

*By Mr. Manion:*

Q. There is one thing I would like to add along the line of Mr. Davidson's question. Would you, as one in favour of proportional representation, recommend this to be adopted in the whole country all at once?—A. In Tasmania they use it, and the whole State of Tasmania is as big as New Brunswick. They divided the whole State of Tasmania into six constituencies, three of the constituencies were urban therefore they had one rural constituency as large as one-half of the province of New Brunswick and they have had no trouble in using it there.

Q. But take Northern Ontario for example. We have in Northern Ontario six constituencies, and they are as big as all the rest of Ontario?—A. Even as an advocate of proportional representation I am reasonable on that point. I think it would be inadvisable to do that. Six or eight constituencies would make very little difference in the whole House.

*By Mr. Sinclair (Guysborough):*

Q. Does that not open a road for gerrymandering in constituencies?—A. No. That area (indicating chart) has to be divided into five constituencies under the present system, and it can be done in either of these ways, and I have shown here how Labour with twenty thousand votes could elect two, and (non-Labour) with thirty thousand votes could elect three. It is true you might change the boundary line and cut off part of these voters, but you are merely weakening the quota there and adding to the quota in the next constituency.

Q. But you might "hire" them in one constituency?—A. It would not matter; in that case they would get one hundred per cent of the representations in that constituency.

Mr. HAROLD: I would like to bring up a question now which seems to me to be a dangerous condition in connection with proportional representation. There is one question which the Committee will have to sit upon and decide, and that is with regard to the single member constituency. Mr. Hooper has admitted, and I think everybody will agree that we are going to have a large number of single member constituencies for a long time in this country, and we have to decide now if under the present political conditions we have got to have a second choice transferable vote or a preferential vote, or whatever you call it, in these constituencies, and I would like to submit here the figures in the last Provincial election in Ontario, where the United Farmers had 256,874 votes and elected forty-five members; the Conservatives had 386,795 votes and elected twenty-five; the Liberals had 336,715 and elected twenty-nine; in other words, the United Farmers who had less than either of the others polled nearly as much as the other two—

A MEMBER: You mean elected?

Mr. HAROLD: Elected. That was accomplished through the three-cornered contest, and the way to overcome that would be that the electors would have the privilege of marking their ballots number one and number two, and if the number one choices when counted did not give a man fifty per cent of the votes and one over the low man would have to be dropped off, and his ballots according to how the elector marked them, would be added to the other candidates. If there were four or five candidates everyone would be dropped off from the bottom after each count until there were only two left, and then the one who had the most votes would be elected. In other words, the one who represented the sentiments of the majority of that constituency would be elected their representative.

Now we are going to have many three-cornered contests. In many cases there may be four or five candidates, and that is a question we should decide here as to whether we would recommend that any change be made from the present system. Now there are some objections to it, that it might have the result of eliminating one of the political parties. That happened in Germany at one time. They have a second choice

[Mr. Ronald H. Hooper.]