

changed. A lot of good time was wasted just to please somebody's fancy to have a system like this. It has been thrown out in many places, but not in Alberta and Manitoba.

Those who advocate the alternative vote never tell you which system they want. There are five different systems of alternative voting. In Manitoba and Alberta you must vote for one candidate, but you do not have to vote for the others. That is outlawed in the United States. In Australia you had to vote for all the candidates. But that system has been thrown out of Australia. There are several different systems. Which system are you going to try to foist on this country? They must agree on something, and so they advocate the Alberta and Manitoba system, which calls for voting for one candidate only, and then you can do what you like with the others. That is outlawed in the state of Connecticut, in the state of Michigan, in the state of California, and I do not know in how many other states, because, according to the United States constitution, every vote must have the same value and it does not have the same value when in the one case you can vote for only one candidate, in another case you can vote for two, and in another case vote for three candidates or more. That makes a differentiation in the value of the votes, of one vote as against another. Therefore it is rightly outlawed, and it should be outlawed here.

The other system, the proportional transferable vote system is superior. It has some merit. But it, too, has been tried in many different places and thrown out; for instance, thrown out in Kalamazoo, Michigan; in New South Wales, Australia; in Toledo, in New York, in Cleveland and in Edmonton. It has been thrown out of Saskatoon, out of North Battleford, out of New Westminster, out of France and out of many other places. Why do we want to bother with this thing, Mr. Chairman? Anybody going in to vote does not want to be pestered with one, two, three, four choices. I always know for whom I am going to vote. I am not going to vote for free trade and protection at the same time. The people should know for whom they are going to vote. I could go on indefinitely. I have a lot more to say but I shall keep it in case somebody else speaks on this matter.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am sure it must be very interesting for those of us who come from Alberta to find how badly our system is working. As a matter of fact, I know of no one in Alberta who thinks it is working badly. But perhaps it is necessary for us to come here and listen to the experts tell us that we are all crazy and that we do not know what we are doing. However, we shall

[Mr. MacNicol.]

plod along in our own usual way, in spite of the experts and the kindly advice that we get here. I think it cannot be said of me, in any event, that I have become concerned because of recent political events in the elections in the Dominion of Canada and in the province of Alberta, because I did, standing where I now am, advocate this system of voting long before any of those elections were ever thought of.

I want to put this to hon. members, because we now have all these fractions, 70 odd per cent, 17 per cent and so on introduced, and I make this broad statement. Except for those of us who were nominated by acclamation by our parties, or where there was only a two-person contest, we were all nominated by the very principle embodied in the single transferable vote. In other words, if four people stand for nomination at a convention of any of our parties, the system invariably adopted is that the low man drops. We vote again and the next man drops, and we vote again until some person has received a minimum of 50 per cent, plus one vote of those in attendance. It might be said that you will get more than 50 per cent. Yes, you do. Therefore I emphasize the word "minimum". That is what the single transferable vote is, although in this case you have a ballot given you which gives you those alternative choices, without going through four or five votings as we do in any party convention that any of us have ever attended. That is the principle of the single transferable vote. It undertakes that all persons voting have a choice between the last two persons to be voted on. That is what it is. It means that every person voting has a choice between the winner and the runner-up. Can anyone suggest anything wrong with it? I do not mean these complicated fractions and percentages; but if we reduce the thing to its bones, to its very simple form, that is exactly what it is.

I do not intend to discuss or compare proportional representation with the single transferable vote. It does not apply to the same circumstances at all. Proportional representation is used only where you have a multiple-member constituency. The best example is any city which has not adopted the ward system. We heard that it was thrown out of here and thrown out of there. The answer is that the burghers and the voters of that city went back to the ward system and preferred to elect their members by that method. I will go along with my hon. friends over here that in multiple constituencies it does guarantee that the minorities have representation. I am not quarreling with that. We have it in our city, but it is something which is complicated.