is a bad one. Let us examine it together.

MULTIPLE OR BLOCK VOTING.

In the ordinary method of voting each elector has as many votes as there are aldermen or councillors to be elected. No specific name is in common use here for this method, but as a matter of convenience we must give it some name. It has been called both the "multiple vote" and the "block vote." The last-named term is in use in Australia, and is the shorter of the two, so we will adopt it. The meaning is, of course, that you vote for a "block" of candidates instead of for one. In a city electing nine aldermen, "at large," each elector has nine votes; so that if two thousand electors go to the polls, about eighteen thousand votes will be cast; probably less, because the full franchise is not ordinarily used by every voter. Then the nine candidates having the highest number of votes are declared elected.

MONOPOLY OF REPRESENTATION.

The block vote leads to a monopoly of representation. That is the first defect that we find, and it is bad enough. A mere section of the voters, who may be either a majority or a minority, can sweep the polls, elect all the aldermen, and get all the representation. This is monopoly with a vengeance!

Take as an illustration a city in which nine thousand voters go to the polls to elect nine aldermen. If five thousand voters unite on a ticket of nine candidates, they can elect the whole council and the other four thousand voters will not be able to elect anybody.

Each of these five thousand voters has nine votes, and this enables them to place their nine candidates at the top of the poll, by giving each candidate about five thousand votes. The remaining four thousand electors may unite on another ticket if they like, but they are powerless. They can only give each of their candidates four thousand votes, so that these are all placed below the candidates of the five thousand.

Consequently, these four thousand voters are disfranchised and unrepresented, although, being four-ninths of the electorate, they are entitled to elect four out of the nine councillors. Is that fair, or even decent?

MAJORITY AND MINORITY.

Some one may say, "Oh, well, the five thousand are a majority, and the majority must govern." Such a remark shows confusion of thought.

Representation is one thing; government and legislation is another. Your city council ought to represent all the voters who come to the polls, not a mere section of them. First get a full and fair representation of the voters, then let a majority of the representatives rule when it comes to a decision, Yes or No, on any measure. And there is much to be done in any governing or executive body besides merely voting Yes and No. An intelligent minority of representatives has great weight and influence; its voice can be heard; it can present the views of those whom it represents; it can watch the majority and keep them straight if need be. These things are the clear rights of the minority, and they are denied by the use of the block vote.

POLITICS BROUGHT IN.

The preceding illustration—five thousand and four thousand electors—is a moderate one, and affords ample margin to allow for scattering votes and for the introduction of independent candidates. Where general politics are rampant in municipal matters, and the two great parties are pretty evenly divided, the party tickets will count overwhelmingly under the block system, and independent candidates will get but few votes, because your average voter hates to throw away his vote on a man with a slim chance.

Here we put a finger on one disadvantage of abolishing the wards without providing a better plan of voting. It offers an inducement to introduce general politics into municipal affairs. The temptation thus to gain a party advantage or win a party victory would be very strong.

GOVERNMENT BY MINORITY.

We have not yet exhausted the delightful possibilities of the block vote. Let us vary our illustration, and suppose that there are three "tickets" in the field, each nominating nine aldermen. The strongest ticket gets the votes of four thousand electors; and the other two tickets get respectively the votes of three thousand and two thousand electors. Then the majority is unrepresented. What shall we say of a system under which such an outrage is possible?

If you say that we are raising a bugaboo which could not materialize, we point you to the Toronto municipal elections of January, 1898. In Ward Six, on that occasion, the four elected aldermen received about 3,500 votes, whilst the defeated candidates got over four thousand! So that the aldermen in this ward were elected by a minority of the votes—47 per cent.