumpers those twenty plumpers would be set aside as his quota, and he would be elected on those plumpers; the other thirty ballots upon which a second choice had been made by the electors would be distributed as you say?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. You say you sorted all the ballots in a group and took three-fifths of each group in order to ascertain which men have the ballots of which twenty are plumpers.

Mr. CALDER: That is one group?

Mr. DAVIDSON: All the second ballots are in proportion.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Take Bonar Law, then five are Banbury seconds, three are Cecils and three are Chamberlains. You put them all together?—A. Yes.

Q. What would you do with the plumpers where there are no second at all?—A. That fraction on the chart would be based on the assumption—

Q. I don't care about assumptions. Take the thirty plumpers on which there is no second choice?—A. If there were thirty plumpers this fraction would be changed. The fraction would be thirty over twenty.

Q. You have an absolute rule?—A. Oh, yes, the absolute rule is the fraction to be transferred, taken off of these respective bundles. It is the surplus divided by the number of transferable ballots.

By a Member:

Q. There are fifty ballots? It requires twenty to elect Bonar Law?—A. Yes.

Q. Then what do you do with the remaining thirty?—A. In that case there will be thirty transferable ballots.

Q. How are you going to say there are thirty transferable ballots when out of fifty there are twenty—

Mr. DAVIDSON: He only needs twenty to elect.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this Committee, but I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN: All right.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. You said a while ago that you took your fifty ballots and if there were fifty for Bonar Law there are thirty transferable. The basis is that you piled these ballots of Bonar Law's into groups?—A. Yes.

Q. If Chamberlain has ten there are ten in that lot?—A. Yes.

Q. And if Lloyd George has twenty, there are twenty in that lot, and so on, and there are twenty ballots in the whole fifty without any second choice in your various piles. Where do you put these twenty ballots?—A. They will be retained as the quota of Bonar Law.

Q. You don't retain these in the quota? What you retain are twenty out of fifty, but in the distribution of those votes into piles where do you place the twenty? —A. You would sort them into a bundle for non-transferable ballots. As you were sorting the ballots you would find one was a bundle of plumper ballots, which you would catch in the sorting.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. If there were twenty-four in that first bundle, four of them would be non-transferable?—A. Yes, and you transfer the other ballots to the other second choice.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. On that basis you would have an extra pile, the name of each candidate for second choice plus a pile without any second choice at all?

Mr. CALDER: What is that question?

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. Supposing there were six candidates, and each of the six candidates had a second choice, then you have one without any second choice. That would make seven bundles?—A. Yes.

Q. When you arrive at that stage how do you distribute them?—A. The non-transferable are retained to help make up the quota and then transferred from each of the other bundles a proportion to the second choice, and you arrive at that by dividing the surplus by the number of transferable ballots.

May I suggest that perhaps a study of that pamphlet will make it clear. It is much easier to read it and to get it by studying the pamphlet.

Mr. MANION: I think I understand Mr Tweedie absolutely In the first place he tells us there were fifty second choice—the man had fifty first choice and fifty second choice, but he only needs twenty first choice, so that out of the fifty second choice he can transfer only thirty. He has thirty second choice transferred, because there were fifty votes and there are only twenty needed, so that he can transfer only thirty of those so he has available for transfer in proportion as thirty is to fifty, but in the case you mention where there are only thirty he has thirty to transfer anyhow, therefore he transfers them all.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Is it possible for an overwhelming majority of one party to elect their five members?—A. Yes. But it could only be in this case, if the party controlled at least ninety-one per cent of the votes. In fact to elect all five members the party would have to practically control the votes of the constituency.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Let me ask one further question. Just what is meant by that next line?—A. Transferable votes? ?

Q. As a matter of fact you do not transfer fifty votes?—A. No, but they are capable of transfer. In this case, you see the whole fifty were marked with a second choice, therefore they are all capable of transfer.

By the Chairman:

Q. What in other words, if twenty of these were marked second choice, they would be retained and the others transferred?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Malloy:

Q. Take that labour candidate McDonald, he has thirteen and Snowden seven, but in the second choice some of these Snowden votes are not marked at all—then McDonald would not be elected?—A. He would not have twenty. He might possibly be elected owing to other votes he might get from other parties.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. You say he might get it from other parties?—A. Yes. If people voting for Lloyd George would say: "If my ballot cannot help the Liberal party, which would I prefer, the Conservative or the Labour?" and they might mark their next choice for the labour candidate, and in that case he might be elected.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. On the second choice some of them would elect——A. If the labour vote is not sufficiently strong to make a first and second choice for both, yes.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysborough):

Q. Has each man a third, fourth and fifth choice?—A. Yes, each voter can mark as many preferences as he chooses—as many as there are names on the ballots.

The result of the election is that the Liberals polled twenty-five votes and elected one member, the Conservatives polled seventy and elected three, and the Labour party polled twenty and elected one, which is as nearly an accurate proportion as we could expect on such a small number of ballots.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. Have you a chart that does not work out quite so accurately. If you have one that is not quite so accurate, I think it might explain away a lot of difficulties?—A. I have the returns of the Winnipeg Provincial election here, but it is rather a formidable looking document.

Q. I think another point in very good, and that is the putting of the ballots in the boxes. I think the Winnipeg explanation was very fine?—A. Yes. I do not know that I can make the point much clearer from this just now.

By Mr. Denis:

Q. If the votes don't split even they are simply fractions?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Have you ever figured it on the actual basis of votes cast in defferent Dominion elections how much of a majority the different parties would have, providing it was done on a proportional basis?—A. There are two outstanding examples of that in the Federal election. In the Federal election of 1908 the Liberal party throughout Canada—these figures were obtained from the resume of general elections prepared by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—the Liberal party, in the Federal election of 1908 polled five hundred and ninety-four thousand odd votes, and obtained one hundred and thirty-five seats; the Conservatives polled five hundred and fifty-two thousand votes and obtained eighty seats.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Supposing the vote had been on a proportional basis?—A. Under the present system the Liberals had a majority of forty-nine, but if the vote had been on a proportional basis, if the whole country was polled as one constituency, the Liberals would have got one hundred and fourteen seats and the Conservatives would have got only one hundred and seven, which would have reduced the majority to seven.

In the Federal election of 1911 the Conservative party polled six hundred and sixty-nine thousand odd votes and elected one hundred and thirty-four members; the Liberals polled six hundred and twenty-five thousand odd votes and elected eighty-seven members. That gave the Conservatives a majority of forty-seven seats. If proportional representation had been in force throughout the whole country the Conservatives would have obtained only one hundred and fifteen seats, and the Liberals would have obtained one hundred and six, a majority of nine.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. In 1908, out of the total vote polled, there were other labour candidates?

The CHAIRMAN: Not many; I think about six thousand votes.

The WITNESS: Yes, there were twenty-eight thousand odd other votes polled in the election.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. The distribution of those votes under proportional representation would make the figures altogether different from what you gave?—A. There is only twenty-eight thousand, as contrasted with over a million. We will assume it gave the Independents one seat.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Twenty-eight thousand would elect one.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. Twenty-eight thousand is a great number because a lot of people who voted Liberal might have marked their second choice Labour?—A. It is not right to take actually the vote polled at an election because the conditions will be different under a proportional representation election.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. But you see that where in this country the parties are evenly divided it would be impossible to carry on, owing to the fact that the majority would be so small?—A. That opens up a big question. I am prepared to deal with that, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. Crowe:

Q. There on the chart you have fourteen votes for first choice for Asquith and ten for Cecil, and five for Chamberlain, and those three men are elected. None of the second choice of these men are ever used again?—A. No.

Q. Why mark so many if you do not use the second choice at ll?—A. The voter while he is in the voting booth does not know that; he does not know that Chamberlain might have a surplus, or that Chamberlain might be dropped and that his ballot might fall to the second choice. It so happened in this case that the second choice is not used, but the voter does not know that and he prepares for eventualities.

By the Chairman:

Q. In the case of a by-election like West Peterborough how would you adopt this system where only one candidate is to be elected but there are four or five running?

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Do you think it would be practicable to have a system of this kind in our country where an election takes place whenever the Government loses the support of a majority of members in the House, or is this not something which would have to be fixed where there is a definite and fixed electoral term?—A. I don't see that. I have laid out my case on that question of group Government, because it is a very fundamental point, and if the Committee desires I will give my argument on that.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. There is one thing I would like to add along the line of Mr. Davidson's question. Would you, as one in favour of proportional representation, recommend this to be adopted in the whole country all at once?—A. In Tasmania they use it, and the whole State of Tasmania is as big as New Brunswick. They divided the whole State of Tasmania into six constituencies, three of the constituencies were urban therefore they had one rural constituency as large as one-half of the province of New Brunswick and they have had no trouble in using it there.

Q. But take Northern Ontario for example. We have in Northern Ontario six constituencies, and they are as big as all the rest of Ontario?—A. Even as an advocate of proportional representation I am reasonable on that point. I think it would be inadvisable to do that. Six or eight constituencies would make very little difference in the whole House.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysborough):

Q. Does that not open a road for gerrymandering in constituencies?—A. No. That area (indicating chart) has to be divided into five constituencies under the present system, and it can be done in either of these ways, and I have shown here how Labour with twenty thousand votes could elect two, and (non-Labour) with thirty thousand votes could elect three. It is true you might change the boundary line and cut off part of these voters, but you are merely weakening the quota there and adding to the quota in the next constituency.

Q. But you might "hire" them in one consituency?—A. It would not matter; in that case they would get one hundred per cent of the representations in that constituency.

Mr. HAROLD: I would like to bring up a question now which seems to me to be a dangerous condition in connection with proportional representation. There is one question which the Committee will have to sit upon and decide, and that is with regard to the single member constituency. Mr. Hooper has admitted, and I think everybody will agree that we are going to have a large number of single member constituencies for a long time in this country, and we have to decide now if under the present political conditions we have got to have a second choice transferable vote or a preferential vote, or whatever you call it, in these constituencies, and I would like to submit here the figures in the last Provincial election in Ontario, where the United Farmers had 256,874 votes and elected forty-five members; the Conservatives had 386,795 votes and elected twenty-five; the Liberals had 336,715 and elected twenty-nine; in other words, the United Farmers who had less than either of the others polled nearly as much as the other two——

A MEMBER: You mean elected?

Mr. HAROLD: Elected. That was accomplished through the three-cornered contest, and the way to overcome that would be that the electors would have the privilege of marking their ballots number one and number two, and if the number one choices when counted did not give a man fifty per cent of the votes and one over the low man would have to be dropped off, and his ballots according to how the elector marked them, would be added to the other candidates. If there were four or five candidates everyone would be dropped off from the bottom after each count until there were only two left, and then the one who had the most votes would be elected. In other words, the one who represented the sentiments of the majority of that constituency would be elected their representative.

Now we are going to have many three-cornered contests. In many cases there may be four or five candidates, and that is a question we should decide here as to whether we would recommend that any change be made from the present system. Now there are some objections to it, that it might have the result of eliminating one of the political parties. That happened in Germany at one time. They have a second choice

there, or a second election. It also happened in France. In 1907 the Social Democrats in ninety constituencies, on the first ballot were at the head of the poll in forty-four, but on the second ballot they only succeeded in retaining that position in eleven. That had the effect that the Social Democratic party were practically wiped out, and that frequently happens in cases where they have the second choice. That is one objection to it.

On the other hand, there is much to be said in favour of it that the electors, if they really desire to do it, have the right to do it. The majority of the people decide. That is really something that I consider a practical question which needs consideration by this Committee, and while Mr. Hooper, a man who has given considerable study to this question, is here I think it would be advisable to have him express his opinion on that so that we may know what the advocates of proportional representation think about the question.

The WITNESS: The system of the alternative vote, or the preferential ballot as it is sometimes called—but let us use the term "alternative vote" as that is used in the legislation in other countries—works in practically the same way as this, except that you only have to elect one. If more than two are running for a seat and no candidate has a majority of the votes polled, then instead of declaring elected the one who has a plurality of votes, we would drop the lowest candidate and the second choices on his ballots would be considered, and if as a result of that no candidate had a majority of the total votes, we would drop the next lowest, until finally one candidate would have a majority of the total votes.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. Would it be a fair thing to go on dropping the candidates?—A. It might not be necessary——

Q. There might be four candidates, and if you dropped the fourth man off that might favour another candidate, and if you dropped off the third man that might change the result entirely?—A. If a candidate has a majority he is bound to be elected.

Q. For instance, there may be a Labour man at the bottom. You drop him off. His votes may favour a certain candidate. The next man may be a farmer candidate, his second choice may reverse the conditions entirely. Therefore, it is only fair, in order to get the sentiments of the constituency that every man who runs other than the two who remain at the last should be dropped off and the votes applied to those that the majority have?—A. But when one candidate obtains the majority of the first votes, or transferred votes, the election is automatically at an end.

However, the disadvantages of the system have been apparent in countries where it was tried. It was tried in certain States of Australia and the British Royal Commission on electoral systems report was rather against it, but they said it was better than the single member constituency system; it was better to have that than to have no change at all. The alternative vote would only keep us from swinging farther into the mire of inaccuracies. It would only ensure that the candidate with the majority in every constituency would be elected, and a lot of anomalies have occurred when the majority has been represented, so it would only prevent us from being worse misrepresented than we are at the present time.

Then there is this disadvantage from the point of view of the candidate himself. Supposing a Liberal candidate polled five thousand votes, and a Conservative candidate polled four thousand, and a Labour candidate polled three thousand. Neither of them have a majority. Then the Labour man would be eliminated and either the Conservative candidate or the Liberal candidate would be elected as the Labour supporters reluctantly might decide.

Now, the member holds his seat by virtue of the Labour support, and he would be, as Russell Lowell put it "a prisoner of the minority."

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]

Now, as an advocate of proportional representation I see two advantages in its favour. If we are not fortunate enough to have proportional representation adopted, I think it would be a good thing to have alternative votes. The voter would mark his ballot one, two or three exactly as under proportional representation, so that it would make it easier——

By Mr. Harold:

Q. Pardon me. He would mark it one and two.—A. He might; it would make no matter.

Q. If it didn't matter why bother with the third choice?—A. It makes no difference if there are only three candidates.

Q. Then why complicate it——

By Mr. Calder:

Q. If five candidates were running and only two choices—would it not be better to have four choices?—A. I would make it as free as possible.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. You said it made no difference. Then why complicate it?—A. I did not mean it made no difference in that way. I meant it made no difference in restricting the voter to two choice when three were running.

Q. I don't suppose anybody will object to discussing Peterborough. There were five candidates there and one to be elected. Can you take that as a particular instance? —A. Yes. I do not know the figures of Peterborough.

Q. It does not make any difference about the figures; make some yourself.—A. I got the impression that there was a Conservative and an Independent Conservative running, and I got the impression that if the alternative vote had been in effect in Peterborough the second choice of the Independent Conservative candidate would have gone to the Conservative.

Q. But there is a point there to be remembered; that the Independent Conservative and the Conservative were among the first three. You would have dropped the farmer, who was the lowest, or the Labour,—there might have been somebody elected before you reached the second choice.—A. In the case of Peterborough they would have been eliminated until they came to the Independent Conservative—I think sufficient ballots would have gone to the Conservative to have him elected.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysborough):

Q. When you say you dropped the lowest do you mean that you would apply the ballot to a candidate whom the voter did not name?—A. Oh, no.

Q. No man gets a ballot unless he is named by the voter?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Tweedie:

Q. I suppose the idea is to ascertain the wish of the greatest number of people in the constituency?—A. Yes.

Q. Now you take any open convention, the same as they had here in connection with the Liberal party, and you have several candidates in the field, no one of whom, on the first ballot, received a majority. Now, we have a Liberal, a Conservative, a Farmer and a Labour candidate, with the Labour candidate at the bottom; their first choice is all Liberal; secondly, they are all Conservative, but the farmers have a number three or four times as great. Their first choice is Farmer, their second choice is Liberal. Now, if we had an open vote right at the convention, and nobody was elected on the first, the Labourers might turn up and vote with the Conservatives, and make them all first votes for the Conservatives, and the Farmers might stand up and vote with the Liberals, and make them all first votes for the Liberals, and the Liberal would be elected?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Whichever was in the majority.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Yes. They are all first votes in that case. Now, you cannot accomplish that result with the alternative votes because the men who file the alternative votes have no opportunity of using their first votes.

Mr. HAROLD: Certainly; it is working the same way.

Mr. TWEEDIE: No, it does not work out the same way, because some people who think they might be giving up their first choice, might want to switch to the other in their second.

The CHAIRMAN: But they do not give up their first choice, until their first choice is eliminated.

The WITNESS: When a voter marks his first choice, or his second choice, or his third choice, that is his instructions to the Returning Officer, just as if he said, "If my first choice candidate has more support than, here it is; if he needs to secure his election, or if he has so little support that he has no chance of election—"

Mr. THOMPSON: You are getting back to the proportional representation again.

The CHAIRMAN: He is answering Mr. Tweedie's question.

The WITNESS: The marking on the ballot is as if the voter gives his instructions to the Returning Officer by saying, "If my first choice of a candidate needs my support, here it is, or if he has so little support as to stand no chance of election, then, in order that my vote may not be wasted, transfer it to my second choice, and if he does not need it—if my second choice does not need my support, or if it cannot help him, if he is elected without it, or defeated with it, then transfer it again to my third choice."

Mr. HAROLD: Mr. Hopper is continuing on the assumption that there are a number of candidates to be elected, instead of only one.

Where there is only one candidate to be elected there is no need of transferring the vote from first to second, or from second to third, of course.

Here is the way it worked out with regard to Peterborough. If my memory serves me right, the Conservative Union candidate came second, I believe, and then there was the straight conservative—as he calls himself—and the Farmer and the Labour. Now, each one of these electors would mark their ballots "Number 1," and "Number 2," but the "Number 1," ballots would not give any one a majority of the votes. Now, the one approved way, as I understand this, is that you would start at the bottom and drop off the Labour candidate, and allot those ballots as these electors desired them to be alloted, to the other candidates. Thus it might make a change in the way they were running. This might leave the next man, either an independent Conservative or he might have been a Farmer. Then you drop the last man again, and you add his ballots to the remaining ones, as the electors desired. That might make another change; then you drop the last man again, and you allot those ballots to the ones remaining, until you only have two left, and the one who then holds the majority is the elected representative. I don't think there is anything very doubtful about that, or anything very difficult to understand, and it is something that we ought to know about.

The WITNESS: I am frank to say that I misunderstood the question, but, if there were five men running for one seat, there is a distinct advantage in marking four preferences for that reason.

Mr. CROWE: Why take the case here where the second choice was never used?—A. Supposing you marked your first choice for a candidate who was fifth on the list: he would be dropped, and your second choice was for the candidate fourth on the list. He would also be dropped. If you had a third choice, your ballot would go to him. That is the advantage of marking your several preferences. Otherwise, your vote would be wasted.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is wise to mark three or four candidates.

By Mr. Crowe:

Q. But why the second choice, as it has never been used at all?—A. It is used here, in this case the second choice on some of those ballots might have been marked for Harcourt, but Harcourt is out, so the ballots would then go to the third choices marked on them.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. Let me ask this question here: Is not the second choice exactly as if you did this: You had an election like at Peterboro, where you had five men, with Mr. Gordon heading the list, then we will eliminate the last man, and that will give you another election, so that the next time they voted first again, then there will be three left, and then another election and there will only be two left, and the highest man left will then be declared elected?—A. It is like the second ballot—like they did in France, but the disadvantage of having a second election is the dickering that takes place between the elections, and by doing it this way, it avoids all of this dickering.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. I think there is a misunderstanding between allowing two choices and more choices. Now for a start, does Mr. Hooper think it better for the simplicity of the thing to have merely a second choice? It strikes me in having three or four choices it is complicating the matter somewhat, and that there might be some way of accomplishing the desired result with a great deal more simplicity?—A. No, I think you should allow as many preferences as there are candidates named on the ballot. Let us suppose, for example, that these (indicating) are the candidates in a single member constituency. This is the order in which they stand (indicating) on the first count: Asquith had more than any other. I have marked my ballot—my first choice was Snowden, my second choice was McDonald, and we will say my third for Bonar Law. Snowden is dropped and then my ballot goes to McDonald. Then he is dropped, and my ballot goes to this third choice, Bonar Law, but if I had stopped at my second choice, my ballot is gone.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. I was trying to confine myself to the single constituency.

WITNESS: I am speaking of that.

Mr. CALDER: Where there is only one to be elected?

WITNESS: Yes, where there is only one to be elected, you should allow the voter to mark as many preferences as there are candidates.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. There is another question which I would like to ask your opinion of on that. We are all trying to learn something about this, and you can give us more information, because you have given it more consideration than the rest of us. We have talked about the single constituency. In your opinion, knowing Canada as you do, and the conditions of Canada as you know them, do you think it would be a better plan for us to have certain groups formed in such a way as to be considered fair for all parties. to try out this question of group constituencies and allow the single constituency with a transferable vote to the other?—A. I think that would be a good plan. I think it would be perhaps a difficult matter to introduce proportional representation throughout all of Canada at one time. It was done in Ireland. The elections were held in 120 municipalities in one day—the first election ever held, but Ireland is a small country, and travelling around Ireland is easy. I think it would be a mistake to try to introduce proportional representation wholesale throughout Canada at once, and I do not

deny that the process of counting ballots is fairly complicated; you need a competent returning officer, and you need two or three trained men. I think you will have fewer election appeals under this system, if you have trained men, than under the old system, but it would not be advisable to try it out all at once throughout the country. If it would be arranged that it could be tried in a few grouped constituencies, so that it would hurt no party—as in the Ontario elections—the system would have a thorough try-out; then in the other constituencies where more than two candidates are running, the alternative vote might be used.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysboro):

Q. What objection is there to trying it out in rural communities?—A. The objection usually advanced is that the candidate would find it difficult to get around the whole of his constituency; it would be so large. I do not admit that because, as I tried to show last week, it is not necessary for the candidates to get around a whole constituency. Then, another objection is the time it would take to collect all the ballots at a central counting station, and it might take two or three days before the result of the election was ascertained. These are the general arguments against it, but against that, I have already cited the case of Tasmania where they have a constituency one-half the size of New Brunswick.

By the Chairman:

Q. The two objections are then the delay in getting over the constituency——? A. They are not mine, but are the objections generally advanced.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. It would require so many trained officials to start that all at once. Is that an objection?—A. Yes, it would cost the Government a good deal of money to train the returning officers to do this work all at once. Some people have raised an objection to proportional representation because of the number of men required to count the ballots and work this out. The case of Winnipeg, where we had thirty men working, has been cited as an example, but in Winnipeg we were doing the counting for ten single member constituencies.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. What staff had you?—A. The counting was completed in three days, and we had an average staff of thirty. We had fifty the first day, and it dwindled down to twenty. It took us forty actual working hours to count 48,000 odd ballots.

Q. In single constituencies it would be done in ten constituencies by ten returning officers in less than one day?—A. Yes.

Q. So the expense over the whole Dominion would be very large?—A. You might probably have had a recount for one thing, whereas no recount has ever been asked for under this system.

Q. What is the possibility of error in this system?—A. There is a very slight possibility of error. An error might be made during any of these stages (indicating chart), but it would be caught when you come to balance up at the end of each step taken. In the case of the Winnipeg election—and this is on record as the newpapers make something of it—in transferring some surplus ballots there were two ballots went astray, and we could not find them, and we were about to enter them as non-transferable, but we did not do that and half an hour later these two ballots turned up.

Q. You had a staff of trained men?—A. No, the only training was the little training which I was able to give them. The law provided for the appointment of three supervisors, and they were very competent men.

Q. I wonder how many of the members of this Committee would like to take charge of that after two days' discussion?—A. We had two rehearsals of the counting

on a small scale with a small number of ballots, and there was no difficulty. The experience has been in Ireland and Tasmania that people were glad to volunteer their services for the counting. It is interesting and people feel that the whole election is clean and fine and fair, and they have had no difficulty in the countries where it is adopted in getting people to volunteer their services; students in universities, engineers, law clerks. They had the pick of the best students at the universities and at the engineering schools and of the law students.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. That might be all right for cities such as Winnipeg—A. In Winnipeg we required thirty men for the whole work, but we had 41 candidates and 48,000 ballots. In a constituency in the smaller places, probably you would have three to be elected and perhaps six or seven running, and the work would be tremendously reduced.

Q. Coming back to the point raised by Mr. Harold—I would like to have this quite clear—in a constituency we will say there were four candidates running, A, B, C, and D, under the alternative voting system. He suggested that there should be only a second choice. Your objection to the second choice is that an elector might vote for C and D—D is last of the four and he is dropped. C, after the transfer of D's votes, is next lowest, and he also is dropped, and consequently that voter's vote is gone?—A. Exactly, that is the objection.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. Mr. Chairman, that is a point which has been raised where a man happens to make a choice for two candidates who happen to be at the bottom, and his vote does not count any farther. It seems to me it should not, because his choice happened to have fallen upon two men who have not met with public favour and who therefore could not very well represent the riding—I would say if he failed to accomplish his desire up to that point, it should be quite proper that his ballot be dropped.

The CHAIRMAN: Supposing there were four or five candidates, such as at Peterboro. What is the objection to allowing the voter to indicate his choice for each one? You get the actual expression of every elector.

Mr. CALDER: And no man loses his vote.

The CHAIRMAN: No man loses his vote.

Mr. HAROLD: It is more complicated.

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Hooper says it adds no complications, so why not have the three or four?

The CHAIRMAN: It perhaps does not add to the complication; it might increase the eliminations—you may have more eliminations, but you have a proper expression of the people.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Did I understand you to say, Mr. Hooper, that you thought it might be well to try this out in portions of Canada and not in other portions of the country? For the purposes of the trial would it not be grossly unfair? Let me give you an illustration. Take a case like this. We will say that at the next election the issue is between protection and free trade. We will say that the city of Montreal is very strongly in favour of protection and there is a minority who favour free trade. Now, we will take the province of Saskatchewan, which is strongly in favour of free trade, but, of course, with a minority in favour of protection. You apply your proportional representation to the city of Montreal, and it means that there will be certain protectionists elected, but the minority will also be represented there; In Saskatchewan, you allow the old system to prevail, and that means all the seats will go to the free-traders with none or

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]

very few protectionists?—A. I would try to balance that. Supposing it was used in Montreal, and as a result of proportional representation in Montreal, there is a minority of free-traders—I am not very familiar with the political map of Canada—perhaps it would work the other way in the city of Winnipeg.

Q. Supposing the cities would be against the towns on the same issues?—A. To balance that, you might perhaps take a few fairly thickly populated rural districts to balance the one urban district.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. You approve of it being tried in group constituencies? Could it be overcome in this way? Take certain groups of certain cities, which are supposed to be supporters of the Government, such as Toronto, and then take another group in Quebec where they are supposed to be strongly liberal—then, if you like,—of course Saskatchewan is a long way off, but we will have to assume that free-trade is going to play a part—it will carry rural Ontario, and then you might take some portions of Ontario and take a group in Toronto and in Quebec—if you did that, would you have the thing fairly dealt with, and no part discriminated against?

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Theoretically that sounds very nice, but who will select those groups?

Mr. THOMPSON: I will.

Mr. CALDER: I imagine you will have a nice time in Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not see why. The Committee of the House——

Mr. CALDER: You are dealing with one province and we are dealing with the entire Dominion. There is a point raised by Mr. Davidson that I think is well worthy of consideration. The suggestion is this: that you arrange for proportional representation in the cities, then you are giving the people of those cities the right to elect candidates according to their opinion, and I think we might assume the result would be that you would have from all our cities in Canada, under the group system, three or four or five types, whereas we must not assume that all the people in the country have only one opinion. They have a difference of opinion on political questions just as the people have in the cities, and it seems to me it would be unfair to provide a system whereby the minority in the cities would get representatives, while the minority in the country would not get representatives.

Mr. THOMPSON: They would, according to the plan suggested in Ontario.

Mr. CALDER: I am speaking as if it were decided to try it out; that you adopt proportional representation in particular toward urban communities. That would not be offset by simply trying out this system in a few groups in the rural parts, unless you applied it to the whole of Canada.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not suggest necessarily applying it in all cities.

Mr. CALDER: For example, if you applied for Toronto, why not for Halifax, and if you applied in Halifax, why not for Quebec?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am making the suggestion that it is fair for all parts.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Thompson's suggestion is this: You say you would provide three constituencies to try it out in. If these constituencies could be obtained there might be a different party in the majority in each, for instance, you would have one constituency in the city, and you might have the others in other places, whereas if you were in a position to judge what these people would do, so far as the policies of the different parties were concerned, it might have some effect upon the result. I believe the only way you would be guided would be by what happened in the past election, and have it arranged so it would be satisfactory to the different parties.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. Let us say you adopt the group system in the city of Montreal, and you are entitled to sixteen representatives in that city. Would it be well to have them all in one group, or divided into two?—A. I think it would be advisable to divide it into two groups.

By Mr. Manion:

Q. Is it not a fact that a great many people will go to the polls and they will look the ballot over and pick on a candidate and they will say: "I know that man, I will mark him first, and I know Mr. So-and-so, I will mark him second, but So-and-so—I do not know any of these other people at all"—is it not a fact that they will mark their ballots for the people whom they know rather than for a lot of people indiscriminately?

The CHAIRMAN: What difference would it make? A couple of electors went into the City Hall at Toronto to cast their vote, and one man said: "I do not know any of these candidates, and I do not know how to vote," and the other man said: "I know them all, yet I am in the same position as you are"; the man who knew them all did not want to vote, so he was in the same position as the man who did not know any of the candidates.

Mr. MANION: But the man who knew them all had a slight advantage.

The CHAIRMAN: That might work out in a municipal election.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysboro):

Q. What do you say of the difficulty of a man making himself known and becoming acquainted with a whole group of constituencies, where the people vote for him and trust him, and where they do not know the man—and it is impossible for them all to know him—is that not one of the difficulties of the district?—A. I illustrated that last week. I took an imaginary case of a city like Winnipeg and I imagined that Winnipeg was divided into ten single member constituencies, with 100 voters in each constituency. To be elected a candidate would have to poll 51 votes out of 100 in one corner of Winnipeg. Under proportional representation, the city would be one large constituency, electing ten members, and there would be 1,000 voters in the constituency. To be elected, a candidate would have to poll 91 votes out of 1,000. It seems to me it would be easier to poll 91 votes out of 1,000 than to poll 51 out of 100, particularly if the candidate were at all known who has had parliamentary experience, and is a man who is known throughout the district.

By Mr. Sinclair (Guysboro):

They have had the same experience in Ireland. It was officially reported that in Winnipeg, there was a great deal of interest taken in the election—more interest than had ever been taken in a provincial election. The percentage of voters on the voters' list which turned out was 76.2 which was very much higher than in any previous election, and of that 76.2 per cent the percentage of spoiled ballots was 1.72, less than it had been in any previous election under the ordinary system.

They have had the same experience in Ireland . It was officially reported that in the municipal elections held throughout Ireland—all on the same day—the percentage of spoiled ballots for the whole of Ireland was slightly less than 3 per cent; in the urban districts, it was very much less than that, but in the rural districts where education was not so far advanced the percentage was raised.

By Mr. Calder:

Q. I think you will concede that this system of holding an election lends itself to the group system in Parliament?

Mr. THOMPSON: He says that authorities show it works the other way.

WITNESS: If you will pardon me—I am not a forensic speaker at all, and I would like to refer to my notes on that point, because it is undoubtedly a fundamental point.

It is suggested that proportional representation will lead to the formation of groups in Parliament, as distinct from the two main parties. It is said that in Great Britain they have two parties, the Government and the Opposition, that was an argument advanced by a gentleman who was giving evidence in Toronto, that the single member constituency system preserved the two parties in Great Britain. They had two parties, the Government and the Opposition he said, but he forgot to mention that the government of Great Britain is composed of a coalition of four parties, and the Opposition is also composed of a coalition of four parties, and various independents as well. The Parliament of Great Britain is split up, but the Conservative element got together and the Radical element got together and formed two main channels of opinion. The group system in France was mentioned last week as an example of what we might expect under proportional representation, but France has used the single member constituency system since 1889, and it is under the single member constituency system that the groups in France have grown up. I do not think it is entirely due to that, but the fact remains that the groups grew up. In 1919, the Government introduced proportional representation into France——

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Covering the whole of France?—A. Covering the whole of France. They may have left a few little places out.

Having in mind the experience of Belgium, where proportional representation has been in effect for a number of years, they introduced proportional representation into France, and it reduced the number of groups, and stabilized the parties. Unfortunately the system introduced was a compromise and gave poor results, and the result is that now a strong effort is being made to introduce a proper system of proportional representation into France.

Proportional Representation was introduced into Belgium in 1900. They have three parties in Belgium, the Catholics, the Liberals and the Socialists. They have another party, with one representative, the Christian Democrats.

I have here the opinion of Professor Seymour and Professor Frary, two professors of Yale University, who have gone thoroughly into election matters, and they have this to say:—

> "Proportional Representation has not increased the number of small parties, as was feared before its adoption. The three great parties continue to poll the largest part of the votes. Public interest in politics has been enlivened by reviving vigorous and effective party activity, and preventing the tyranny of the majority. Most salutary of all the effects of proportional representation has been the closing of the rift which was rapidly widening between the Walloons and the Flemish, when the Catholics and the Socialists were left face to face with no mediators after the introduction of universal suffrage. Its desirability is no longer open to serious question. The leaders of all the chief parties and the bulk of the voters seek, not to abolish proportional representation, but to make it more perfect."
>
> This that I have just read is found in the book entitled "How the World Votes."

By Mr. Manion:

Q. You absolutely contradict yourself when you say it does not increase grouping because you say one of the advantages is that it gives all minorities representation?—A. No.

Q. There are on this chart (indicating) how many different parts—red, blue and black?—A. Yes.

Q. According to this election you would have had Asquith elected and Banbury elected and then Macdonald elected, but by running these two together (indicating Macdonald and Snowden) you get this proportional representation—only by running this very small vote together do you get these (indicating) elected. In other words, one of the boasts is that it gives a minority of seven a chance to elect a man, so how could you claim it does not increase grouping?—A. May I hold your question over for a time?

Q. Surely?—A. Mr. J. Fischer Williams, C.B.E., a prominent student of the subject, who gave great assistance to the Royal Commission on Electoral Ssytems, has given the following—

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. Is it not a fact that there have been several changes of Government in Belgium?—A. No, the same government has been in power in Belgium ever since proportional representation was introduced, although on occasion the government majority was only six.

Mr. Williams in his book entitled "The Reform of Political Representation," says:—

> "Belgian experience is against the theory and, indeed, points rather to a consolidation of groups into parties under proportional representation. The three great Belgian parties—Catholic, Liberal, and Socialist,—seem to have strengthened themselves under proportional representation rather than disintegrated."

Then, a little further on, he goes on to say:—

> "From Sweden, Finland, and the Swiss proportionalist cantons we have no evidence that the party system as in force at the introduction of proportional representation has been destroyed by it"

By Mr. Calder:

Q. Just there, Mr. Hooper: They have proportional representation—take these Western European countries, Sweden, Switzerland,—Norway?—A. I am not sure about Norway.

Q. In Belgium?—A. Yes, and Holland.

Q. In those countries they have the same constitution as we have so far as their Parliaments are concerned? In other words, if the government is defeated in the House does it mean an election?—A. In Belgium under the constitution of 1893, article 71, "The King has the right to dissolve the chambers, either simultaneously or separately."

Q. That would not happen unless the government in Belgium were defeated by a vote of the House?—A. The King has the right to dissolve the Chambers either simultaneously or separately. He is just as likely to exercise that right in this country as in Belgium.

Q. Take the United States Congress: It does not make the slightest difference in regard to grouping. Congress is elected for four years and they sit there regardless of what takes place. You could have a hundred groups and it would not make any difference. Under our constitution you have four or five or six different groups, and they shift about, and when the government is defeated it practically means an election in every case.—A. The same thing could happen in Belgium.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. But not in France?—A. In France, Article 5 of the Constitution of 1875 says: "The President of the Republic may with the advice of the Senate dissolve the Chamber of Deputies before the legal expiration of its term." I grant you it has not been done.

Mr. HAROLD: While Mr. Hooper is on Belgium, I want to put something in here with regard to this second transferable vote. In Belgium they tried to solve their difficulty in having a non-representative parliament by introducing the second transferable vote, but it was a failure.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: By the "second transferable vote" do you mean what Mr. Hooper has called the "alternative vote"?

Mr. HAROLD: Yes. In Belgium the effect of the second ballot was to deprive the Liberal party of their fair share of representatives. In 1896 owing to the coalition of the Socialists and Catholics at the polls, the Liberals had only eleven representatives in the popular Chamber. All their leaders had been driven from Parliament, their electoral associations had become completely disorganized save in some large towns, and in many constituencies they had ceased to take part in elections.

"Yet the results of the very first elections, in 1900, after the establishment of proportional representation showed that the Liberals were the second largest party in the states, and that it was a party which still responded to the needs and still gave voice to the views of a large number of citizens."

I bring that in in all fairness because I brought up this question of the transferable vote in single member constituencies, and it only shows the necessity of taking the greatest care.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case did they only have a second choice?

Mr. HAROLD: It would have worked out exactly the same because any two parties might happen to be in the humour to throw their opinions against a third party. Those were the conditions, and they could easily take place if that sentiment should prevail at a certain time, and I recognize that as a great danger.

WITNESS: I think by the system you outline that is not impossible, the system of the Second Ballot, as they use it in Belgium. Where there were three candidates, they would hold an election and none of the candidates would have a majority so they would hold a second election three weeks later, and the last candidate was dropped. Then there were dickerings between the elections between the party dropped and the other two remaining.

Now to resume the argument: I have cited Continental Europe as an example of stabilized government under proportional representation. The same happened in Tasmania. There they have the Anti-Labour Party—they go by Labour and Anti-Labour Parties—which has been in power ever since proportional representation has been adopted, and they have had a small majority for the last five elections.

In the province of Manitoba at the present time there are four groups, and various independents, so that we have groups in Canada, and to say that we do not want grouping does not help much. We are facing a condition and not a theory.

By Mr. Thompson:

Q. We don't say you cannot have groups, but what we said was that it tends to grouping.—A. The experience in Winnipeg would show that the Government of Manitoba would have been in a stronger position if they had had an alternative vote in the rural districts. I have a letter from a prominent official on this point, and it shows that if they had used the alternative vote the Government would have had six more seats than they did, and that is probably the reason why John Queen is opposed to the introduction of the alternative vote. He probably thinks that the bridge that carried the Labour Party into Parliament is good enough for them.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, our time is getting on——

WITNESS: May I just finish one other point? I have given you the English and American opinions, now let me give you the Belgian. Monsieur Georges Lorand, who was for many years the leader of the Radical Party in the Belgian Chamber of Representatives, stated publicly in London as follows:—

> "It has been stated that proportional representation would lead to the splitting of parties, but it has had the opposite effect; parties, far from splitting into fragments have brought their ranks closer together; but within those ranks they have found room for such diversity of opinion as may exist, nay, as is essential within any living and active political force."

He speaks from the experience of his own party which had been split into two sections, the Moderates and the Radicals. They had split the party vote in their elections and had weak representation in the House. When proportional representation was introduced, he said, they united their groups, and in the very first Parliament elected under proportional representation, took a strong position in both Houses.

I say it will unite groups into parties, because the parties can afford to have broader platforms; they are not limited to one candidate. They can run a number of candidates who agree on the fundamentals of the party but who differ on other important questions which are not strongly party questions, but which may some day become so.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. You have already illustrated that, where McDonald and Snowden headed two groups within the party, one of the two was eliminated. On the other hand, take the Liberal Party represented by Asquith, Lloyd George and Harcourt; Harcourt may have headed a wing of the Liberal Party, but he only got four votes——A. I think that is hardly a fair assumption to say that Harcourt, with only four votes headed the wing of the party. If the wing was very weak, as that would indicate, then it is fair to say it should not be represented.

By Mr. Molloy:

Q. Had you been an elector in Peterborough, with five candidates running, how many would you have preferred? What would you have advised somebody else to do? —A. Understanding, to some extent, the system as I do I would have marked preferences for all but one of the candidates. I would not have bothered to mark the last, because it was not necessary, and for this reason—supposing I was a Conservative—I would mark my first choice for the Conservative candidate, and in the event of his being defeated I would mark my second choice for the Independent Conservative. There are no more Conservatives. Which do I prefer between the Liberals, Farmers, and Labour? I would say: "If I stop here neither of my Conservatives may be elected, but I will keep to myself the right to say whether it shall be Labour or Liberal or Farmer," and I would mark my choice in the order that I would prefer them.

Q. If there were three running you would vote for two——A. You could mark the three if you wanted to.

The CHAIRMAN: It is one o'clock gentlemen, and if you are through with Mr. Hooper we will adjourn. I think we have had a very interesting discussion this morning.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: There is a gentleman from whom I have heard who says he is opposed to proportional representation, and he says he would like to be heard.

The CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE: This gentleman says:—

> "We note that a Parliamentary Committee has been selected to look into the questions of proportional representation. We have been following up this question for some considerable length of time, and the more we go into it the more we become opposed to any such system. It is now being debated by the British House of Commons for the third time, and last week the Bill introducing proportional representation was defeated by a greater majority than

ever. If our House of Commons is really serious in regard to this question we wish to have the privilege of presenting our objections to any introduction of proportional representation.

Yours truly,

THE BRITISH REPRESENTATION LEAGUE,

(Sgd.) J. R. McNichol."

Mr. CALDER: Do you know this gentleman?

WITNESS: I crossed swords with him in Toronto, and his argument and mine in answer are in this little report of the Ontario Parliamentary Committee (indicating).

Mr. MANION: I move we give this gentleman an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. CROWE: I second the motion.

Carried.

WITNESS: I might suggest that you ask Mr. John Queen of Winnipeg to give his views.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That might be a good idea.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should have some representatives here from Winnipeg on both sides of the question. They have had the actual experience out there.

WITNESS: May I make a suggestion to the Committee? Perhaps the gentleman who could give you the most information is the Attorney-General of Manitoba, if you can get him. He put the Bill through and understands it thoroughly. He asked me to go out and help in the preparation of the Bill, which I did, and he could give you the most authoritative information.

If you cannot get him I would suggest that you get Major McLean, a Professor of the University of Manitoba, who assisted in the supervision, or Mr. C. C. Ferguson, General Manager of the Great West Life Insurance Company, who was also a supervisor, and is a clear level-headed impartial man. Another man would be the editor of "Canadian Finance," but he is like myself, and would probably re-echo largely what I have said, and you might not be quite satisfied as to getting an impartial opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is best to communicate with these men whom we want to hear with a view of having them appear before the Committee, because we cannot arrange to have men come here from Winnipeg at a moment's notice.

Mr. HAROLD: There is a Sub-committee of this Committee which should deal with that.

The CHAIRMAN: That may be the wisest procedure.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I would suggest that Mr. Sexsmith take my place.

Mr. HAROLD: I move that a Sub-committee be appointed for the selection of witnesses.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: You had better have a Committee of about five.

Mr. MANION: Let us add the names of Mr. Harold and Mr. Davidson.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The Chairman should be on the Committee.

Mr. MANION: Certainly he is on it. I would suggest the Chairman, Mr. McMaster, Mr. Harold and Dr. Molloy. I will act on that Committee if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the Committee for the selection of witnesses?

The WITNESS: If I can be of any assistance you can always get me on the 'phone.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Mr. Crowe has been receiving numerous communications from certain municipalities in British Columbia where they have tried out proportional representation. I think he should have the privilege of filing these with the Clerk,

and he also has a large sheet showing the result of the vote in Vancouver city at the last municipal election.

The CHAIRMAN: You desire them to appear in the records, Mr. Crowe?

Mr. CROWE: No, they are of a confidential nature and I would rather not have them quoted.

Mr. HAROLD: Why not have them submitted to the Sub-committee and Mr. Crowe can take a little time to explain them?

Mr. CROWE: I would be glad to do that

The Committee adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SUBJECT OF

Proportional Representation

AND THE SUBJECT OF THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE
OR PREFERENTIAL VOTE

No. 3

22911—1

Library of Parliament
CANADA
JUNE JUIN 21 1972
Bibliothèque du Parlement

THURSDAY, May 12, 1921.

The committee met at eleven o'clock, a.m.

Present:—Messrs. Sexsmith, chairman, Blair, Crowe, Harold, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Thomson (Qu'Appelle) and Whidden.

The minutes of the previous meeting were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. John MacNicol, representing The British Representation League, who was in attendance, was heard in opposition to the application of proportional representation to elections to the House of Commons.

Mr. R. H. Hooper who was present resumed his address and requested to attend the next meeting of the committee.

On motion of Mr. Harold, it was

Ordered:—That the clerk of the committee be instructed to invite the following to attend the next meeting of the committee with a view of obtaining their views in reference to the subject under consideration, viz:—

Messrs. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress, Ottawa; J. J. Morrison, secretary, United Farmers Association, Toronto, and the president of the Great War Veterans' Association.

On motion of Mr. Crowe a vote of thanks was tendered Mr. MacNicol.

The committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

J. A. SEXSMITH,
Chairman.

EVIDENCE AND PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, May 12, 1921.

The committee met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Sexsmith, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: We have here Mr. John R. MacNicol, representing the British Representation League. We will be glad to hear him.

Mr. MACNICOL: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to be here to-day. I understand you have had one or two sittings of the committee already, I was unfortunately unable to come down the last time. I am connected with a large manufacturing establishment employing several hundreds of men, so I cannot get away just when I want to, but when your worthy secretary wired me the other day, I determined that it was necessary for me to come down. My view of government is well expressed by the poet Pope in these lines:—

> "For forms of Government let fools contest,
> Whate'er is best administered, is best."

That is the whole significance of this question which form of Government is best administered. I hope before I am through to be able to prove conclusively that the regular British system of electing members of Parliament, not only for the Federal Parliament, but for the Provincial Legislature as well, is the best, and I hope from here the agitation will go to the various provinces that have been led by propaganda into adopting Proportional Representation, and that they too will revert back to the regular stable system of electing members of Parliament. I am sorry that I am alone here. It is difficult to get men who are engaged in business and whose occupations keep them pursuing along one line or two lines, as the case may be, to come here. On the other hand people who get a fad or idea concerning something in which the public are not much interested, are not the sort of people who are interested in keeping the wheels of industry going; but I felt that it was absolutely necessary that I should give part of my time in combating this propaganda for introducing Proportional Representation. I am going to put it as strongly and vigorously as I can. We defeated the attempt to introduce it in the last session of the Ontario legislature and I will fight it harder next time any such attempt is made. I have no doubt that this Parliament, which contains the brainiest men in the different ridings throughout the Dominion of Canada, will oppose this proposed change. How did Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and other places that have this new system come to adopt it? Merely through propaganda. For instance, this morning I am pitted against Mr. Hooper, who is an employee of the Government and has plenty of time on his hands. There are too many such persons interfering with the business and administration of this country. I am a business man and employ hundreds of men, and have a great deal of private business to look after, and I find pitted against me Mr. Hooper who is an employee of the Government. To show how carefully this movement is carried on by propaganda, I will quote from the *Toronto Star* of the 26th November, a despatch from Ottawa which is headed "Ottawa delighted with P.R. proposal. Only regret is that Toronto is not included in the scheme." That is propaganda, I came here a day or two afterwards, and interviewed eight prominent gentlemen of this city. I came at my own expense and I am here to-day at my own expense, not at the expense of the Government and not taking the time for which the Government pays. In every case these eight gentlemen said "We never heard of it; we know nothing about it." So Ottawa was not delighted with the P.R. proposal as the heading of the despatch said it was. Mr. Hooper may be delighted with his active

22911—1½

propaganda. Now, public opinion has not demanded this change in our system of electing members of Parliament. The Proportional Representation Society alone have put the public to the expense of considering this matter at this busy time of the year. You gentlemen are better versed in Parliamentary affairs than I am, and will be in a position to judge whether I correctly represent public opinion here to-day. You know the rapid power of public opinion. In England it effected the repeal of the Corn Laws. That was the direct result of the pressure of public opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any reform been brought about in the world without some system which you describe as propaganda?

Mr. MACNICOL: The repeal of the Corn Laws, the passage of the Reform Bills, and the Franchise Acts were not the result of propaganda, but of the power of public opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: You call the advocacy of Proportional Representation "Propaganda," but the advocacy of these other reforms to which you have referred you call an "expression of public opinion."

Mr. MACNICOL: You must make a distinction between a change effected by public opinion, and a change sought by propaganda. These reforms to which I have referred were demanded by the great mass of the English people. I can give you an illustration of action taken by the Government of Canada, as the result of pressure of public opinion. The first I will mention is the sending of a contingent to the South African war. Public opinion demanded that Sir Wilfrid Laurier should send a contingent. Another instance is the sending of the Remedial Bill to the people, and another the sending of the Reciprocity Bill to the people. That was the result of public opinion influencing the members. I want to differentiate between propaganda carried on by people who have plenty of time to devote to the work, and public opinion such as I am representing here to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: I have the platform of the Farmers party in Ontario before me, and they include in it the adoption of the principle of Proportional Representation. You do not call that public opinion?

Mr. MACNICOL: No, I do not call it public opinion in the same sense that public opinion expressed itself in sending a contingent to the South African War or the sending of the Remedial Bill and the sending of the Reciprocity Bill to the people.

The CHAIRMAN: What brought about the public opinion that resulted in the sending of a contingent to South Africa?

Mr. MACNICOL: All the leading Liberal and Conservative papers at that time demanded that a contingent should be sent. Those great papers, the *Toronto Globe* and the *Toronto Mail* united in making the demand.

By the Chairman:

Q. You claim that the "Toronto Globe" reflects public opinion better than an institution like the Farmers Organization?—A. I do not want to get into any conflict with the Farmers Organization. I realize that there are men on this committee who would take exception to that. I want to leave politics and class out of this. I do not think this is at all a political matter. We are not carrying on this as a debate.

Q. You are supposed to give evidence and not to make a speech?—A. I am not a parliamentarian, and therefore I feel that I shall be obliged to read my statement. I maintain that public opinion is not interested in, and knows nothing about Proportional Representation, and has not demanded it. I doubt if there are, outside the members of this committee, five members in your House of Commons who could make an intelligent speech on Proportional Representation, and they represent the constituencies. Public opinion has not demanded it and your members have not made themselves conversant with it, because your constituents have not demanded it, and this in face of the fact that doctrinaires and theorists under the name of Proportional

Representation Society, or otherwise, have persistently advocated for sixty years and more what the great Gladstone called "A novel and artificial system of voting." The Proportional Representation Society has continuously and persistently attacked the fancied defects of the British system, (and there are some defects), while all the time there has not been any organized league or society to present the many serious defects of the various proportional representation systems of voting and to point to the effective virtues of the British system of voting. I do not impute any wrong intentions to the Proportional Representation Society, they are interested in propagating their ideas: what I maintain is that public opinion is not, that it takes no interest in the matter, and has permitted this to be forced on Manitoba and Vancouver. But the time has come when public opinion in Britain and Canada, through the publicity given to the subject, will be awakened, and when the real issue is understood by the people, I doubt if they will adopt this new-fangled or joke system of voting. Their claims having been unchallenged, the Proportional Representation enthusiasts have actually forced their opinions in Manitoba, Vancouver and other places in this country, but from now on the defenders of the British system of voting will not be found wanting. Public opinion is now awakened by the introduction into Canada of Proportional Representation and its immediate results—Group Government —no matter how it operates in any European country. The "Halifax Chronicle" is one of the leading papers of Nova Scotia, and in its editorial of July 7, 1920, it gives evidence of a wakened public opinion in the following words:—

> "It is earnestly hoped that the people will profoundly and patriotically consider these facts."

"It is earnestly hoped that the people will profoundly and patriotically consider these facts."

In a previous editorial on the subject the *Chronicle* had made reference to the systems enforced in some European countries, and there are the facts to which reference is made.

> "It is earnestly hoped that the people will profoundly and patriotically consider these facts in view of the efforts being made to stampede the public in the direction that has brought Manitoba in such a deplorable muddle."

You men who come from Manitoba know the muddle that Manitoba is in to-day. British responsible Government is no longer in existence there, as I will show later on. The "Chronicle" continues.

> "The group system (which is Proportional Representation in another form) on the European continent has been anything but satisfactory. They (the groups) are generally classified as they sit right, left, centre, tapering off respectively from extreme conservatism to extreme radicalism. The door would be thrown open to all sorts of dickering, compromise and corruption. A Government so formed could in the nature of things be neither stable nor trust-worthy."

Advocates of this system will no doubt tell you that in some European states there are troups, these groups, can concentrate and should carry on. They will tell you that in Belgium there are only two parties, but these two parties are subdivided into several groups, grading down from extreme Conservatism to extreme Radicalism. Now I maintain that the success of our parliamentary system of government in the British Empire has been the result of the stability of our Governments. During the late war, France had seven premiers, while England had only Lloyd George.

Mr. THOMSON: Was not Mr. Asquith in power for a time?

Mr. MACNICOL: I am only taking the time in which Lloyd George has been in power. If the British Government had been upset seven times during that period, I

do not think we would have won the war. The fact that during such a critical time there was no change of government, shows how stable it was, and its stability was one of the causes that led to the winning of the war.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have the changes of government in France been due to the existence of the group system?—A. Yes, due to the existence of groups.

Q. Is group government in France due to Proportional Representation.—A. No, the legislature of France has a Proportional Representation Bill. I am very glad to learn that they afterwards repealed it.

Q. I draw the inference from what you say that group government brought those changes about?—A. Yes.

Q. Then you acknowledge that that was brought about under the old single constituency system?—A. Are you aware of the way the French Government is carried on? Although the members of the French Parliament are not elected by Proportional Representation they are elected by a system resembling it, inasmuch as when parties are divided on the floor of the House, the groups do not always go together. That also occurs under Proportional Representation. I have an article here from the "Vancouver Sun" of January 17, 1921, which says:—

> "A Proportional Representation election is an election with the kick taken out, a non-alcoholic beverage, a christening in which the baby cannot possibly refuse to accept the name bestowed upon it. So long as an election is more uncertain than a horse race, you can get the electors worked up to a pitch of excitement, but take away the element of uncertainty and you take away the element of excitement."

Only six thousand voters out of a list of forty thousand turned out to cast their ballots in that election. I repeat that business men and the ordinary rank and file of people have not time to go to the ballot boxes and spend five to fifteen minutes selecting half a dozen names on a ballot as long as this table. They want to have their minds made up and vote accordingly. That is why so few of the Vancouver voters went to the polls. The "Ottawa Journal" of January 8, 1921 said:—

> "The League urges, not without reason, that the Legislature of Ontario should not impose Proportional Representation on Ottawa and Hamilton and the adjacent counties without the consent of the people. The people have not asked for it, many of them, it contends, know nothing about it."

The CHAIRMAN: Have not the people of Ottawa voted in favour of Proportional Representation?

Mr. MACNICOL: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Have they not voted for it for municipal elections for the city?

Mr. MACNICOL: We are discussing the principle as applied to parliamentary elections.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought we were discussing its application in all elections.

Mr. MACNICOL: The *Toronto Mail and Empire* of January 5th of 1921 said:—

> "The British system of responsible Government has been adhered to in the Mother Country from the time it became firmly established. It has been gladly accepted as a heritage by the self-governing dominions of the Empire. It is not for the mother of parliaments and the states in her family of nations to hasten to introduce from the politics of other nations changes utterly out of harmony with the British principle of responsible government. The Referendum is something of an innovation for Britain and the British Dominions.

> It is less objectionable than some other alien methods that find friends in this country, such, for example, as the Recall. These things are not of the spirit of a responsible government, nor is the idea of Proportional Representaion. We cannot have stable responsible government in a parliament that is split up into many groups. Alliances of those groups must be formed, but as these must be generally of a precarious or even of an ephemeral character, under them the people can have no reasonable security for continuity of government along any given lines of policy."

I know that the Government in the province of Ontario could have been defeated on several different occasions during the last meeting of the Legislature in Toronto, and we all know that the Government of Manitoba is now governing without the majority—that it is actually in a minority.

The CHAIRMAN: What concrete evidence have you that the Toronto Government might have been defeated a number of times last session of the legislature?

Mr. MACNICOL: I would not care to divulge it, but I know the facts. It is all very well for you to doubt what I say: you are a parliamentarian. There is no doubt whatever that in the Ontario legislature the parties are even, and the reason why the Government has not been defeated is because they did not want to have an election, and neither of the old parties wanted to take any action that would bring about that result. I am not a politician, but I know something of politics, and I have ordinary horse sense, I think. The *Toronto Mail and Empire* editorial, from which I have been quoting, continues:—

> "By multiplying and stereotyping groups, Proportional Representation would bring confusion into public affairs, make Bedlam of parliament itself and put Government at the mercy of intriguers and log-rollers. It would be a bad thing for the country. It would not be the country's affairs, but a conflict of class affairs that would become the business of parliament. Those who desire to bring about that change wish to clear the way for mastery by the group with which they are identified. But if the old parties were disintegrated and new ones pushed forward in their places, there could be no endurance for these new ones. The Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of our provinces must keep on the lines of the British system. No group, no minority, will suffer under that system. Legitimate grievances and allowable claims will always be remedied and acknowledged."

You gentlemen, I take it, are all representing ridings in Canada: do you not feel that you represent all the people in the riding that elected you? Cannot any of your constituents go and ask you to support any measure that they wish to pass through this Parliament, if they are numerous enough to do so? Under this system Toronto will probably elect twenty members to the Local House, and fifteen to the Dominion House after re-distribution. Members will be elected at large. Say you are representing a small constituency where the people know you and know that you are a good true man—or the majority believe it at all events. They know the kind of man you are, but I submit there are very few men in Toronto, with the possible exception of Tom Church, who are well enough known to represent all the people of Toronto. The Vancouver correspondent of the *Toronto Sunday World*, says on March 13th, 1921:

> "Vancouver has just got its first dose of Proportional Representation voting and has found it very much like spring medicine, nasty to take, whatever the effect of the tonic may be. It took nearly three days for a corps of experts to find out who was really elected, although the vote cast was the smallest in recent years—6,138 out of a list of 42,000. The inference is that thousands of voters thought "R.P." too involved to trouble about. It is the transferring of votes that is tedious, for the mills of proportional representation grind exceedingly

slow. The count was made on a huge blackboard at the city hall, under the direction of City Clerk McQueen, who, at the close of the performance exclaimed: "The more I look at that board, the more figures I see."

The CHAIRMAN: You resented my asking a question about the effect of proportional representation in the municipal election, yet you are giving information in that line now.

Mr. MACNICOL: Yes, but this is a case where Proportional Representation has been tested. It has not been applied in Ottawa yet, you cannot bring up a case where the system has not been in operation.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not entering into an argument, I am merely asking a question.

Mr. MACNICOL: I wish to point out that Proportional Representation is not in operation in Ottawa, and therefore I am unable to state what would happen here if it were adopted, but I have evidence as to what has happened in Vancouver. Alderman Gibbens is quoted as stating that it would be fairer and more satisfactory all round to shake the dice for seats. Alderman Woodside, who was elected as a result of the multiple counts, has already started work to have the old voting system in vogue next year. He says "The voting system was changed as the result of a plebiscite a year ago, but it would stand absolutely no chance of endorsation if the question were asked to-day." Now, I suppose I should not quote any American journals on this question. I have two in my memorandum, but I shall not read them out. You are thoroughly familiar with how this system operates. I debated this question with the member representing Ottawa in Toronto. He is a fairly intelligent man, and the effect of putting the facts squarely before the meeting was that I carried every man there excepting himself. I remember one gentleman who asked him questions, and he said it would involve too much time to make a reply, and that he had to use a blackboard to illustrate the system, and that after he was through they would know no more about it than when he started. To illustrate how Proportional Representation operates, let us take a constituency of five members or more, which is the size recommended, the intention is that a voter shall vote for five candidates of the list nominated. Experience is that in a five-member constituency from twenty to thirty candidates will stand for election. The voter must place numerals after the names of his five favourites, in the order of his preference. 1-2-3-4. The returning officer first ascertains the quota which is the minimum number of votes required to elect a candidate. The quota is found by sorting the ballots and counting the number of first preferences, and by dividing this number by the number of the candidates plus one. In a five-member constituency the devisor is six. Example: suppose there are 12,000 first preferences; six divided into 12,000 gives 2,000. He then adds one to this number, making 2,001, which number becomes the quota. He declares elected all candidates having 2,001 votes or more. Suppose candidate No. 1 received 4,002 first preferences. He has therefore a surplus of 2,001 votes. The returning officer counts these ballots again so as to divide the surplus votes according to the preferences of the voters. Suppose he finds that on these 4,002 ballots candidate No. 2 has 500 second preferences, No. 3 has 1,500 second preferences, No. 4 has 1,250 second preferences according to this percentage and gives No. 2 50 per cent of his 500, or 250, No. 3 thus gets 750, No. 4 gets 625, and No. 5 gets 376. This process continues until five candidates receive the quota. After considerable figuring and counting the ballots several times they finally decide that six are returned whether the people so decided or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Do we infer from what you say that they can deal with these ballots as they like? Can they credit any candidate with a vote otherwise than as indicated by the voter?

Mr. MACNICOL: No, but I doubt very much if Mr. Hooper can explain how it happened in Winnipeg that the Labour party received so little representation in proportion to their strength. I have not seen any explanation why when such a large

majority was given to the labour candidate, and the labour element had forty-three per cent of the vote, only four labour representatives were elected. It took a week to count the ballots, and I have no doubt that Mr. Hooper was nearly blinded before he got through. If it took only four or five days to count the ballots, it was too long a time to wait to know the result of the election.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is it not true that labour wants proportional representation?—A. I do not know. I only know that under the system when they had a majority of first preferences they were counted out.

Q. Did not the leading labour candidate get more than half the votes cast?—A. There has been no explanation forthcoming yet. If Mr. Hooper can explain and will put the explanation in writing, it will be gladly received in Winnipeg. I object to Proportional Representation because it is complicated. I do not care how you figure it, there is nothing simpler than going to the ballot box and voting for the candidate that you wish to see elected. If a majority of the votes favour a candidate, he is elected for the constituency. The party returning the largest number of supporters throughout the Dominion rules the country. The whole basis of our British institutions, so far as it relates to the election of representatives, is simplicity. Mr. Hooper knows that in the election in Winnipeg, he had to count the ballots at least thirty times, and almost a week elapsed before the result was definitely known. In one election in Tasmania it was found necessary to count the ballots more than one hundred times. I do not think British institutions would be improved by anything of that kind, I want to know as soon as the ballot box is opened and the votes are counted, who my member is, I do not want to wait a week to find out. In the late Winnipeg municipal election under Proportional Representation a large percentage of the ballots were destroyed and the people were distracted waiting for the results to be announced. In the Vancouver municipal election under Proportional Representation it required experts almost three days to announce the elected. No other system is as unintelligible and complicated or takes such a wearisome time to determine who are the victors. With the single member constituency, you gentlemen who represent rural constituencies are conversant with the leading men throughout the riding. The Proportional Representation Society wants to have the counties of Grenville, Leeds, Lanark and Carleton form one riding for the election of six members of Parliament. You know what it costs you to run an election to-day: You cannot do it for the price of a loaf of bread. In a small riding where you can possibly visit the whole constituency in a couple of days the expense is not heavy, but if the riding is to be six times as large, it cannot be done in less than six or seven days. That has been the experience elsewhere. That is a serious matter for members of the House of Commons to think of. Ask Mr. Hooper what he thinks of it: he has possibly explained the matter before, and I shall be glad if he speaks again. He is said to be an expert on the subject of Proportional Representation, but there are a dozen people in Canada who are posing as experts on the same subject. You are all as conversant as I am with the British system: there is no mistaking what it is, but every one of these experts on Proportional Representation has a different system, and in every country they say that they must have a system of their own—but they cannot adopt the system of any other. France could not adopt the Belgian system, and Belgium could not adopt the system recommended in France. The inventor of Proportional Representation, Mr. Hare, recommended that all England be one riding. In Belgium, the city of Brussels is one seat returning twenty-one members. In Manitoba, Winnipeg is one electoral division returning ten members. In Finland the ridings average ten members each. In Tasmania each riding returns six members. One municipal seat in Vancouver returns eight aldermen. Is there any uniformity? None. Mr. Hooper recommends that in Ontario there shall be six ridings, and an expert in Manitoba

that there should be ten ridings for that province. Who is going to say—Is it Mr. Hooper, or some other expert—that we are going to have the British system taken away from us?, I submit you would have to call all the experts from Dan to Beersheba, and then strike an average from the recommendations. Every expert has a different idea on the subject. The constituencies recommended are large, returning five or more members, and the voter must use at least three of his five preferences, the candidates elected to be determined as I have already outlined, the largest number of groups that can form a working majority to govern. I am very sorry that I cannot take up all the points that I wish to touch upon, but there is one which comes to my mind at this moment. Do any of you gentlemen represent a riding in which there is a city at one end. I am sure there are. Take for instance, the county of Leeds with Brockville in one end of it. If these constituencies are thrown into one area of three or four counties, and parts of county are sparsely settled, what chance would a man in that sparsely-settled section have of being elected? The city would carry all the members. I think that is a point worthy of consideration. I maintain that sparsely-settled sections of the country like Northern Ontario are entitled to representation.

By the Chairman:

Q. How would the adoption of Proportional Representation take away representation from any part of the country.—A. Take Northern Ontario: What counties would you bring together?

Q. You say they would not get representation. In what way would representation be taken from them?—A. Take as an illustration Nipissing and Algoma. In the south end of each of them you have cities, and they would get the representation.

Q. That is all supposition?—A. We have nothing to go by since the system has not been adopted yet, but you would have to have large ridings, some of them sparsely settled.

Q. It all depends?—A. All the way through under the British system keep clearly before you that one riding returns one member. There are only a few exceptions to this rule and where there are exceptions it is not good politics, and should be abandoned. The majority of the elected candidates rule the House. That system is simple. No simpler system has ever been devised. It has been the system in England from the time of Edward the First, to the present day, and has been the result of careful study. No other system devised is as intelligent or easily understood or as speedy. Proportional Representation is absolutely unintelligible to the ordinary voter and involves endless delays before the result of an election is known. Now the advocates of Proportional Representation claim that they have a very strong point in the fact that their system gives minority representation. Notwithstanding the fact that in Canada, the Parliament is usually divided into two great parties, over some national question, under the British system members feel that they are elected to represent the country's intersts as a whole. Our parliaments have always been influenced by public opinion. For example, take the case of Sir William Hearst and the Ontario Temperance Act, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the South African Contingents. In the past, races, creeds, or classes have found ready defenders in our parliaments without specially electing such representation. I know that every one of you gentlemen, no matter what your race or creed may be, will give British fair-play to all your constituents. It is not necessary under our system of government that any one should come into our Government as a class representative. I received yesterday from England a copy of the Parliamentary debates of the House of Commons, dated April 8, 1921. It is the very latest word from the House of Commons in England, I find on page 637 in the report of a speech by Lieut. Col. Hurst on the Proportional Representation Bill the following reference to the working of the system in Ireland. He said:—

"I am not a bit interested by those arguments from Ireland. We are told with great pride by advocates of Proportional Representation how wonderfully the scheme has worked on the Dublin County Council: Out of eighty members, no less than one Unionist has been returned."

Q. Do you think under the single-member constituency system the Unionists would have got any representation?—A. I have no doubt there are wards in Dublin where the Unionists are strong enough to return a representative, but under Proportional Representation in the whole county only one Unionist out of eighty candidates elected was returned. Now as to relative and absolute majorities, we hear a lot about such constituencies as East Elgin and Peterboro having three candidates. Those are very unusual cases. In the great majority of constituencies in Canada, there are only two candidates.

Q. What about British Columbia in the last provincial election? It is true that there were only two candidates in each riding?—A. I do not quite catch the significance of your question.—A. I am not familiar with the parties that ran in British Columbia.

Q. There are supposed to be two under the old system, but in British Columbia in some constituencies they had I suppose eight or ten candidates?—A. They would not have that many in Kootenay or other large constituencies.

Q. There were twenty-one in Vancouver?—A. There are six seats in Vancouver, and that gives about three for each. We have had numbers of men in this House who were returned by acclamation.

Q. In some cases the successful candidate has been opposed by two or more candidates?—A. What I claim is that the British system of small constituencies and the system of two party government eliminates race, creed or class candidates. Our constituency fights are generally between well-known men, the better known they are the more interest is taken, indeed, it takes a good fight to get the voters out, and therefore, under our system only in rare instances does the victor not receive an absolute majority. Even in three-cornered fights the victor has an absolute majority as frequently as a relative majority. The British system of small constituencies, I maintain, is a very good one. In the constituency in Toronto where I vote we know our representative personally and know him to be a good clean man. I submit the better the public and voters know their members of Parliament the better will be the men returned to represent them, and the better the men returned to parliament, the better the government will be. If you turn Toronto into one riding, it will be impossible for many people there to go to the ballot box and select the best men. It cannot be done in a single-constituency riding. Peterboro and East Elgin are cases where the victor did not receive an absolute majority, but that rarely happens. As a rule where there are three candidates, the victor has a majority and it is always so where there are only two candidates.

By Mr. McMaster:

Q. How long ago is it since a Liberal was elected for Toronto?—A. Last June.

Q. We will leave out the last election? When was a straight Liberal elected in Toronto?—A. In the election of 1911, none were returned. That was the reciprocity campaign.

Q. I ask this gentleman, who is a strong advocate of the single-seat constituency, does he think it is fair to the Liberals of Toronto, who I understand constitute two-fifths of the population, that they should have had no man to represent them for five years?—A. That is a good question. In like manner you might ask, is it fair to the Conservatives of Nova Scotia that eighteen Liberals were returned and no Conservatives?

Q. Exactly—Was it fair in either case?—A. It is fair. It is fair in this manner, where Toronto returned only Conservatives, Nova Scotia returned only Liberals, so the Liberals were represented.

Q. So the Liberals of Toronto were represented, by the members elected in Nova Scotia. That is to say, the Toronto Liberals had to look to the Nova Scotia Liberals to represent them, and the Toronto Conservatives had to represent the Conservatives in Nova Scotia—Is that your arugment?—A. You can take it that way if you wish, but the principal thing you gentlemen have to do in Ottawa is to govern Canada, and to do that you must have a majority. Do you think for a moment that the Manitoba Government, which cannot enact a Government Bill represents the people of the province? The second to last day of the session the Premier was obliged to withdraw a Government Bill because he could not get it through the House. Is that right? You must have majorities in order to govern.

By the Chairman:

Q. Did the majority not rule then in Manitoba, the other day when the Premier withdrew a Bill?—A. No.

Q. Simply because he realized that a majority of the representatives of the people were against the Bill he withdrew it, if he had had a majority he could have forced it through?—A. The best system is to have a Government introduce legislation and stand or fall by the decision of the House, not to withdraw it if it does not receive the support of the majority. What would you think of Premier Meighen if he introduced a Bill, and finding that it would not pass withdrew it—Is that British government?

By Mr. McMaster:

Q. It was done last session.—A. This is not a political question. Mr. Hooper has given us the views of some university and other professional men in favour of Proportional Representation. Now I find in the volume of parliamentary debates of the British House of Commons from which I have already quoted, the following in the speech from Mr. Burdett-Coutts, on the subject of Proportional Representation in New South Wales. He asks: "What has been the result there?" Then he continues:—

> "In the first place, the Hon. John Storey, and his party are in power in New South Wales. How? By the majority, the magnificient majority, which you are going to get by a proportional representation in this country? Not at all. He is in power on the strength of a minority of one in four of the whole electorate of New South Wales. Is that a system which you want introduced in this country?"

If that statement was not true it would have been challenged.

Q. Can you tell us how that sort of thing can be prevented?—A. No.

Q. That is only an extract from a man's speech?—A. Apparently his view was approved by a vote of 187 to 186—that is a majority of 99. Along that line I will quote the Toronto *Globe* on relative and absolute majorities. The *Globe* is a good solid paper and one I think a lot of.

The CHAIRMAN: We have all the newspapers of Canada as well as documentary evidence. We want your views and any evidence you can submit on the question.

Mr. MACNICOL: How am I going to prove the case unless I submit the argument of men that I think are abler than myself?

By Mr. Harold:

Q. We would just as soon have your views as those you have been reading to us. What has been the result of the last Ontario election? Out of 978,000 votes cast, 256,000 elected forty-five members, against 722,000 which elected fifty-four members, and forty-five members who were elected by 256,000 votes with the aid of another group are carrying on the government of the province under the present system.—A. You must admit—I admitted it earlier in my remarks—that there are anomalies under the existing system.

Q. That is what brought this before the committee?—A. I have cited the experience in New South Wales.

Q. There is a solution proposed to overcome that difficulty of minority government by having a second preference vote, and arranging so that a man who represents the riding shall have a majority to support him? What have you to say about that? —A. I will come to that later on. I will first read a word or two from an article in the *Globe* of May 9th. It is in an editorial on Manitoba and its groups.

> "The only result has been to introduce an element of instability into the administration of the province. The Government had no control over the committee machinery, and could not bring forward measures with any certainty of their adoption. It could not carry its Bill to establish preferential voting in single-member constituencies where more than two candidates are in the field—legislation which is advocated in this province by some of the leaders of the U.F.O. One evidence of the confusion of thought in the House was the proposal of the Concervative leader that the administration be converted into an Executive Council representing all groups. Such a contrivance would have put an end to the principle of ministerial responsibility and the British Cabinet system. What argument could there be for the existence of separate parties outside the House if they were combined inside the House for office-holding purposes?"

By Mr. Levi Thomson (Qu'Appelle):

Q. What is the gentleman referring to? We have no Proportional Representation in any province in Canada?—A. We have it in Winnipeg. In fact, it has put the Norris Government in the position it occupies to-day.

Q. Nothing of the sort.—A. This that I have read bears out my opinion.

Q. You did not say what it was the result of. Proportional Representation has no existence in any province in Canada, and it must be the result of the present system if any?—A. It is the result of group government.

Q. But not the result of this system?—A. They have reached this state in Manitoba, the Government cannot assume the responsibility for anything they bring in, and they have Proportional Representation for the election of ten of their members. That is about one-fourth of the whole. I think it is a very good sample of what you may expect under Proportional Representation.

Q. I understand your argument is that Proportional Representation will result in the formation of groups.—A. Yes.

Q. But you admit that we can have unstable Government without Proportional Representation—A. Not as often.

Q. But we have had it?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Under the present system, we have minority Government in three Provinces? —A. Mr. Hooper is recognized here as one expert on the subject of the Proportional Representation; Mr. Good is another. Mr. W. C. Good, I take it, is at expert as Mr. Hooper, and he says, in advocating Proportional Representation:—

> "We may have groups which are not occupational, as, for example, free traders, prohibitionists, or socialists. And there again we may have groups which are more or less occupational in their basis, such as the U.F.O. Why not let our citizens organize on whatever system they like? We cannot have democracy unless we are free to utter our own thoughts, be they wise or foolish: and if a number of electors should desire to organize so as to secure legislation, requiring the editor of the "Globe" to wear a frock coat and a silk hat three feet high, the "Globe" ought to give them every facility to find political expression."

Q. Can you prove your case from existing instances where Proportional Representation has been adopted, that it results in unstable Government?—A. Yes, in every case.

Q. Why not confine yourself to that? To my mind, that is the most important point made, and if you can prove it, I would consider that you make a case?—A. This brings to my mind a very important point. You are putting Mr. Meighen's governing of Canada by Proportional Representation against other countries where it is said to be in operation. In no country in which it is in operation is there any parallel case to Canada. In Belgium there are two races, in Tasmania there is no immigration and they are all one race of people. In Sweden they are all Swedes, in Wurtemberg they are all Germans. There is not any other country where there is such an immense immigration as you will find in Canada and our work is to make these people who are coming into the country good Canadians.

Q. If we allow Proportional Representation to come into operation, what would be the result?—A. In the Northwest different groups would send their representatives to Parliament. In Saskatchewan would not the Germans return members of their own race? They would have the privilege of doing so. You know the percentage of foreigners in Saskatchewan, and my remarks apply to every part of Canada. Immigrants in the past, coming to Canada had to look to one or the other of two parties, the Liberals or the Conservatives, and they were Canadianized. But if you allow these immigrants to line up under heterogeneous groups they would not become Canadianized. One of the first principles of this Government should be to make all these immigrants Canadians.

Q. Would you object to a German community in Saskatchewan having a representative from their own people?—A. Not by any means. They are good citizens. I taught amongst them at one time, and I know what they are. What I would object to is, having them run a slate in Manitoba. As Mr. W. C. Good of Paris says, it will result in occupational representation, and he asks why should not carpenters, blacksmiths or working men in any particular trade, if they are in sufficient numbers, return members to Parliament to represent them as a class. Now, I do not think we should have classes represented in Parliament. Canada is too big for that. The members elected to Parliament should represent all the people. If Mr. Good is correct as to what Proportional Representation would do in Canada, I maintain that it would lead to the establishment of Soviets and occupational groups. Our British tradition has been government by the people as a whole and not as groups. There are six groups in the Belgian Parliament, five in the Wurtemberg, and numerous groups in the other foreign Proportional Representation Parliaments. In the Belfast Municipal Council elected by the Proportional Representation system there are six groups, the Nationalists, Sinn-Feiners, Unionist, Labour and two others.

Mr. HOOPER: There are five.

Mr. MACNICOL: Five is just as good for my argument. I contend that Proportional Representation will abolish appeal to the people. The Proportional Representation Parliaments in foreign countries, are not dissolved when the bloc or combination of groups forming the Government is defeated, the groups merely re-align under another leader. At best, this is only government by compromise. Under the British system, when a government is defeated in the House on any policy, an appeal to the people is made, and the people decide the issue. The British system is therefore government by the people, whereas Proportional Representation system is government by groups. You might notice that in Germany, according to a despatch in this morning's paper it is believed the new Government will be short-lived. It is a Government formed under the Proportional Representation system. If it should be defeated to-morrow there would not necessarily be an appeal to the people. There was none when the former Government went out. The first thing you have to do, if you adopt Proportional Representation in Canada, is to elect a Parliament for a fixed

term, as is done in the United States, because if they do not, elections will be frequent as groups change from day to day. That has occurred in France. The result of Proportional Representation there, as incorporated in its constitution has been to prevent appeals to the people. Since the Republic was established, there has been forty-seven premiers.

The CHAIRMAN: You say that was brought about by Proportional Representation.

Mr. MACNICOL: No, I say that one of the results of Proportional Representation is the abolition of the appeal to the people, and in explanation of what I said I referred to the situation in France, because the constitution of that country has something resembling Proportional Representation, and that has been the result of it. So if you adopted this system in Canada, you would have to do as Mr. Drury did in Ontario, abolish appeal to the people.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have all the countries which have adopted Proportional Representation static Parliaments?—A. As far as I know.

By Mr. McMaster:

Q. I think all democratic countries have. We have had for five years?—A. Suppose your Government here is defeated this afternoon, I presume the Premier would either resign, or whoever was called in to form a government would appeal to the people; but under Proportional Representation that does not take place.

Q. Why not?—A. Because your constitution says—

Q. You are dodging my question. Why would Proportional Representation prevent an appeal to the people? You say it would result in the formation of several groups in the House—that is your argument—and a couple of groups may have to coalesce to carry on. They may lose their majority in the House, but unless they were able to attract to themselves other groups, they would be unable to carry on.—A. Take for example the position of the Government in the United States. There are stated periods for appealing to the people. In France if the Government of the day should be defeated, the President calls upon the leader of some prominent group to form a Government. The groups compromise and form a Government.

Q. They must always be able to command a majority, just as in this country?—A. They may do that by the groups uniting.

Q. Supposing the Government now in power here were defeated and the Governor General called on the leader of the Opposition to form a Government, if he could get sufficient support in the House, could he not carry on the Government?—A. He could, but has such a thing ever happened here in Ottawa?

Q. I do not know whether that ever happened in Canada, but it has happened in England.—A. It may have happened in England but it is not the rule, the rule is that when the Government is defeated, there is an appeal to the people and the people settle it. Take the case of Ottawa, which Mr. Hooper recommends shall be an area electing three members. To-day Ottawa has two seats and sends two members to the local House. In the last election for members of the local legislature, the people either voted for Mr. Hill or for his opponent in one case or for Mr. Champagne or his opponent in the other. It was a simple matter. But if you put Ottawa under Proportional Representation you will have a ballot of not less than twenty names. You would have three Tories to start with, and three Grits and probably three Labour candidates, a single-taxer and goodness knows what other group would put up a candidate. It is a serious question. I have not time to go through a ballot with fifty names on it, and if I have not I am sure that none of my workmen have the time.

Q. How did it come about under our old system that there were twenty-one candidates in Vancouver in a recent election?—A. There are six constituencies in Vancouver, and there were twenty-one candidates, but under Proportional Representa-

tion you will likely have ninety. I have spoken of Ottawa under Proportional Representation as an example. Under that system a ballot in an Ottawa election would contain from thirty-five to fifty names. A small percentage of the people vote even on the simple ballot of to-day. Will numerous candidates of more or less joke calibre induce a larger percent to vote? At present an Ottawa voter merely makes the letter "X" after a candidate's name. Will the requirement to select several candidates from a long list and to mark the figures 1-2-3-4-5 after his favourite's names according to his preferences induce him to vote? The experience is that voters under Proportional Representation use but few of their preferences. Indeed, in one of the Australian States so marked had been the neglect to do so that the Government has threatened compulsory legislation. And it is obvious that failure to use the preferences seriously affects the system. In Glasgow they elect their municipal council under Proportional Representation. At the election in that city, six Labour candidates were successful. Not a single one of them was elected on the first preference; they were all dependent for their election on the transference of certain votes from another party. Under Proportional Representation it would be possible for two minorities to come to an agreement, by which each might transfer to the other surplus votes which they might not require on the understanding thereby they would achieve their own ends. Any system of election which would encourage bargaining is bound to degrade the whole political life of the country. I take this from a speech of Major Henderson, M.P., published in the "London Times," April 9, 1821. I come now to the question of by-elections. Under the present system by-elections serve a good purpose, they illustrate the trend of public opinion and fill parliamentary vacancies. The cost of running a by-election is moderate, but under Proportional Representation a by-election will be like a young general election. To fill a vacancy in a six-seat constituency would necessitate the whole constituency voting again and the cost would be excessive. The Belgian method of supplementary candidates to do away with by-elections would not be tolerated in a British country. One of these two things would happen: Successful men would refuse to be bled and would not be candidates, or only rich men would be candidates. Now, every country in which they have Proportional Representation has a different system of conducting those by-elections. In Winnipeg they have ten seats, and in a letter the attorney general says that in the event of the death of one representative from Winnipeg, the whole city would be without representation. Take such a case as that of the group of six ridings including Leads, Grenville, Carleton and Lanark: suppose one of the members from that group of counties dies, either that area remains unrepresented or you hold a by-election. Only a millionaire could afford to run an election under such circumstances, and in the end the group of counties would be represented either by a millionaire or by some demagogue.

Q. What you claim is that the Proportional Representation system could not be used to elect one man?—A. No. In England if two or three men were to die it would mean a young general election and that is something which the people in England do not want to be bored with. It would mean putting the whole country into a turmoil for the election of one or two members. I now come to the question of "ticket plumping." The Winnipeg parliamentary election which was carried on under Proportional Representation regulations appears to the public to have been a pronounced failure, at least as far as the claims of Proportional Representation are concerned. Thirteen per cent of the electors voting cast their votes for the Independents, but none were elected. I should like Mr. Hooper to xplain how only four Labour representatives were elected when 42.5% of the electors voted Labour-Socialist. We maintain that Labour or any other party, naming a slate, will plump for that slate. That was not Mr. Hare's idea. He thought that the best men would be elected, but it works the reverse way. I find on page 48 of the Royal Commission Report on electoral systems, published in England in 1908, the following:—

"The sole regrettable of the phase of the contests in which the new system operated, is that "plumping" was so common."

The percentage of plump votes was 34.31, the total votes cast was 25,819, and of these 8,858 were plump votes. That does not bear out the ideas of those who are advocating Proportional Representation. It does not indicate that the system will lead to the selection of the ablest men.

Q. Did they elect more than that proportion by plumping?—A. That is the return.

Q. Do you consider that under Proportional Representation plumping does any good to the candidates who are plumped for?—A. Yes I would. The man who gets the majority of first choice votes is elected. Members of Parliament in large working-class constituencies were almost the father and mother of the electors. There were a number of personal questions to be considered which had nothing to do with parties or politics. Under Proportional Representation the personal side of politics would absolutely go by the board. How could a man keep in touch with 70,000 electors? The whole basis of the early representation of this House, dating back to the days of Edward I, would be destroyed. There were no parties in those times, but there was representation: there would be no representation under Proportional Representation. The future of the country depended not on machinery but on personality. I repeat the purpose of Government and its chief duty is to govern.

Q. I suppose that is why Mr. Church succeeded in getting elected in Toronto?—A. Mr. Church knows everybody in Toronto: he is the one exception to the rule. On the one hand you have simplicity: on the other, complicated ballots with experts manipulating the vote. I do not wish to cast any reflection on Mr. Hooper. I know he has his ideas and believes they are sound. I am trying to show that there is simplicity under the old system, and that experts and blackboards are required in the other. Mr. Gilbert, M.P., opposed Proportional Representation in the British House of Commons because it was of vital importance to have simplicity of election, and Mr. Burdett Coutts, M.P., said "This system (Proportional Representation) would throw them (the electors) into confusion, and make them distrust the polling booth as an instrument of representative government. There were very few members who could go to their constituents and really explain the process which it was purposed to enforce upon them." A point has been made by the advocates of Proportional Representation that under the present system Sir Richard McBride carried British Columbia by a majority of something like thirty-six to one; and that Sir James Whitney was returned by a majority of sixty-nine to fifteen, etc., whatever it may be. Now, that was public opinion, and I would remind the committee that the same electors who returned Mr. McBride by a majority of thirty-six to one wiped out Mr. McBride's government at the next election by an equally overwhelming majority. The object of having a good majority is to give stability, and it does give stability, but let any Government trifle with public opinion, and the public will turn them out. That has been the case under the British system ever since the time of Edward I. I would rather see Sir Richard McBride or Sir James Whitney elected by a big majority and legislating for the good of the people than to have such governments as they have to-day in Ontario and Manitoba, neither one of which can introduce and enact legislation. Such government is what log-rolling, compromise group government does. We do not want it in Canada. I do not care a fig whether the new States in Europe have adopted Proportional Representation or not. Why should Great Britain or any of the Dominions go to Czecho-Slovakia, or other countries in middle Europe for an example? If the other countries have not sense enough to follow the example of Great Britain, it is no wonder that Europe has been torn asunder so frequently and new states have been set up. Give us stability, and we will have legislation: Give us instability and we will have no legislation. The Propor-

tional Representation Society is going to have an election here. There was one recently held by an agricultural society in Toronto, which was attended by delegates from all over Canada. Those delegates are sent because they are able men. Ignorant men—and by ignorance I do not mean lack of ability because I have met many able men who could not read or write—are seldom selected as delegates to such conventions. The very best representative men are chosen. Who do your constituents send, Mr. Chairman? You are from East Peterboro (Laughter). I take it that Mr. Sexsmith is the ablest man in East Peterboro or he would not be here. The candidates that are named by the parties in the past have been the ablest men they could pick, but if Proportional Representation is to be adopted what sort of members would they have in the House of Commons? If those who advocate the adoption of the system want to test how it works, let them try it in some large manufacturing district, and see how the people will vote. They had a Proportional Representation model election in England just previous to introducing the late Bill. This is the fourth time such a Bill has been introduced in the British House of Commons, and it has been rejected four times, the last time with a larger majority than ever before, and that in face of the fact that Proportional Representation Society in England has been carrying on active propaganda. I do not know where they get their money, but they seem to have any amount of it. They send out innumerable circulars and literature everywhere to the electors.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose they get their money the same as your league gets money.

Mr. MACNICOL: All the money I have spent has been put up by myself, and the league sends out no literature. Since 1859 this same society or its forbears have been advocating Proportional Representation in England. For sixty years there has been propaganda, and after sixty years the House of Commons has thrown out the Proportional Representation Bill for the fourth time; but it took only a year or two to pass the Corn Laws. That legislation was not obtained by propaganda, but by force of public opinion. In the model election in England it was intended to demonstrate the work of Proportional Representation. The Proportional Representation Society did not distribute any ballot paper. A constituency was formed from newspaper readers, and as the postmarks showed, votes were sent in from all parts of the country. In that election they had fifteen candidates. The voting was on Friday, and the result was ascertained the following Monday.

Mr. THOMSON: The speaker has been asked to discuss the other question with which we are dealing here, that is the question of applying the transferable vote to single-member constituencies.

Mr. MACNICOL: As I have said, there were fifteen candidates on that sample ballot, and of that fifteen I think there were to be six or seven elected. Sir Donald MacLean, who received only six hundred and twenty-four votes against 9,465 for Mr. Asquith, was elected by the manipulation of a transferable vote.

By the Chairman:

Q. By manipulation you say, not by the people's choice?—A. One man votes for 2-3-4-5 candidates.

Q. The man elected is returned by the choice of the people after all, is he not? —A. No, I would not say that. I would rather be returned by the first choice. Here is a man who received only 624 votes who is declared elected over men who received very many more votes. I do not think that the people of Canada want to elect their representatives, on second, third or fourth preference, but on the first preference.

Q. Mr. Thomson asked a question with reference to the application of the transferable vote to the single-constituency. How would that work where three candidates are to be elected—say in West Elgin or Peterboro. Have you anything to say on that?—A. I do not think we shall have anything of that kind.

By Mr. Thomson:

Q. This committee is to consider not only the question of Proportional Representation but also the transferable vote?—A. That is not in existence in any place. (Cries of Oh, yes). I am opposed to that.

Q. Give us your reasons?—A. Take one single riding where to-day we have two men running.

Q. In some cases there are three.—A. As a rule, only two men run.

Q. But in this case there are three?—A. Well, where you have three running—you are going to elect these by Proportional Representation.

Q. No, the alternative vote. We are discussing two questions, Proportional Representation and the Preferential vote in single-member constituencies, where there are more than two candidates. Those are the questions we are to report on.—A. The result would be as demonstrated elsewhere. A man has five choices: there are five candidates running?

Q. No, four choices?—A. That would leave the door open against yourself. If you are representing a farmers' riding, with a city in one end of it, there would be a Labour candidate nominated against you, and probably a single-tax one, because they would figure this way—where the majority does not count, they might by the system of preferences get enough votes to elect them. I have given an instance where one candidate in the model election, who was near the bottom of the list was elected.

Q. There is a system in operation in Australia in two provinces, and here is the way it works out. The elector marks his ballot No. 1 and No. 2 according to his choice. The experts in making up the returns drop off the lowest candidate and add his choice as directed. If there are five candidates running they drop off one after another until two remain, and the candidate who has a majority will represent the riding. I mentioned a concrete case in the province of Ontario where a Government represents the minority under the old system. Would it not be better to have an election so conducted that it would work up to a point where the successful party would represent the majority. Under the British system the issue is simply that the man elected must have the majority in the riding, declaring their desire to have him represent.—A. That has not been up for discussion. I would be opposed to it, because it would lead to the nomination of numerous candidates, and I would rather see numerous acclamations. If you apply that in one case, you would have to apply it to all. Under that system in Toronto the ballot would have ten names. In the debate in the House of Commons on the Proportional Representation Bill, they quoted several distinguished men who favoured it, among them Beaconsfield, Gladstone, Bright, Goschen and John Stuart Mill, who was more of a philosopher than a practical politician. On page 669 of the Report of the British Parliamentary Debates, April 8, 1921, Mr. Burdett Coutts quotes the following from Disraeli:—

> "He had always been of opinion that this and other schemes having for their object to represent minorities, were admirable schemes for bringing crochety men into the House. They were schemes of coteries and not the politics of nations, and, if adopted, would end in discomfiture and confusion."

He also quotes John Bright, as follows:—

> "Every Englishman ought to know that anything which enfeebles the representative powers and lessens the vitality of the electoral system, which puts in the nominees of little cliques, here representing a majority and there a minority, but having no real influence among the people—every system like that weakens and must ultimately destroy the power and the force of your Executive Government. . . . A principle could hardly be devised more calculated to destroy the vitality of the elective system, and to produce stagnation, not only of the most complete, but of the most fatal character, affecting public affairs."

And further on Mr. Burdett-Coutts says:—

> "Mr. John Bright spoke of the minority representation clause in the Bill he was discussing as an infamous and abominable clause which must have come from Bedlam or some region of that sort."

Now, in concluding, I ask is it not very good evidence against this system that the British House of Commons has cast it out for the fourth time, on this occasion after a very exhaustive report in 1910, and an equally exhaustive report this time? We get reports showing how the application of this system of Proportional Representation works out in the countries to which reference has been made, and one man spoke of the high success that has attended it in Winnipeg. That is all very well for strangers, but we Canadians know that it has been a rank failure in Winnipeg.

The CHAIRMAN: In what respect is it a rank failure in Winnipeg?

Mr. MACNICOL: The very fact that the Manitoba Government cannot introduce to carry legislation when 25% of the members of the legislature of Manitoba are returned by Proportional Representation.

A MEMBER: The harm might be in the other three-fourths.

Mr. MACNICOL: I have as good a right to assume that it is the result of Proportional Representation. I submit that you should read those reports from which I have quoted and advise the House of Commons that such a system is not worthy of consideration. It costs a great deal of money to keep Parliament in session, and it would be a waste of time to press this matter further. Proportional Representation cannot be applied successfully to a country like this, where we have so many races and creeds, and where you must Canadianize our people in order to bring about harmony. Do not disrupt this young country. Do not let it be ruined by divisions, into a host of groups representing all the races and creeds that come in here with our immigrants.

A MEMBER: Mr. Hooper has been taking a deep interest in this matter and I think he ought to be given an opporunity to reply. The gentleman who has been addressing us, has brought forth his arguments very emphatically and well.

Mr. HOOPER: Perhaps the most important point that has been raised relates to the election in Winnipeg. Mr. MacNicol says it was a rank failure, because it did not turn out according to the balloting. I have the actual figures here. The vote according to the first choice was as follows:—

Labour Party, polled..	42.5% First choice votes.
Liberals, polled..	30.4%
Conservatives, polled..	13.7%
Independents, polled..	13.4%

Labour polled 42.5% and because of this Mr. MacNicol, claims that it should have received a larger representation than four member out of ten. Mr. Dixon, of course, headed the poll; he got a very large number of Labours' first choice votes.

Mr. MACNICOL: He did not get a majority; only 11,000.

Mr. HOOPER: The number does not matter. He had a surplus of votes. On 1,444 of Mr. Dixon's ballots the second choices were marked for Conservative and Liberal candidates; the result of this was that when we came to transfer Mr. Dixon's surplus votes, 911 of them went to Liberals and Conservatives, and that is why Labour only received 40% of the seats. Mr. MacNichol says that the Independents were badly treated because they polled 13.4% first choice votes and did not elect a representative. But eleven Independent candidates were running and these were all independent of each other, for example, one favoured prohibition while another opposed it. The Independents were all low men in the voting and the result was that when the Independent candidates were dropped, their second choices came into effect and these added to the Conservative

and Liberal figures, giving the Conservative and Liberals about 20% and 40% of the votes respectively. The result of the election was that Labour obtained 40% of the representation, the Liberals 40% and the Conservatives 20%. Mr. MacNicol has made the statement that Proportional Representation was responsible for the fact that a minority party was in power in the Manitoba Legislature. But, there are fifty-five members in the Manitoba Legislature, only ten of whom were elected by Proportional Representation. I have here a confidential letter from a responsible official of the Manitoba Government in which the following statement on this point is made:—

> "I cannot understand how the newspapers are possessed with the idea that Proportional Representation is responsible for the reduced majority of the Norris Government, as the vote in Winnipeg did not show this by any means."

What he means by that is this: The returning officer in Winnipeg after the election divided Winnipeg into ten single-member constituencies, as nearly as he could, as if Proportional Representation had not been in effect. He took the votes in these ten constituencies and came to the conclusion, (which I can confirm from my own information and observation) that if there had not been Proportional Representation Labour would have gained seven seats instead of four, the Government three instead of four, and the Conservatives none instead of two.

By Mr. McMaster:

Q. When you made that comparison, did you consider the first choice votes coming from each polling station?—A. Yes, from each polling station within each of the imaginary constituencies. It was only approximately done, of course, but we were satisfied that the result we obtained was sufficiently accurate. My correspondent, who was in an excellent position to form an opinion, goes on to state in his letter:

> "Had Proportional Representation been in force throughout the whole of the province, there is no question in the world but that the Norris Government would have received a much larger representation."

It has been claimed that there is no stability of government under Proportional Representation, and instability in Belgium has been alleged. I have already given evidence as to the stability of government in Belgium, under Proportional Representation. It has been stated that we would have a tremendously long ballot under Proportional Representation. I admit that where the system is tried for the first time, you might have a fairly long ballot as some candidates and parties might not understand how the system operates. In Winnipeg they had four candidates for one seat. But, even under Proportional Representation a candidate requires votes to secure election. Twenty-five of the Winnipeg candidates lost their deposits and will know better next time. I have noted very carefully the results of the Irish Municipal elections, and I find that the percentage of candidates running is 2·4 for every seat, so, to say as Mr. MacNicol does, that we would have twenty-five or thirty candidates running for three seats in Ottawa is hardly reasonable. In the recent provincial elections in British Columbia twenty-eight candidates ran in the city of Vancouver for only six seats. They used the block vote in Vancouver. In Victoria nineteen candidates contested for seats.

The CHAIRMAN: That is under the present system?

Mr. HOOPER: Yes, that is, under the block vote.

Mr. MACNICOL: Was the whole city voting as one riding?

Mr. HOOPER: Yes.

Mr. MACNICOL: That bears out my argument.

Mr. HOOPER: No, for nobody objects to the long ballot in Vancouver or Victoria. In Manitoba there were thirteen constituencies where the candidate secured election on a minority vote. I have analysed these returns and have come to the conclusion

which has been confirmed unofficially, that if they had had the alternative vote, in the rural constituencies in Manitoba, the government would have won as many as six seats, at the expense of the Labour and other parties.

By Mr. Thomson:

Statements are made here that gentlemen returned in by-elections under the present system have been minority candidates. Is it not a fact in every by-election for single constituencies since the last general election that where more than two candidates ran that the minority was represented. We have had it in the case of Temiskaming and East Elgin and others.

Mr. HOOPER: In the recent British Columbia provincial elections twenty-one seats were won on a minority vote—

Mr. THOMSON: I am speaking of the Dominion elections.

Mr. HOOPER: I know that the last three by-elections were won on a minority vote.

Mr. THOMSON: And in each case there were more than two candidates running?

Mr. HOOPER: Yes, five in one case, I believe.

By Mr. Sinclair:

Q. Do you say that the tendency of proportional representation is to increase or diminish the number of candidates?—A. It would increase the number of candidates over the number we have been used to having, but, of course, in the past three-cornered contests were rather rare. As I have shown from the report of the Irish municipal elections you might get from two to three candidates for each seat.

Q. Would not a large area constituency tend to diminish the number of candidates?—A. I think possibly the larger the area the smaller the percentage of candidates for each seat—after the system was understood of course.

By a Member:

Q. Why did the Maintoba authorities decide that there should be two vacancies in Winnipeg before holding a by-election?—A. That was the opinion of the Attorney-General of Manitoba himself. I was not very enthusiastic over the suggestion. I recommended either of two other schemes for filling seats in Winnipeg in case of a vacancy arising. If they wished to retain the by-election for Winnipeg members accepting Cabinet appointments they could do so by dividing the city into ten electoral areas (just like the single-member system—and each elected candidate could select in the order of his election the particular area that should be his for the purpose only of a by-election. Each member of course would choose an area where he had polled a large number of first choice votes. If on the other hand, they desired to get rid of the old convention of holding a by-election when a member was elevated to the Cabinet I suggested that they might consider this system: The ballots by which each member was elected should be retained, and under retirement of a member his ballots should be re-examined and the vacant seat given to the unelected candidate who was the next choice on the greatest number of them. This would ensure, reasonably at any rate, that the new member would be of the same political party as the retiring member. By this scheme you avoid the expense of a by-election; but, of course, there are other schemes worthy of consideration.

Mr. ANDREWS: Were there any members in the present Ontario Parliament who were elected by Proportional Representation?

Mr. HOOPER: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any others that the committee would like to hear?

A MEMBER: It seems to me it would be well to have representatives of the trade and labour organizations who had in their platforms advocated Proportional Representation. Let us have them here and get their opinion on the two systems before us.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any one in mind that you would like to have called?

A MEMBER: I would ask Mr. Moore, president of the Trade and Labour Organization to pick out a man to represent them here.

Mr. MACNICOL: Could we send down other men also?—I presume I am the only one that has so far presented the public side of this question.

A MEMBER: Others are studying this. We have received a good deal of literature, and pamphlets have been sent to us in large quantities, as we are fairly well posted on the subject. What we want is the opinion of some people who have been advocating the adoption of Proportional Representation. We wish to find out what their organizations want and why they want it.

The committee adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SUBJECT OF

Proportional Representation

AND THE SUBJECT OF THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE
OR PREFERENTIAL VOTE

No. 4

Library of Parliament
CANADA
JUNE JUIN 21 1972
Bibliothèque du Parlement

23445—1

SATURDAY, May 21, 1921.

The Committee met at eleven o'clock a.m.

Present: Messrs. Sexsmith, Chairman, Blair, Calder, Crowe, Davidson, Denis, Harold, Molloy, Simpson and Thomson (Qu'Appelle).

The minutes of the previous meeting were taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. J. A. P. Haydon, representing the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and C. G. MacNeil, Dominion Secretary-Treasurer, Great War Veterans' Association of Canada, who were invited to attend the meeting, addressed the Committee, both favouring the principle of proportional representation for the House of Commons.

On motion of Mr. Crowe, a vote of thanks was tendered Mr. Haydon and Mr. MacNeil.

On motion of Mr. Harold it was

Resolved, that a sub-committee composed of Messrs. Blair, Molloy, Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Sexsmith, McMaster and the mover be appointed to draft a report to the House on the subject referred to the Committee for consideration.

The Committee then adjourned to the call of the chair.

Chairman.

SATURDAY, May 21, 1921.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Sexsmith, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: We have two witnesses here this morning, Mr. Haydon, representing the Trades and Labour Congress, and Mr. C. G. MacNeil, representing the G.W.V.A.

J. A. P. HAYDON called.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are here representing labour?—A. I am representing the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. I am substituting for Mr. Tom Moore, who is unavoidably absent. The question of proportional representation is one on which labour and capital on three occasions during the past three years have unanimously agreed. First, there was the Mathers Commission on Industrial Relations which made an investigation and filed its report with the Government. In their report, they referred to the lack of confidence in constituted government and suggested as a remedy the inauguration of proportional representation by group constituencies. I will read from the recommendation in that report. It says:—

> "The complaint was made at several places that legislation enacted at the request and for the benefit of labour was not adequately enforced.
>
> "The belief appears to be entertained that the Governments, both local and federal, are largely controlled by the financial interests and that their influence was manifest not only in legislation but in the executive action of the several Governments. These considerations, it was alleged, had shaken the faith of the working classes in governments as at present constituted.

"The remedy suggested was a system of election by which the workers could secure better representation in Parliament. The means suggested for bringing this about was the adoption of a system of proportional representation from group constituencies. We understand this system has been in operation for several years in Belgium and Sweden and we believe the proposal is well worth serious study by a committee of Parliament."

That was the recommendation of the Mathers Industrial Relations Commission. Following that, the first National Industrial Conference was held at Ottawa, at which there was an equal representation of employers and labour, with a third group representing the public. They considered the question of proportional representation, and at that conference a large part of the time was devoted to the discussion of that question. They passed the following resolution:—

"Believing that there are defects in the system of electoral representation in Canada, which defects are stated by the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations to be a contributary cause of social and political unrest, this conference welcomes the declaration of the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, that a Speaker's Conference will be called to investigate the merits of the proportional system, and urges that such action be taken without delay."

These are two occasions on which Labour and Capital unaminously agreed on the question of proportional representation. The great labour movement is represented by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. I may explain that it is not a political organization, it is purely an industrial organization, whose membership stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the boundary line as far north as you can go. Our membership is composed of people of all political beliefs. We are interested merely in getting better conditions for the workers. The lack of proportional representation has given the Direct Actionists and the Revolutionaries one of the greatest weapons that is known. They claim that under our present system, and rightly so, large minorities are deprived of their representation. I might cite one case. In Ontario to-day, we have a Farmers' Government, and yet the farmers are by no means in the majority in that province. I could cite many instances, but that is one. At our last convention of the Trades and Labour Congress we passed the following resolution which embodied our views:—

"Whereas, the present system of voting for members of the House of Commons does not give a true representation of important minorities in constituencies; and whereas, this state of affairs tends to create distrust of Parliamentary government and consequently adds to the general unrest and the tendency towards Direct Action, in adjusting unsatisfactory social and economic conditions; and whereas this can be remedied by enabling important minorities to be directly represented in the Federal Parliament, in proportion to its numerical voting strength, by the Hare system of proportional representation, or the single transferable vote; Be it therefore,

Resolved: That the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada do hereby instruct its President and Executive Committee to immediately and insistently press the Prime Minister of Canada and the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons for pledges to incorporate and to assist in incorporating in the Electoral Law for the next Dominion Elections, the single transferable vote system; or, at least, in all the urban constituencies of Canada, and those constituencies immediately adjoining the urban constituencies, which for this purpose should be grouped in one constituency from which grouped constituency should be elected the same number of members that are now elected from the constituencies before being grouped."

That embodies our views.

[Mr. J. A. P. Haydon.]

Mr. HALBERT: That single transferable vote is not exactly Proportional Representation.

Mr. HAYDON: That is the Hare system.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your opinion with regard to the application of Proportional Representation to, say the Peterboro election, where there were five candidates running?

Mr. HAYDON: Had there been proportional representation, it is doubtful whether the result would have been what it is now.

The CHAIRMAN: You think it would be preferable to have the alternative vote where the man elected would require to have a majority.

Mr. HAYDON: Of course.

Mr. HAROLD: It would be better to make your point clear. In speaking of Proportional Representation we always think of the group constituency, but this is a question with regard to a single member constituency which we will always have in large numbers in this country, no matter how much we try to adopt proportional representation on account of the great area of the country and the impossibility of combining constituencies. For instance, take the Yukon, the Gaspe Peninsula, and the large constituency in northern Ontario, in Saskatchewan and British Columbia: the point is—and it is one of the things we have to consider—are you prepared to express an opinion for your organization with regard to whether they prefer to have the present system of electing the man that gets the most votes, or whether it would be changed so that a man could not represent that constituency unless he had the majority of votes behind him, which is arrived at by taking the second choice votes, starting at the bottom and eliminating the one who is last on the list, until you come to two members. You see the effect of that. It works out in this way; that in some instances groups do not get a good representation possibly as they might under the present system, and there is a difference of opinion among those who are in groups as to whether that change should be made, and while we are considering that we would like to have a definite statement if you could give it to us, as to how your organization stands on that question.

Mr. HAYDON: I might say that we run all our elections where there are single officers to be elected in this way; we eliminate the low man and vote over again. That is not really proportional representation, and for a Federal election I doubt whether that system could be carried out. I am of the opinion that proportional representation can be conducted in a single constituency as well as in a group constituency, but we are strongly of the opinion that group constituencies are at all times desirable. I understand that there will be cases where it will be impossible to have a group constituency, but the same thing can take place, and proportional representation can well be applied in single constituencies.

The CHAIRMAN: We call that the alternative vote.

Mr. HAROLD: Take a constituency where there are three groups and three candidates, a Labour man, a Farmer, and a Party man. Now in the first choice the Labour man may head the poll. Under our present system he would be elected, but under this system, the Farmer might be the last one and he would drop off, and perhaps the majority of his votes would go to the Party man, which might increase his votes to such an extent that he would have more votes than the Labour man, or it might be shifted round to any other result. That is proportional representation so far as that is concerned in that riding, if you want to call it proportional representation, but it is really what you call the single transferable vote in that riding. Do you want to change that? Would you be in favour of a change with regard to our present system of elections in those single member ridings?

Mr. HAYDON: Yes, we are. Our whole desire is to establish faith in constituted authorities, and under our present system of elections, there is no guarantee that the majority will rule, and in a true democracy the majority must rule.

Mr. HAROLD: That is a definite statement.

Mr. THOMPSON (*Qu'Appelle*): Your real object is to get majority rule.

Mr. HAYDON: Yes.

Mr. HAROLD: Some labour men are opposed to that.

Mr. HAYDON: In Australia, when the Liberal Party were in power the Labour Party wanted proportional representation, and the Liberal Party said "Nothing doing." At the next election the Labour Party had a majority of members. Then the Liberal Party said "Give us proportional representation" and the Labour said "Nothing doing. We got elected under this system, and it is all right." The Labour men are not all angels you know, and we have a sample of it in Ontario, where one of the chief planks of both parties that are in power is proportional representation and when the Bill came before them they gave it a hoist and shelved it. I am not speaking for the Labour Political Party, but I am speaking for the Industrial Organization.

The CHAIRMAN: In Australia they were playing politics.

Mr. HAYDON: Some Labour men play politics.

Mr. HAROLD: You recognize that as a sound principle that a majority should be behind a representative.

Mr. HAYDON: Yes.

Mr. DENIS: I do not know whether Mr. Harold made his point quite clear to you. There are two systems. One is the single transferable vote, which is applicable in the case of proportional representation. That is one system. Under that system you cannot work it out unless you make the constituencies into groups. Now you have expressed yourself, representing your organization, as being in favour of that. Suppose for a moment that we could not achieve that purpose; suppose that a majority of the Committee or of the House would be against this grouping of constituencies, then there is a second proposition which might be submitted to the Committee and to the House, and it is this system which is called the alternative vote. Now, in order to make you understand the alternative vote, I may explain it in this way: Take the case of Peterboro, where there was only one constituency, and in that single constituency there were five candidates. If the alternative vote system had been applied in the case of Peterboro, each elector would have given one vote for the candidate of his choice, then a second vote for the candidate of the second choice, and a third vote for the candidate of his third choice, and he might give a fourth vote for the candidate of his fourth choice. If this had been done, after the election was over, it would have been found that no candidate had a majority of the votes cast. If any candidate had an absolute majority of the votes cast he would have been elected at once, but because no candidate had an actual majority of the votes cast, then they proceed in this way; they eliminate the lowest candidate, and redistribute the votes cast for him to the other candidates according to a method which would take too long to explain. After eliminating the lowest candidate four candidates would be left, and the distribution being made among the four candidates, if none of the four had an absolute majority they would eliminate the lowest of the four again, and distribute his votes among the remaining three, and this process would be continued until one of the five candidates had a majority. I have described what we call the alternative vote for a single constituency. What you have described, to which you have given your approbation in the beginning, is proportional representation to be applied to several constituencies, it being understood that your organization is in favour of proportional representation. In case we could not achieve that end at the present system, in case Parliament would not be in favour of proportional representation, have you any opinions to offer in regard to the alternative vote, or as a second proporsition, would you favour the alternative vote, if proportional representation cannot be secured now?

Mr. HAYDON: I understood that very thing from the previous question, and I gave my definite statement. It is the same principle, but we prefer group consti-

tuencies for several reasons, and one of them, I might say, is that Parliament has been in the habit of Gerrymandering constituencies, and with group constituencies this is impossible, because it does not matter whether they do butcher up constituencies, for the reason that under proportional representation the majority shall rule.

Mr. DENIS: You are in favour of proportional representation first and above all. In case that end could not be obtained, then you would be in favour of the alternate vote in single constituencies.

Mr. HAYDON: Exactly, which is proportional representation as I understand it.

Mr. HAROLD: Mr. Calder is here, but he has not heard what has taken place up to date. Possibly he may have a word to say.

The CHAIRMAN: This gentleman is representing the Trades and Labour of Canada, and he has read the resolution passed by the Trades and Labour Council, as well as the resolution by the National Industrial Council that has been passed here, and has expressed himself on behalf of the organization as definitely in favour of proportional representation, or the alternative vote as some call it, in the single member constituencies.

Mr. DENIS: What is the membership of your organization?

Mr. HAYDON: Roughly, 260,000.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: How do you account for the attitude of Mr. Heaps, when the matter came up in Manitoba?

Mr. HAYDON: He is not a member of our organization, and is a member of an industrial organization—I mean by that that he is one of the adherents of the O.B.U., and I cited the case of Australia where the same thing took place.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Have you already given evidence on that point?

Mr. HAYDON: I was not asked that same direct question, but I am not surprised at Mr. Heaps' attitude, because as it is well known to you, almost everything we propose is opposed by him.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: He represents a certain wing of labour, and it was proposed at one time that he be called as a witness, and I was wondering if you had any idea why he, speaking on behalf of those he represents, opposed the idea of the alternative vote in the single constituency.

Mr. HAYDON: Mr. Heaps represents the city of Winnipeg in the Manitoba Legislature. My idea is that had there not been proportional representation, labour would possibly have elected seven members in Winnipeg, and possibly Mr. Heaps thinks they would have better representation had they not had proportional representation. Although we think the principle of proportional representation, so far as we are concerned, is sound, whether we may lose out occasionally or not.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: In other words, he is opposed to both proportional representation in a constituency where a number of candidates are to be elected, and he is opposed to the alternate preferential vote in a single constituency where only one candidate is to be elected.

WITNESS: As I understand his declaration, I think so.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. We would have to have him here himself?—A. Yes, I cannot speak for him.

Q. You cannot speak for him?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? If not, we will excuse this witness.

Witness retired.

C. G. MacNeil, called and examined.

Witness: I may state very briefly the views of our association with regard to Proportional Representation. Our opinion in this matter was expressed first at the annual Dominion convention held at Vancouver, June 20th, in these terms:—

"That this association endorse the principle of proportional representation for the proper reflection of public opinion, and that the Prime Minister of Canada be requested to summon a Speaker's Conference, similar to the one which met in Great Britain in 1917, to discuss this matter and report its findings to the House of Commons at the earliest possible date."

The last annual convention re-affirmed this in this way:—

"Whereas it has been shown that the system of proportional representation is the only fair way that the true feeling of an election can be established;

"And whereas this has been fully demonstrated in other parts of the world;

Therefore, be it resolved that we, the Great War Veteran's Association, in Dominion Convention assembled, thank the various local and Provincial Commands for the great interest shown on this important question, and re-affirm the stand of the Vancouver Convention, 1919,—that the Great War Veteran's Association recommend the principles of election under the system of proportional representation in all elections in the Dominion of Canada, and that this recommendation and affirmation be forwarded to the proper authorities through our Dominion Command."

I may say, sir, that subsequent to this expression on behalf of the Dominion body one provincial command after another has supported the idea in their relationship to their various provincial governments. In British Columbia, the British Columbia Provincial Convention has on several occasions expressed itslf in favour of proportional representation; in many of the larger branches the system of proportional representation was followed in the election of officials of the branch, and the organizations of that province are active in pressing for the adoption of this principle in municipal elections within certain limits.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you found the system in the election of your officers satisfactory?—A. Yes, wherever properly conducted. Saskatchewan, Ontario and Manitoba commands have also made representations to their various governments as being in favour of proportional representation, and our organization in Winnipeg was definitely interested in the matter, and following the observations made as the result of the experience at that time, they have re-affirmed their support of proportional representation. In the hearing which was held by the Ontario Government recently——

Q. Were they satisfied with the results of the Winnipeg elections?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they re-endorsed the principle?—A. Yes, sir. The Ontario Provincial Command has also made representations to the Ontario Government in support of this. I wention this to show that there is practically a unanimous support of the principle of proportional representation throughout the organization. We have never attempted at any time to go into the technical side of it. We arranged to have the subject fully explained by men who are experts, and the endorsation was quite cordial.

I may mention before leaving the stand, that there are two very important reasons why our association is supporting proportional representation. One is probably based on our policy. If I may have your permission, I would like to read from our declaration of policy as follows:

"That we pledge ourselves to the common service of our country, acknowledging no pre-eminence in our association, except devotion in the building up of our national life.

"That we reject for our association and ourselves any claim to special or peculiar favours, based on our military service, simply demanding our just rights as returned citizens of this country to be placed on an equality with our fellow citizens, who were not privileged to serve."

The purpose of our association was an interest in the national welfare—very distinctly. We have sought to preserve a proper standard of citizenship and national idea. We feel that in proportional representation the opinions of the electorate will be more faithfully represented in the House of Commons, and this will do a great deal toward promoting national harmony and reducing the apparent unrest. In that general way we are definitely in support of proportional representation.

The second reason is this: Although primarily our organization is a fraternal organization, we have found it necessary to approach the Government on numerous occasions for various legislation relating to returned soldiers. Hitherto our association has been definitely opposed to anything savouring of partizan political action. The need has, up to the present time, been very acute in many respects. It has not always been possible for the Government to accede fully to our requests, and the result has been that among returned soldiers there has been created a very large class of men who are dissatisfied with the legislative action taken with regard to their need, and their demand is for political action. Now, the association in considering this question has been opposed to political action as vaguely expressed in that way. Although we have been accused of fostering a class consciousness, as a matter of fact, our organization is working very definitely against just that sort of thing. We are not anxious that the returned soldiers should be constituted a distinct and separate group from other citizens. There is some degree of comradeship and fraternalism,—some sort of mystic bonds that exist among men who have faced common dangers, but we have not endeavoured to capitalize that, for any selfish interests of the returned soldier, but rather to promote the welfare of the whole country and that can be done as a benefit to the country and not as a menace. We are very anxious, therefore, that any influence which can be created on account of that bond be not exploited nor bartered for. We think the dissatisfaction which has arisen owing to the apparent inability of the Government to deal fully with the demands which have arisen from time to time, and the dissatisfaction which shows, where they could not get what they wanted, by the ordinary method of petition, if it be by organized representation, and we will, therefore, demand action at the polls. We think that through proportional representation we shall find a safe outlet. We are all endeavouring to prevent the formation of any other group——

Q. You consider that proportional representation is rather a detriment to grouping than a benefit?—A. Oh, yes. Proportional representation, for instance, in our case, would very definitely neutralize what would result by any political action in the formation of a group. The returned soldier would feel that he would have an opportunity of expressing in the House his legislative needs without in any way segregating himself as a returned soldier and believing this, what the returned soldier should do is to realize that he is a citizen, and not as a class apart at all. I hope I have made that clear.

Q. Your belief is then, in conducting an election under proportional representation that it would be more harmonious and some would get the views of the people better?—A. Yes.

Q. It would do away with party strife and factions?—A. Yes, and what is very important as well, sir, it would revive the waning confidence in constitutional—we must admit it, there is a spirit abroad which tends to distrust our present parliamentary institutions, and with proportional representation, there would be a very faithful reflection of opinion, and there would be a corresponding increase in the confidence shown, and less desire to take unconstitutional methods for redress of grievances.

[Mr. C. G. MacNeil.]

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions the Committee would like to ask Mr. MacNeil?

By the Chairman:

Q. You are through with your statement?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Denis:

Q. What is the membership of your organization?—A. Roughly, the enrolled membership is around two hundred thousand.

Q. And as you have just told us, your central organization is in favour of proportional representation, and so is every one of your local or provincial councils?—if you call them so—is that what you said?—A. Every provincial council that has expressed itself is—

Q. Is in favour of it?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Harold:

Q. In answer to a question which we put to Mr. Haydon in regard to the single member constituencies, do you agree with his views that the candidates should have a majority of the votes behind them?—A. We prefer, of course, the single transfer votes to the group constituency.

Q. But where that is impracticable——A. The alternative vote only as an improvement upon the existing system, and to more definitely insure that the elected representative has a majority of the constituency behind him.

By Mr. Denis:

Q. To make your idea clear, you are in favour of the single transfer vote first? —A. Yes.

Q. Failing to secure that, you would be in favour of an alternative vote rather than sustain the present system?—A. Only where it has been proven that the single transfer of the vote would be wholly impracticable, and only as some improvement upon the present system.

By Mr. Thomson (Qu'Appelle).

Q. In case the House refuses to adopt proportional representation,—that group constituency—would you prefer we should adopt the other system, that is, the alternative vote system, rather than retain our present system—generally?—A. Yes, we regard that as progress.

Q. You regard that as a forward step?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Crowe:

Q. Do you think it would be fair, Mr. MacNeil, to have in one part of a province proportional representation, and in another part of the province the single alternative vote? You are acquainted with the western provinces. Some of those constituencies are very large, and it would be almost impossible to group them. Take the province of British Columbia. There are three representatives who take in probably three-quarters of British Columbia. It would be almost impossible to group these three in one constituency. Do you think it would be advisable to have proportional representation applied to the cities and to the larger populated farmer constituencies, and have the larger constituencies single representation?—A. It was our opinion, sir, that there would be very few portions of the Dominion where it would not be possible to group constituencies.

Q. There is the northern part of Ontario and the northern part of the four western provinces—it would be almost impossible to group the constituencies there.—A. Well, that would have to be—I would not presume to answer that question very definitely. It will have to be gone into by experts, and examined very closely.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. Take your knowledge of the situation in Saskatchewan. Would it be advisable to combine the constituencies at, say, Moosejaw, Maple Creek, and Swift Current, for the purpose of electing three members?—A. I see no reason why it should not be done.

Q. Do you think the candidates could come to a common constituency?—Would they get near the people?—A. It would depend upon the campaign programme——

Q. Do you think the people would have an opportunity of seeing their candidate, and sizing him up, and learning something about his habits, and his character, and his personal qualities?—A. Well, sir, I would think——

Q. Do you think that any election—in any six weeks campaign, that the people would know their candidate?—A. It would be covered as fully as it is under the present system, without the duplication which now goes on.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: He would have to divide himself into three parts, because with a constituency so large he would have to do some hustling.

Mr. DENIS: What about the President of the United States who travels all over the United States? Surely that is larger than any province in Canada, and there are 110,000,000 of people who are all satisfied that they know the President.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: In that case it is certain principles that count. The man represents certain principles.

Mr. DENIS: It would be the same in our elections.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you not think Mr. Calder that if you were running for that constituency to which you refer that you would be fairly well known?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I might be, because I have been taking part in public life for fifteen years out there. But what about the man who has never been in public life, who gets nominated for the first time, and who lives in a certain locality? That is the usual thing; the other is the unusual thing.

Mr. DENIS: I understand that the elector votes more on principle and on the candidate's policy than for the candidate himself. We know that even in single constituencies, a great number of the electors vote for a man they have never seen before, or assuming that they have seen him once on the hustings making a short speech, and he goes away for the rest of the campaign the electors can appreciate that man, judge of his talents and so on. If that can be done in single constituencies, it surely can be done in several constituencies grouped together, even although they comprise a large area.

Mr. THOMSON: I think there is a good deal in what Mr. Calder has said regarding the necessity of knowing something about the man. I think the more we know about the candidate, the beter man we will get. Probably it would not hurt if the present House of Commons had members of a litle better calibre than we have, and the only way to get the calibre is to have the people judge of the man as well as of his policy. I believe that under proportional representation we would have very much more of that than at present, and that is one of the reasons why I am strongly in favour of it. I believe we would have it even by the alternative vote in the single constituency. I quite believe that there are many constituencies in this country where it would be impossible to carry out the grouping system satisfactorily. So far as Saskatchewan is concerned there are only one or two places where a group could be formed successfully, perhaps in the south-eastern part of the province, and it is even questionable whether it would be very satisfactory there. But it is a different matter altogether where you can group constituencies.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I think we are all agreed that there would be difficulty in applying the principle generally. What would you say about this Mr. MacNeil? I understand that in the city of Montreal the question of proportional representation was submtited to the electorate recently for municipal purposes and they voted against it by what majority?

Mr. DENIS: I doubt whether Mr. MacNeil is in a position to answer that. I know something about it. It was no test at all. The people of Montreal—and I take the responsibility for saying, for though I do not live in Montreal I am quite close to it—did not vote on proportional representation at all. They have made it a municipal political issue, and if you read the Montreal newspapers you will see that what I state is correct. I am absolutely confident that if the people of Montreal had had to pronounce themselves on the straight issue of proportional representation, they would be in favour of it. That is my idea. But the conditions in the city of Montreal have been mixed for a number of years. There has been a great deal of discontent from year to year, and representatives of the city have gone to the Quebec Legislature to have the city's charter amended. The issue became purely a municipal one, in which the principle of proportional representation embodied in one of the propositions submitted to the electors was absolutely lost sight of. It was a case of the people voting for one group of men against another group of men, or if I may so express myself they voted for a group of men in order to get rid of another group with whom they were dissatisfied. The vote in Montreal on the 16th of May was certainly not a vote on proportional representation, although the system was embodied in the questions which were submitted to the electorate. Anyone who will take the trouble to read the questions will see that they were very intricate. It was like giving a man one bill of fare that he has to accept all the way through, and another bill of fare that he has to accept all the way through. In the first bill of fare there were soup and fish and meat and everything and there was mention of proportional representation. In the other bill of fare there was something else in which proportional representation was not included, and the first bill of fare was discarded, but it was not because of proportional representation.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What else was on that bill of fare?

Mr. DENIS: I cannot answer that off-hand. There were several things. I would not take the responsibility of giving the details.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Were there any large principles involved?

Mr. DENIS: One principle, or one idea was the old system under which the city of Montreal was ruled some years ago of having a certain number of wards in which the local representative would be in contact with his electors. The other system was that representatives would be elected in three large constituencies, each selecting five members. If the system which has been defeated had been approved, the city of Montreal would have been divided into three constituencies, each constituency having five members. Then they would have proceeded along certain lines defined in the plan. I might also say that Mayor Martin who had control of the city of Montreal for some years came along and made it a personal affair.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: He decided which of those bills of fare he wanted?

Mr. DENIS: Yes, he chose his bill of fare, and according to some newspapers he went the limit in making use of prejudices. They discarded the group bill of fare.

Mr. HAROLD: Was not the most important thing involved proportional representation? Was that not the most important issue? The very fact which you mention, the difference between the single constituency representatives and the representatives of groups, would indicate that the issue was considered most important.

Mr. DENIS: Perhaps on the programme placed before the electors it may have been the issue, but it was not the issue which was defeated. How can we for a moment think that the voters of Montreal could decide the merits or demerits of proportional representation in a municipal election in which everything was entangled? Why, I remember that at the second meeting of this Committee there were members of Parliament who knew absolutely nothing about proportional representation. I do not blame them, and I am not saying that as a reflection upon anybody; it merely shows that the question is rather complicated, and how can you expect the people of Montreal to

become educated in regard to that system through a municipal election in which everything is mixed up?

The CHAIRMAN: Is it not the fact that the two systems voted upon were first practically the old system of electing 35 aldermen, the old ward system, and the second that of electing 15 members?

Mr. DENIS: In the city of Montreal they had a commission nominated by the Quebec Government consisting of five members I think, and there was a great deal of objection raised to that commission, and a great deal of prejudice, I believe. The people said, "Now we know what we got from that commission, and we are going to get rid of that commission. If you choose the system of dividing the city into three wards and electing in each five members, that would be just like any commission; they would control the city, and the people would be left out and would have no control, and when you want anything in your street or ward you will be neglected altogether." They said that the big interests would get control of the city because there would be only 15 members elected, five in each ward, and each ward has a population of 350,000 or 300,000. On the other hand, they said that if the people chose their aldermen in their own ward, they would know their aldermen and could go to them when they wanted anything. That was the kind of talk during the election in Montreal, and I know it because I am a voter in Montreal and the people voted against it. But it was no test at all, so far as proportional representation is concerned.

Mr. THOMSON: They were largely personal issues?

Mr. DENIS: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I was going to ask Mr. MacNeil if the issue was squarely placed before the people, so far as civic affairs was concerned, and the people turned it down by a good many votes, could Parliament impose upon these people for Federal purposes the issue of proportional representation? What is the situation in Vancouver, Mr. Crowe? Was proportional representation dropped there?

Mr. CROWE: Not yet. They have dropped it in Victoria, New Westminster, and Nelson.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Well, we will take the case of Victoria. Victoria, apparently, has decided that the proportional representation system, so far as municipal elections are concerned, should be dropped. Would it be fair for us to impose proportional representation for Federal purposes upon that city in view of that fact?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that a Federal election and a municipal election are two entirely different things.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What is the difference? They are seeking representatives in both cases?

The CHAIRMAN: In one case you have a party system, and in the other you have not, nor are there any principles involved, nor any great issue.

Mr. HAROLD: In connection with Mr. Calder's question, would it not be a good idea to consider the advisability of having a plebiscite at the time of a Federal election in the cities on the question of proportional representation as a forerunner to any decided action on the part of Parliament? That would seem to me to be an orderly way of going about it.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Could you not get on a little faster if we examined the witness?

By Mr. Crowe:

Q. You mentioned that your officers were elected by proportional representation? Did you mean in all your commands?—A. Not all of them. We are gradually educating them.

Q. That was only on the single alternative vote, not proportional representation. Whoever voted for the officers voted on the second or third choice?

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. In electing your president you did not have proportional representation?

By Mr. Crow:

Q. You are only taking the first, second and third choice in the election for president?—A. That is true. We have different systems in different branches.

By Hon. Mr. Calder:

Q. If you had to elect a committee of five men, you would apply the principle of proportional representation?—A. Yes. Of course we find it impossible to follow that system in our election for the Dominion, because we have to have one man from each province.

By Mr. Davidson:

Q. Has the sense of your Dominion organization been taken on the question of proportional representation in Dominion elections?—A. Yes, for two years the question has been before the organization, and on every occasion when it has been discussed, the opinion has been unanimously in favour of proportional representation, and I gave the reasons for that.

By Mr. Simpson:

Q. You have spoken strongly in favour of proportional representation and the grouping of constituencies. Have you ever given any thought to by-elections, of which we have a great many, as to the additional expense of having a by-election over a group where only one man is to be elected. Take Northern Ontario, we have five members representing that area, which is about eighty-five per cent of the area of Ontario. That was grouped into one constituency. Have you ever thought of the expense of conducting a by-election in that area?—A. When I came before the Committee I did not profess to be an expert on proportional representation. There are men in our association who have studied it more intensively than I have, who are unable to be present to-day, but we think it should be carried as far as practicable, and of course the case you mention would be an extreme one.

Witness retired.

Mr. CROW: I move a vote of thanks be tendered to the gentlemen who have appeared before the Committee, seconded by Mr. Thompson.

The motion was carried.

The CHAIRMAN: We made an effort to have a representative of the farmers before the Committee. The secretary wrote to Mr. Morrison, asking him to come or to send a representative, but we have had no reply.

Mr. HAROLD: He has just returned from California.

The Committee adjourned.