

C. A candidate, to ensure election, need not poll a majority, but only a certain proportion of the votes cast.

This proportion, which is the least number of votes sufficient to render certain the election of a candidate, is called the quota. Thus, in a single-member constituency a candidate who polls one more than half the votes must be elected; the quota is therefore one more than half. So, in a two-member constituency the quota is one more than a third, for not more than two candidates can poll so much; and in a three-member constituency one more than a fourth, and so on. Therefore, to ascertain the quota, divide the total of the votes by one more than the number of seats to be filled and add one to the result.

D. The returning officer ascertains the result of the election as follows:—

(1) He counts each ballot paper as one vote to the candidate marked 1 thereon; he also counts the total number of votes.

(2) He ascertains the quota.

(3) He declares elected the candidates who have received the quota.

(4) He transfers in strict proportions the surplus votes of those candidates who have received more than the quota, and credits them to the unelected candidates indicated by the figures 2, 3 and so on, as the next preferences of the electors whose votes are transferred. This operation renders all votes effective; votes are used and not wasted.

(5) He declares elected those candidates who, after the transfer of surplus votes, have obtained the quota.

(6) He eliminates the candidates lowest on the poll one after another by transferring their votes in accordance with the wishes of their supporters to the candidates indicated as next preferences. This process is continued until the required number of candidates, having each obtained the quota, have been declared elected, or the number of candidates not eliminated is reduced to the number of seats still vacant, in which event the candidates not eliminated are declared elected.

This system, as hon. members will see who will take the trouble to look at the formula which I have quoted, is in reality a very simple one. It has been made the subject in England of two important tests. One of these elections took place in 1906 and the other in 1908. Both were eminently successful. An account of each of these elections is given in the journals of the society. In the case of the last one, the names of 12 well known public men of England, including the former Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister were chosen. The newspapers in England, the great organs of public opinion, consented to give the greatest possible publicity to ballots containing these names. I think that the last day of sending in ballots was the 1st of December. The ballots were all returned to a central office in London. I may say that, in the first test, there had been only 6,000 votes. But, as evincing the increasing public interest in this question in England, I may explain that there were

Mr. MONK.

over 21,000 votes cast in this last test election. These votes were counted in Caxton Hall, Westminster, under the presidency of Lord Avebury the president and Lord Courtenay the vice-president of the league. There were present 40 volunteers to count the votes and the count began at a quarter to six o'clock; practically, the counting occupied from six o'clock to twelve o'clock, at which time the result of the election was proclaimed. This shows that the objection very often formulated against this system, that it would take too long to count the ballots, is absolutely without foundation. But there is no question as to that now; every one in England admits that under this system the ballots can be counted in a reasonable time.

I may say that the system advocated by this league in England, the single transferable vote, is advocated by a league in the province of Ontario, Mr. Robert Tyson, one of the principal citizens of Toronto, being the chief officer of that league. That system has been in use for quite a time in Toronto for the election of delegates from the labour council to the Labour Congress of Canada, and it has always given the most perfect satisfaction. Indeed I may say there is no country where the proportional system has been adopted that has manifested any desire to return to the old and defective system which is in force in this country. That system is not only attracting the attention of electoral reformers in England, but it has been actually put into operation in several British dependencies, in New Zealand and Queensland with excellent results. Bills for the adoption of the proportional representative system, and the single transferable vote, if I mistake not, have been adopted in some of the American states, and are, or were a short time ago, pending in many of the Australian states. They were pending a short time ago in South Australia. The system is about to be adopted in Tasmania; and Mr. Deakin, the Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, is known to be an advocate of that system, and has evinced a disposition to see it adopted throughout the Commonwealth. It has been adopted quite recently in the new constitution of the South African confederation, which has not yet even received its ratification from the British parliament. In the 'Times' newspaper of the 10th February, I think, the scheme is published, and it proposes to adopt the system of proportional representation for the election of members of the executive members of provincial councils; it is to that limited degree embodied in the constitution. There is every expectation that an electoral reform on the lines of proportional representation will be introduced as soon as the Commonwealth of South Africa is definitely organized. At present it is in the constitution, and I