

Now let me deal with some specific cases to show just what I mean. Take, for instance, Mr. Bracken, who had a good majority under the present system in Neepawa, Manitoba. He obtained 6,480 votes, about 1,900 more than the Liberal candidate, who got 4,568, and the C.C.F. candidate, who polled 2,986 votes. In other words, Mr. Bracken had 6,480 votes and his opponents 7,554. Yet on the surface it would appear that he had a big majority.

Let us go now to Selkirk, where a C.C.F. candidate was elected. We find that the C.C.F. candidate there polled 7,556 votes and his opponents 13,225 votes—nearly twice as many. The candidate who stood in second place was a Liberal, with 6,400 votes; the third was a Progressive Conservative, with 3,400 votes; the fourth was an Independent Liberal, with 2,000 votes, and the fifth a Social Creditor, with 1,300 votes. I do not know where those votes would have otherwise gone. I do not believe the Social Crediters would have voted for the C.C.F., or that the Independent Liberals would have voted for the C.C.F., but they might have. I am sure the Conservatives would not have voted for the C.C.F. Some of the votes die, but they do not all die.

In the Manitoba campaign and in coming campaigns we are going to be faced with three parties, the Liberal, the C.C.F. and the Progressive Conservative. The C.C.F. say, and I think they are correct, that their philosophy of government and life is absolutely opposed to that of the Liberal and Conservative parties. As a result, the voter first decides whether he is going to vote for the C.C.F. or one of the other parties; then he decides between those two parties.

Let me take another situation. Perhaps some of my honourable friends will be more interested in the constituency of Prince Albert than in Neepawa. In Prince Albert Mr. Bowerman polled 7,928 votes; the Prime Minister secured 7,799 votes; the Conservative candidate had 2,767, and the Social Credit candidate had 847. Bowerman was elected with about 8,000 votes; the total opposing vote was 11,400. Now if the Social Credit votes had been transferred, I do not know where they would have gone. I do not know where the Conservative votes would have gone, but I do not believe they would have gone to the C.C.F.

Now let us look at Lake Centre. Mr. Diefenbaker received 6,884 votes; the C.C.F. got 5,875; and the Liberals 3,812. In this situation I am persuaded that a large number of Liberals voted purposely for Diefenbaker to defeat the C.C.F. candidate.

Let us look at Qu'Appelle. Mrs. Strum received 6,146 votes; Mr. Perley had 5,400 votes; the Minister of Defence had practically 4,900. Now under the single transferable system where would those 4,900 votes have gone? From my knowledge of Saskatchewan I am certain that great numbers of them would have gone to Mr. Perley. The same situation prevails in Manitoba. We do not hear the C.C.F.'ers in Manitoba advocating the single transferable vote. In fact, in the Winnipeg Free Press to-day there is a letter criticizing that paper because it advocated the single transferable vote. It said: "You must want to keep down the under dog." No doubt the author was a C.C.F.'er and was afraid of the single transferable vote.

Now, honourable members, let me take a typical instance in the province of Ontario, that of the constituency of Wentworth. Mr. Lennard, a young man, got 15,458 votes; the Liberal candidate got 13,652; and the C.C.F. got 11,915. In other words, Mr. Lennard became the member for Wentworth with 15,500 votes, but he had opposed to him 25,500 votes. Here, again, it is not known what would have happened if the 11,900 C.C.F. votes had been transferred. But why not try the scheme? Someone may say to me, "Yes, Mr. Haig, but when I go in to vote. I vote for the Liberals. Why should I make a second choice and vote for the Conservatives? I don't believe in their policy." The only difficulty with that statement is this, that the voter does make a second choice for the Conservative.

I am sure most honourable senators have been at one time members of provincial legislatures, also members of the House of Commons. They know that many men and women, even in the same family, are divided in their political choice. They say they don't know whether to vote for this side or that side. The result is that one vote is cast for one side and a cancelling vote is cast for the other side. Under the system in Manitoba we find that votes are transferred.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: You don't have to transfer?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: No, you don't have to—this is a free country—but you do. I am thinking of the province of Manitoba, where 15 men are in office on a minority vote.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Fifteen out of how many?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Out of 17. In the province of Saskatchewan, 17 out of 21 are in by a minority vote. Even in Ontario, where