Under the Point System the same 100 votes, as marked for choices in the Alberta system, would be tabulated showing the number of each candidate's first, second, third and fourth choices as follows:-

|  |  |  |  | First | Second | Third | Fourth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Brown.. | .. | . | . | 40 | 5 | 5 | $50-100$ |
| Robb.. | .. | .. | $\cdots$ | 30 | 5 | 25 | $40-100$ |
| Jones.. | .. | . | $\cdots$ | 20 | 10 | 65 | $5-100$ |
| Smith.. | .. | .. | $\cdots$ | 10 | 80 | 5 | $5-100$ |
|  |  |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Although only 10 per cent of the electorate chose Smith as their first choice, 80 per cent of the people wished to have Smith as their representative if they failed to elect their own candidate. Therefore he represents more fairly than any other the whole electorate.

In valuing this ballot we allow 4 points for first choice, 3 points for second, 2 points for third and 1 point for fourth. The results would then be tabulated as follows:-

| Brown. . . . | 160 | 15 | 10 | $50-235$ points |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Robb. . . | 120 | 15 | 50 | $40-225$ points |
| Jones. . . . | 80 | 30 | 130 | $5-245$ points |
| Smith. . . . | 40 | 240 | 10 | $5-295$ points |

This shows clearly that Smith is the majority choice. This can be proved in another way.

By holding elections between any and every two of the above candidates separately and dropping the low man each time Smith would be elected. To further explain this we will show all possible elections held one after the other the same 100 people voting each time.

Brown vs. Robb<br>Brown vs. Jones<br>Brown vs. Smith<br>Robb vs. Jones<br>Robb vs. Smith<br>Jones vs. Smith

It does not matter when or against whom Smith runs he will always be elected since he will be backed by all, or nearly all, the supporters of the two candidates not running.

Putting it in another way. Suppose there are four nearly equal groups of voters. The first group wish to elect Brown, but if they can't have Brown they want Smith. The second group wants Robb, but if they can't have Robb they want Smith. The third group wants Jones, but if they can't have Jones they want Smith. It is obvious that Smith is the choice of the majority of the people, whereas under the present systems he would not be elected.

This system can be used for any number of candidates by counting the number of names on the ballot and using this number as a value for first choice.

The superiority of this system of electing representatives is too obvious to need further explanation. In the days of two-candidate contests the ballot was the weapon of the people. This is no longer the case with three or more candidates in the field. Let us rearm the electorate with an up-to-date weapon.

