

Mr. HALBERT: That single transferable vote is not exactly Proportional Representation.

Mr. HAYDON: That is the Hare system.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your opinion with regard to the application of Proportional Representation to, say the Peterboro election, where there were five candidates running?

Mr. HAYDON: Had there been proportional representation, it is doubtful whether the result would have been what it is now.

The CHAIRMAN: You think it would be preferable to have the alternative vote where the man elected would require to have a majority.

Mr. HAYDON: Of course.

Mr. HAROLD: It would be better to make your point clear. In speaking of Proportional Representation we always think of the group constituency, but this is a question with regard to a single member constituency which we will always have in large numbers in this country, no matter how much we try to adopt proportional representation on account of the great area of the country and the impossibility of combining constituencies. For instance, take the Yukon, the Gaspé Peninsula, and the large constituency in northern Ontario, in Saskatchewan and British Columbia: the point is—and it is one of the things we have to consider—are you prepared to express an opinion for your organization with regard to whether they prefer to have the present system of electing the man that gets the most votes, or whether it would be changed so that a man could not represent that constituency unless he had the majority of votes behind him, which is arrived at by taking the second choice votes, starting at the bottom and eliminating the one who is last on the list, until you come to two members. You see the effect of that. It works out in this way; that in some instances groups do not get a good representation possibly as they might under the present system, and there is a difference of opinion among those who are in groups as to whether that change should be made, and while we are considering that we would like to have a definite statement if you could give it to us, as to how your organization stands on that question.

Mr. HAYDON: I might say that we run all our elections where there are single officers to be elected in this way; we eliminate the low man and vote over again. That is not really proportional representation, and for a Federal election I doubt whether that system could be carried out. I am of the opinion that proportional representation can be conducted in a single constituency as well as in a group constituency, but we are strongly of the opinion that group constituencies are at all times desirable. I understand that there will be cases where it will be impossible to have a group constituency, but the same thing can take place, and proportional representation can well be applied in single constituencies.

The CHAIRMAN: We call that the alternative vote.

Mr. HAROLD: Take a constituency where there are three groups and three candidates, a Labour man, a Farmer, and a Party man. Now in the first choice the Labour man may head the poll. Under our present system he would be elected, but under this system, the Farmer might be the last one and he would drop off, and perhaps the majority of his votes would go to the Party man, which might increase his votes to such an extent that he would have more votes than the Labour man, or it might be shifted round to any other result. That is proportional representation so far as that is concerned in that riding, if you want to call it proportional representation, but it is really what you call the single transferable vote in that riding. Do you want to change that? Would you be in favour of a change with regard to our present system of elections in those single member ridings?

Mr. HAYDON: Yes, we are. Our whole desire is to establish faith in constituted authorities, and under our present system of elections, there is no guarantee that the majority will rule, and in a true democracy the majority must rule.

[Mr. J. A. P. Haydon.]