

like the idea because it means the billion dollars must be raised by taxation. But the Old Country stood between us and a ruthless enemy, and if she had not done so I do not know what might have happened.

Churchill was right. His countrymen never lost heart throughout the intensive air raids of 1940 and 1941, when tens of thousands of civilians were killed or wounded, and the destruction of houses and factories was appalling. No matter how much we may dislike taxing our people in order to help Great Britain, we must give sympathetic consideration to whatever steps the Government may deem necessary to meet this problem.

Then the rehabilitation of our soldier, sailor and air personnel will be a difficult proposition. While our boys were on active service they did not have to think about where they were going to sleep or eat, or what clothes they should wear; all they had to do was the fighting. Now as thousands of them return to Canada we have to help them re-establish themselves in civil life. Money alone will not do it. There must be sympathetic consideration by those of us who did not go through their ordeals and privations.

The Government have advised us that in October they are going to ask for a war loan totalling \$1,500,000,000. If the loan is to be a success the Government, in my judgment, have got to furnish fuller particulars than they have furnished up to date. It will be a very difficult loan to float; therefore I would ask that the Government give very much more detailed information, to satisfy not only the citizens who have money to lend, but people in this House and in the other House, so that they will clearly know what the purpose is.

The Minister of Finance can give us a full explanation of what the money is needed for, and he has got to do it. You cannot push the people around now as you could in war time and say "I want another \$1,500,000,000." They must know why the money is needed and for what it is intended to use it.

Now, honourable members, I am going to talk about something that to some of you may seem a little out of line in a debate on an appropriation bill. I propose to advocate the single transferable vote, and to tell you why I think the single transferable vote ought to be used in this country. Now, do not let anybody be confused by the two kinds of voting. One is the single transferable vote; the other is proportional representation. In the case of the single transferable vote you are dealing with one constituency, and there might be one candidate, two candidates or any number up to ten. The man or woman who gets a

majority of the total votes polled is elected. If nobody gets a majority on the first count, the last man is dropped, and the second choices are transferred, and so on until somebody is elected. That is the single transferable vote.

Under proportional representation there is a difference. It may be that four, eight, or ten members are to be elected for a single constituency. For instance, in the city of Winnipeg, ten members are to be elected. You divide the total number of votes cast by eleven, and add one. Only ten persons can be elected. However, I am not dealing with that phase at present. I am not sure that I believe in proportional representation. I do not think it is workable in a Dominion election. While you might use it in the cities you could not use it in the country. The constituencies would be all out of proportion, and the cities would be disfranchised. My honourable friends from Manitoba who sit opposite may not agree with me, but let me explain further.

At present there is an election on in Manitoba, and ten members are to be elected for Winnipeg. I predict that no party will have a majority of votes in that city. Some C.C.F.'s, some Liberals and some Progressive-Conservatives will be elected; there will also be some Independent Liberals and some Independents. These ten members will go into the Legislature and, because they cannot agree, lengthy discussions will take place as to what should be done. Therefore you virtually disfranchise the city, unless you have the same system for the country.

However, I am dealing to-day with the single transferable vote only. Permit me to say something about the recent federal election. I will take, for example, three provinces, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In Ontario 82 members were elected; 34 by a majority, and 48 by a minority vote. In Saskatchewan 21 members were elected; four by a majority—that is, each of these candidates got a majority over all—and 17 by a minority vote. In Manitoba 17 members were elected; two by a majority and 15 by a minority vote. This proposition would not apply to the province of Quebec nor to the Maritime Provinces. I venture to say, however, that it would apply to Alberta and to British Columbia. In Manitoba two candidates were elected by a majority. In Souris Mr. Ross had a clear majority over all, as Mr. Knowles did in Winnipeg North Centre. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Burton each had a clear majority. Nobody else did, and in some instances the vote was very nearly split three ways. In Ontario, 23 Progressive Conservatives and 11 Liberals had a clear majority.

Hon. Mr. HAIG.