

File No.:

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:

JOAN RUSSOW and THE GREEN PARTY OF CANADA

Applicants

- and -

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA,
THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER OF CANADA and
HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA**

Respondents

AFFIDAVIT OF ALAN C. CAIRNS

I, ALAN C. CAIRNS, of the City of Waterloo in the Province of Ontario, MAKE

OATH AND SAY:

1. I am Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of British Columbia and adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Waterloo. I received a Bachelor of Arts in 1953 and a Master of Arts in 1957 from the University of Toronto, and a D. Phil. from St. Antony's College, Oxford University, in 1963. In the year 1982-3, I was the Mackenzie King visiting Professor of Canadian Studies at Harvard University, and in 1995-6, I was the John Willis Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Toronto. Among my awards and honours are a Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal (1977), a Molson Prize of the Canada Council (1982), the Governor General's International Award for Canadian Studies (1994), and three honorary

Doctors of Laws, from Carleton University (1994), the University of Toronto (1996), and the University of British Columbia (1998). In 1998, I was made an Officer of the Order of Canada. I have written several academic texts on Canadian politics including *Constitution, Government and Society in Canada: Selected Essays by Alan C. Cairns* (1988), *Disruptions: Constitutional Struggles from the Charter to Meech Lake* (1991), *Charter versus Federalism: The Dilemmas of Constitutional Reform* (1992), and *Reconfigurations: Canadian Citizenship and Constitutional Change* (1995), *Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and The Canadian State* (2000).

2. In 1967, I undertook a study of Canada's election laws, in order to examine some of the claims that are made on the behalf of the SMP system. The results were published in my article, "The Electoral System and the Party System in Canada, 1921-1965" in (1968) 1 Canadian Journal of Political Science 55. In particular, I examined the claim that even if systems of proportional representation weighted votes in an election more equally than SMP laws, the latter fosters a party system that acts as a unifying agency, which is of critical importance in a country where sectional cleavages are very significant. A copy of my study is appended hereto as Exhibit A.
3. The defining feature of any election law is the principle or system it uses to translate votes cast in an election into seats in a parliament or legislative assembly. There are two dominant electoral models used in modern democratic states in the world today. Most countries build their laws around a principle of proportional representation (PR). Some, including Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States use a system known as the single member plurality (SMP) model. Others, including Germany, Italy, Mexico and New Zealand use a system that incorporates features of both.

4. Electoral systems based upon a principle of proportional representation award seats to parties in direct proportion to the percentage of the popular vote that the party actually commands. PR systems commonly make use of multi-member constituencies in which several candidates, usually from different parties, are elected to the legislature. In principle, every candidate is elected who receives a minimum number of votes, calculated by dividing the number of seats in the constituency by the number of votes cast. Governments are typically formed by coalitions of parties that collectively command more than fifty per cent of the seats. There are several different variants of the PR model, some of which use the SMP system to fill a portion of the seats in the legislature. These mixed models preserve the geographical salience of the riding system while achieving greater representation of parties in the allocation of seats in the legislature.
5. The Canada Elections Act employs a single-member plurality model. In SMP systems, candidates who obtain a plurality of votes in individual, geographically defined ridings, are awarded seats in the legislature. With many ridings in Canada currently being contested by candidates from three or four major parties, the proportion of the vote that is required to achieve a plurality is almost always less than fifty per cent – meaning that it is usually the case that a majority of the voting electorate has not supported the elected candidate. The party that is awarded the most seats in the legislature forms the government through the installation of a cabinet, while the party with the second-highest number of seats becomes the official opposition.
6. In my study I found that Canada's Elections Act has not been impartial in its translation of votes into seats in the House of Commons. In fact, it is strongly biased in

favour of whatever party wins the election as well as all regional or sectional parties that enjoy a basic minimum, threshold level of support. An examination of historical data from federal elections reveals that Parliament has consistently failed to reflect, with even rough accuracy, the distribution of partisan support in the different regions and provinces in the country. Because Canada's Elections Act employs the SMP model to translate votes into seats, it has favoured parties with concentrated sectional support like Alliance/Reform and the Bloc Québécois, and discouraged those with diffuse national support like the Progressive Conservative and New Democratic parties. In addition, Canada's Elections Act has been a major factor in the identification of particular sections of the country and provinces with different national parties. It has also frequently undervalued the partisan diversity that exists within each section /province. In effect, the SMP system has rendered the parliamentary composition of each of the major national parties less representative of the sectional interests in the political system than is the party electorate from which that representation is derived. A further effect of the identification of particular parties with particular sections/provinces is the exaggeration of regional and sectional cleavages, thus tending to transform contests between parties into contests between regions or sections.

7. In my study, I collected data that shows how Canada's electoral system positively favours parties with sectional strongholds and, except for the party that wins the election, discriminates against parties that draw their support from all parts of the country. In my study, I highlighted the fate of the Reconstruction party in the 1935 election, as a classic example of the latter phenomenon. In that election, the Reconstruction party won 8.7 per cent of the vote, but was rewarded with only one seat

in the House (0.4 per cent) and promptly disappeared from the political scene. By comparison, the Social Credit party won seventeen seats with less than half the number of votes that the Reconstruction party had received. The treatment of the CCF/NDP by the electoral system in federal elections is equally revealing. This party, with diffuse support and aspirations of becoming a major national party, has never received as many seats as would have been justified by its voting support. In six of the ten federal elections that took place between 1935 and 1965, the CCF/NDP received less than half the seats to which it would have been entitled had seats been awarded according to the proportion of the popular vote each party received (See Exhibit A, Table III, and especially the results in 1935, 1940, 1949, 1958, 1963 and 1965).

8. The results in the federal elections that have taken place since my study confirm, in a very dramatic way, my conclusion that the Canada Elections Act systematically discriminates against voters who support parties with diffuse national support that do not win the election. In the most recent election on November 27, 2000, citizens who voted for Progressive Conservative or New Democratic Party candidates got much less representation in the House of Commons than they would have received if the seats had been distributed on the basis of their share of the popular vote. The Conservatives were limited to 4% of the seats in the Commons, even though they won 12% of the vote. They elected no representations from Ontario and Québec even though they got 15% and 6% of the vote, respectively, in each province. Canadians who voted for New Democratic Party candidates did slightly better but their share of Commons' seats was only half of their percentage of the popular vote. In terms of the contribution of each ballot toward the election of an MP who shared the voter's political point of view,

there were huge disparities between the parties. As a matter of equality of voting power (calculated by dividing the number of seats a party occupies in the House of Commons by the number of votes it received), the votes of those who supported Liberal candidates counted the most. In effect Canadians who voted for the Liberal Party were able to claim a seat in the House of Commons for every 30,184 votes they cast. Bloc seats were worth 36,258 votes. By contrast, each Progressive Conservative and New Democratic Party MP represents 130,582 and 84,134 voters respectively. Rather than parity of voting power, Liberal votes were almost three times more valuable than those that were cast for the NDP and more than four times those that were marked for a Conservative. A copy of the Official Voting Results from the Chief Electoral Officer is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

9. In the 1997 federal election, the disparities were as bad and in some cases even worse. For example, the Liberals were able to win 51.5 per cent of the seats with 38.4 per cent of the vote, whereas the Progressive Conservatives (PCs) won just 6.6 per cent of the seats with 18.9 per cent of the votes and the Bloc Québécois (BQ) won 14.6 per cent of the seats with 10.7 per cent of the vote. In effect, the Conservatives won fewer than half the seats held by the Bloc Québécois even though they received almost twice as many votes. The results can be described in terms of parity of voting power by noting that the Liberals won a seat for every 31, 817 votes where the PCs won a seat for every 121, 287 votes. The BQ, running a strictly regional campaign, won a seat for every 31, 233 votes and the Reform party with its support concentrated in the west, won one for every 41, 501 votes. The NDP managed one seat for every 67, 723 votes. Expressed in terms of winning seats in Parliament, a vote cast for the Bloc Québécois was worth

four times more than a ballot marked for a Conservative. Even within the province of Québec, a vote for the Bloc was almost twice as valuable as a ballot that was cast for the Liberals. A copy of the Official Voting Results, 1997, from the Chief Electoral Officer is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

10. The 1993 federal election provides even more dramatic examples of the relative disparity in voting power between regionally based and nationally based parties. In that election, the PCs won just 0.67 per cent of the seats with 16 per cent of the vote, whereas the BQ took 18.3 per cent of the seats with 13.5 per cent of the vote. In other words, the BQ won a seat for every 34, 186 votes whereas the PCs received a seat for every 1,093, 211 votes. Expressed in terms of winning seats in the legislature, each BQ vote was worth 32 PC votes. The Reform Party with most of its supporters concentrated in the west took 17.6 per cent of the seats in the Commons on the strength of 18.7 per cent of the popular vote. In the result, even though the Conservatives won more votes than the Bloc Québécois and almost as many as Reform, they won only two seats compared to the other two parties who elected 54 and 52 candidates respectively. The bias in favour of regional parties was so pronounced in this election that, in the province of Quebec, the BQ elected an MP for every 34,186 votes whereas each Liberal, MP effectively represented 65,046 politically like minded people. A copy of the Official Voting Results, 1993, from Chief Electoral Officer is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

11. No less important than the way in which Canada's election law discriminates against voters who support national parties that do not win the election, is the manner in which the law denies effective representation of regional interests in all parties that aspire to

build a national base. In my study, I showed how major sections of the country were denied effective representation in both of the two major national parties of the day. For fourteen consecutive elections, covering nearly half a century, there was a consistent and marked overrepresentation of Québec in the parliamentary Liberal party and marked under-representation in the parliamentary Conservative Party, with the exception of 1958. In contrast, for ten consecutive elections from 1921 to 1957, Ontario was consistently and markedly over-represented in the parliamentary Conservative party, and for eleven consecutive elections from 1921 to 1958, there was a consistent under-representation of Ontario in the parliamentary Liberal party. Thus the electoral system, by pulling the parliamentary Liberal party toward Quebec and the parliamentary Conservative party toward Ontario, made the sectional cleavages between the parties much more pronounced in Parliament than they were in the electorate. (See Exhibit A, Table IV).

12. An analysis of CCF/NDP votes and seats from 1935-1965 shows how its supporters in Ontario have been discriminated against in the same way. With the exception of 1940, CCF Ontario voting support consistently constituted between 30 and 40 per cent of total CCF voting support. Yet the contribution of Ontario to CCF parliamentary representation was unimpressive. During the same period there was a marked over-representation of Saskatchewan in the CCF caucus. The 1945 election is illustrative. The 260, 000 votes from Ontario, 31.9 per cent of the total CCF vote, produced no seats at all, while 167, 000 supporters from Saskatchewan, 20.5 per cent of the total party vote, were rewarded with eighteen seats, 64.3 per cent of total party seats. In

these circumstances, it was not surprising that observers were led to mislabel the CCF an agrarian party (See Exhibit A, Table IV).

13. Since my study, the distortion in representation from Quebec has continued. In the 1980 election, for example, the Liberal party won 98.7 per cent of the seats even though 30 per cent of the electorate voted for other parties. By comparison, the PCs were awarded only one seat in the House despite winning 12.6 per cent of the votes in that province. In effect, the Liberals won a seat for every 27, 259 votes they received while it took 268, 409 Conservative votes to elect a member from Québec to Parliament. Like the Conservatives, the New Democrats continue to be under-represented in Québec. In 1988, the NDP was unable to win a single seat in that province even though it received 14 per cent of the vote. In contrast, the regionally based Bloc Québécois has prospered under the Canada Elections Act and the SMP rule. The BQ has consistently won a higher percentage of seats from Québec in Parliament than its share of the Québec vote. For example, in 1993 the Bloc Québécois won 72 per cent of the seats in the province, even though it received less than 50 per cent of the votes. Copies of the Official Voting Results of 1980 and 1988 from the Chief Electoral Officer are attached hereto as Exhibit E.

14. Another dramatic example of how regional interests can be denied effective representation in national politics occurred in the 1972 and 1974 elections that were won by the Liberals. In both elections not a single Liberal was elected from Alberta, despite the fact that the party received 25 per cent of the vote in the province. In the result, not only were Liberal supporters in Alberta denied parity of voting power and effective representation in Parliament but, in addition, their voice was muted in cabinet

as well. In the 1980 federal election the Liberals were practically shut out of all Western Canada. They only won 2% of the seats in the four provinces even though they received 23% of the popular vote and once again their representation at the cabinet table suffered as a result.

15. In the last federal election when the Alliance Party tried to expand its support across the country it experienced the same kind of regional distortion in electing representatives outside of its base in Western Canada and in particular in Ontario. Even though it polled almost half as many votes as the Liberals in Ontario it elected only two candidates compared to 100 for the Liberals. (See Exhibit B).

16. In summary, an examination of the historical results of federal elections reveals that the SMP system persists in favouring supporters of regionally concentrated parties and discriminates against supporters of national parties with diffuse support that do not win the election. This discrimination inheres in two major effects of the voting system. First, the rule of winner-take-all denies parity of voting power to everyone who votes for candidates who do not win a plurality in a specific, geographical riding. In addition, voters who support parties that do not elect many candidates in particular regions of the country are denied effective representation in the parliamentary caucuses of the parties they support. This denial is particularly troublesome when a province or region is denied a presence in the executive branch of government that is proportionate to its electoral support. The salience offered to sectional cleavages by the single-member constituency system has led several authors to query its appropriateness for national integration in special circumstances. It has been suggested that countries possessed of strong underlying tendencies to sectionalism may be better served by

proportional representation which breaks up the monolithic nature of sectional representation stimulated by single-member constituency systems. The United States is often cited as a country where the SMP system has heightened cleavages and tensions between north and south. Whatever its other merits, the SMP system lacks the singular capacity of proportional representation to encourage all parties to search for votes in all sections of the country. Minorities within different provinces and regions of the country are not frozen out, as they tend to be under the existing system. Consequently sectional differences in party representation are minimized or, more accurately, given proportionate rather than exaggerated representation -- a factor that encourages the parties to develop a national orientation.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City)
of Waterloo in the Province of Ontario)
this)
day of April, 2001)
)

Alan Cairns

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits, etc.

APPENDIX A

Minor parties: percentages of seats and votes

	Progressives		Reconstruction		CCF/NDP		Social Credit		Créditiste	
	votes	seats	votes	seats	votes	seats	votes	seats	votes	seats
1921	23.1	27.7								
1925	9.0	9.8								
1926	5.3	8.2								
1930	3.2	4.9								
1935			8.7	0.4	8.9	2.9	4.1	6.9		
1940					8.5	3.3	2.7	4.1		
1945					15.6	11.4	4.1	5.3		
1949					13.4	5.0	3.7	3.8		
1953					11.3	8.7	5.4	5.7		
1957					10.7	9.4	6.6	7.2		
1958					9.5	3.0	2.6	--		
1962					13.5	7.2	11.7	11.3		
1963					13.1	6.4	11.9	9.1		
1965					17.9	7.9	3.7	1.9	4.7	3.4

APPENDIX B

Liberals and Conservatives: Percentage of total parliamentary strength and total electoral support from Quebec and Ontario

	Conservatives				Liberals			
	Ontario		Quebec		Ontario		Quebec	
	seats	votes	seats	votes	seats	votes	seats	votes
1921	74.0	47.1	--	15.5	18.1	26.6	56.0	43.8
1925	58.6	47.4	3.4	18.4	11.1	30.1	59.6	37.8
1926	58.2	44.9	4.4	18.7	20.3	31.7	46.9	33.4
1930	43.1	38.9	17.5	24.0	24.2	33.7	44.0	30.6
1935	62.5	43.1	12.5	24.7	32.4	34.4	31.8	31.5
1940	62.5	48.6	2.5	16.4	31.5	34.4	33.7	31.2
1945	71.6	52.7	3.0	8.3	27.2	34.6	42.4	33.3
1949	61.0	43.6	4.9	22.6	29.0	31.9	35.2	33.2
1953	64.7	44.2	7.8	26.0	29.8	32.6	38.6	34.2
1957	54.5	42.9	8.0	21.7	20.0	31.1	59.0	38.1
1958	32.2	36.2	24.0	25.7	30.6	33.3	51.0	37.8
1962	30.2	36.9	12.1	21.6	44.0	39.2	35.0	28.6
1963	28.4	37.8	8.4	16.0	40.3	39.1	36.4	29.3
1965	25.8	37.4	8.2	17.3	38.9	38.6	42.7	30.0

APPENDIX C

Thirty-sixth General Election 1997:
Official Voting Results

TABLE 7/TABLEAU 7

Trente-sixième élection générale 1997 :
Résultats officiels du scrutin

Distribution of seats, by political affiliation and sex
Répartition des sièges, par appartenance politique et par sexe

Province or Territory - Province ou territoire	Liberal Party of Canada - Parti libéral du Canada		Reform Party of Canada - Le Parti Réformiste du Canada		Bloc Québécois		New Democratic Party - Nouveau Parti Démocratique		Progressive Conservative Party of Canada - Parti progressiste- conservateur du Canada		Others - Autres		Total	
	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes	Male Hommes	Female Femmes
Newfoundland / Terre-Neuve	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	0
Prince Edward Island / Île-du-Prince-Édouard	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Nova Scotia / Nouvelle-Écosse	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	8	3
New Brunswick / Nouveau-Brunswick	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	7	3
Quebec / Québec	20	6	0	0	33	11	0	0	4	1	0	0	57	18
Ontario	76	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	78	25
Manitoba	6	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	12	2
Saskatchewan	1	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
Alberta	1	1	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	3
British Columbia / Colombie-Britannique	4	2	23	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	29	5
Northwest Territories / Territoires du Nord-Ouest	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Yukon Territory / Territoire du Yukon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals/Totaux	118	37	56	4	33	11	13	8	18	2	1	0	239	62
%	49.4	59.7	23.4	6.5	13.8	17.7	5.4	12.9	7.5	3.2	0.4	0.0	79.4	20.6
Canada	155		60		44		21		20		1		301	
%	51.5		19.9		14.6		7.0		6.6		0.3		100	

Reproduced from the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the Thirty-Sixth General Election, online at http://www.elections.ca/election/results/results_e.html, last visited Thursday, March 09, 2000.

APPENDIX D

Thirty-sixth General Election 1997:
Official Voting Results

TABLE 8/TABLEAU 8

Trente-sixième élection générale 1997 :
Résultats officiels du scrutin

Number of valid votes, by political affiliation
Nombre de votes valides, par appartenance politique

Province or Territory - Province ou territoire	Bloc Québécois	Canadian Action Party - Parti action canadienne	Christian Heritage Party of Canada - Parti de l'Héritage Chrétien du Canada	Liberal Party of Canada - Parti libéral du Canada
Newfoundland / Terre-Neuve	0	0	0	84,657
Prince Edward Island / Île-du-Prince-Édouard	0	0	145	31,595
Nova Scotia / Nouvelle-Écosse	0	0	0	132,539
New Brunswick / Nouveau-Brunswick	0	0	0	131,246
Quebec / Québec	1,385,821	304	1,494	1,342,567*
Ontario	0	10,903	17,551	2,294,593
Manitoba	0	159	1,974	163,226
Saskatchewan	0	1,389	0	109,200
Alberta	0	418	1,528	253,983
British Columbia / Colombie-Britannique	0	4,329	6,257	438,769
Northwest Territories / Territoires du Nord-Ouest	0	0	0	8,866
Yukon Territory / Territoire du Yukon	0	0	136	3,036
Totals/Totaux	1,385,821	17,502	29,085	4,994,277*

* Revised data, March 2000 / Données révisées, mars 2000

Thirty-sixth General Election 1997: TABLE 8/TABLEAU 8 Trente-sixième élection générale 1997 :
 Official Voting Results Résultats officiels du scrutin

Number of valid votes, by political affiliation (continued)
 Nombre de votes valides, par appartenance politique (suite)

Province or Territory - Province ou territoire	Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada - Parti Marxist-Léniniste du Canada	Natural Law Party of Canada - Parti de la loi naturelle du Canada	New Democratic Party - Nouveau Parti Démocratique	Progressive Conservative Party of Canada - Parti progressiste-conservateur du Canada	Reform Party of Canada - Le Parti Réformiste du Canada	The Green Party of Canada - Le Parti Vert du Canada	Independent - Indépendant	No affiliation - Aucune appartenance	Total
Newfoundland / Terre-Neuve	0	510	49,125	82,214	5,632	388	0	1,054	223,580
Prince Edward Island / Île-du-Prince-Édouard	0	74	10,675	26,998	1,056	0	0	0	70,543
Nova Scotia / Nouvelle-Écosse	159	2,015	142,081	143,854	45,207	0	1,264	251	467,370
New Brunswick / Nouveau-Brunswick	0	2,519	73,249	139,431	52,270	0	0	0	398,715
Quebec / Québec	4,316	11,870	71,558	811,410	10,767	2,504	16,196	1,088	3,659,895 ^a
Ontario	4,609	10,240	495,155	871,616	886,797 ^a	17,928	3,202	21,116	4,633,710 ^a
Manitoba	1,059	546	110,181	84,511	112,863	0	1,180	244	475,943
Saskatchewan	0	930	136,555	34,460	159,332	0	420	0	442,286
Alberta	289	3,239	60,633	152,309	577,551	4,321	2,213	436	1,056,920
British Columbia / Colombie-Britannique	1,036	5,142	277,006	94,550	655,699	30,442	7,231	2,063	1,522,524
Northwest Territories / Territoires du Nord-Ouest	0	0	4,289	3,424	2,413	0	1,567	0	20,559
Yukon Territory / Territoire du Yukon	0	0	4,002	1,928	3,493	0	1,234	0	13,829
Totals/Totaux	11,468	37,085	1,434,509	2,446,705	2,513,080^a	55,583	34,507	26,252	12,985,874^a

^a Revised data, March 2000 / Données révisées, mars 2000

Reproduced from the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the Thirty-Sixth General Election, online at http://www.elections.ca/election/results/results_e.html, last visited Thursday, March 09, 2000.

APPENDIX E

Thirty-sixth General Election 1997:
Official Voting Results

TABLE 9/TABLEAU 9

Trente-sixième élection générale 1997 :
Résultats officiels du scrutin

Percentage of valid votes, by political affiliation
Pourcentage des votes valides, par appartenance politique

Province or Territory - Province ou territoire	Bloc Québécois	Canadian Action Party - Parti action canadienne	Christian Heritage Party of Canada - Parti de l'Héritage Chrétien du Canada	Liberal Party of Canada - Parti libéral du Canada
Newfoundland/Terre-Neuve	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.9
Prince Edward Island/Île-du-Prince-Édouard	0.0	0.0	0.2	44.8
Nova Scotia/Nouvelle-Écosse	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.4
New Brunswick/Nouveau-Brunswick	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.9
Quebec/Québec	37.9	0.0	0.0	36.7
Ontario	0.0	0.2	0.4	49.5
Manitoba	0.0	0.0	0.4	34.3
Saskatchewan	0.0	0.3	0.0	24.7
Alberta	0.0	0.0	0.1	24.0
British Columbia/Colombie-Britannique	0.0	0.3	0.4	28.8
Northwest Territories/Territoires du Nord-Ouest	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.1
Yukon Territory/Territoire du Yukon	0.0	0.0	1.0	22.0
Totals/Totaux	10.7	0.1	0.2	38.5

Percentage of valid votes, by political affiliation (continued)
Pourcentage des votes valides, par appartenance politique (suite)

Province or Territory - Province ou territoire	Marxist- Leninist Party of Canada - Parti Marxiste- Léniniste du Canada	Natural Law Party of Canada - Parti de la loi naturelle du Canada	New Democratic Party - Nouveau Parti Démocratique	Progressive Conservative Party of Canada - Parti progressiste- conservateur du Canada	Reform Party of Canada - Le Parti Réformiste du Canada	The Green Party of Canada - Le Parti Vert du Canada	Independent - Indépendant	No affiliation - Aucune appartenance	Total
Newfoundland/Terre-Neuve	0.0	0.2	22.0	36.8	2.5	0.2	0.0	0.5	100.0
Prince Edward Island/Île-du-Prince-Édouard	0.0	0.1	15.1	38.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nova Scotia/Nouvelle-Écosse	0.0	0.4	30.4	30.8	9.7	0.0	0.3	0.1	100.0
New Brunswick/Nouveau-Brunswick	0.0	0.6	18.4	35.0	13.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Quebec/Québec	0.1	0.3	2.0	22.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.0	100.0
Ontario	0.1	0.2	10.7	18.8	19.1	0.4	0.1	0.5	100.0
Manitoba	0.2	0.1	23.2	17.8	23.7	0.0	0.2	0.1	100.0
Saskatchewan	0.0	0.2	30.9	7.8	36.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	100.0
Alberta	0.0	0.3	5.7	14.4	54.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	100.0
British Columbia/Colombie-Britannique	0.1	0.3	18.2	6.2	43.1	2.0	0.5	0.1	100.0
Northwest Territories/Territoires du Nord-Ouest	0.0	0.0	20.9	16.7	11.7	0.0	7.6	0.0	100.0
Yukon Territory/Territoire du Yukon	0.0	0.0	28.9	13.9	25.3	0.0	8.9	0.0	100.0
Totals/Totaux	0.1	0.3	11.0	18.8	19.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	100.0

Reproduced from the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the Thirty-Sixth General Election, online at http://www.elections.ca/election/results/results_e.html, last visited Thursday, March 09, 2000.

APPENDIX F

Thirty-sixth General Election 1997:
Official Voting Results

TABLE 10/TABLEAU 10

Trente-sixième élection générale 1997 :
Résultats officiels du scrutin

Number of candidates by percentage of valid votes received, by political affiliation
Nombre de candidats selon le pourcentage des votes obtenus, par appartenance politique

Political affiliation - Appartenance politique	Number of candidates in the following percentage groups - Nombre de candidats ayant recueilli le pourcentage de votes suivants					Total
	0 - 14.9	15 - 19.9	20 - 29.9	30 - 39.9	40 or more - 40 et plus	
	Bloc Québécois	5	2	8	23	
Canadian Action Party / Parti Action canadienne	58	0	0	0	0	58
Christian Heritage Party of Canada / Parti de l'Héritage Chrétien du Canada	53	0	0	0	0	53
The Green Party of Canada / Le Parti Vert du Canada	79	0	0	0	0	79
Liberal Party of Canada / Parti libéral du Canada	9	16	75	61	140	301
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada / Parti Marxiste-Léniniste du Canada	65	0	0	0	0	65
New Democratic Party / Nouveau Parti Démocratique	214	20	34	19	14	301
Natural Law Party of Canada / Parti de la loi naturelle du Canada	136	0	0	0	0	136
Progressive Conservative Party of Canada / Parti progressiste-conservateur du Canada	112	70	80	23	16	301
Reform Party of Canada / Le Parti Réformiste du Canada	66	32	56	19	54	227
Independent / Indépendant	43	0	1	0	0	44
No Affiliation / Aucune appartenance	31	0	0	0	1	32
Totals/Totaux	871	140	254	145	262	1,672

NOTE: Candidates who have obtained at least 15 % of the valid votes cast within their electoral district are entitled to a partial reimbursement of their election expenses.
Tout candidat a droit à un remboursement partiel de ses dépenses électorales s'il a recueilli au moins 15 % des votes valides dans sa circonscription.

Reproduced from the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the Thirty-Sixth General Election, online at http://www.elections.ca/election/results/results_e.html, last visited Thursday, March 09, 2000.

APPENDIX G

Political Parties' Share of Popular Vote and Seats in 1993 General Election

	Percent of Votes	Percent of Seats
Liberal	41.3	60.0
Reform	18.7	17.6
PC	16.0	0.7
BQ	13.5	18.3
NDP	6.9	3.1

Election data reproduced from Eagles, D. M. (1995), *The Almanac of Canadian Politics*, 2nd Ed. (Toronto: Oxford University Press) at xviii.

APPENDIX H

Percentage of total CCF/NDP strength, in seats and votes coming from selected provinces

		NS	PQ	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	BC
1935	votes	--	1.9	32.7	13.9	18.8	7.9	24.8
	seats	--	--	--	28.6	28.6	--	42.9
1940	votes	4.5	1.9	15.6	15.6	27.0	8.9	26.2
	seats	12.5	--	--	12.5	62.5	--	12.5
1945	votes	6.4	4.1	31.9	12.5	20.5	7.0	15.4
	seats	3.6	--	--	17.9	64.3	--	14.3
1949	votes	4.3	2.3	39.2	10.6	19.5	4.0	18.6
	seats	7.7	--	7.7	23.1	38.5	--	23.1
1953	votes	3.5	3.7	33.4	10.0	24.6	3.7	19.7
	seats	4.3	--	4.3	13.0	47.8	--	30.4
1957	votes	2.4	4.5	38.7	11.6	19.8	3.8	18.6
	seats	--	--	12.0	20.0	40.0	--	28.0
1958	votes	2.7	6.6	37.9	10.8	16.3	2.8	22.2
	seats	--	--	37.5	--	12.5	--	50.0
1962	votes	3.8	8.9	44.0	7.4	9.0	4.1	20.4
	seats	5.3	--	31.6	10.5	--	--	52.6
1963	votes	2.6	14.6	42.6	6.4	7.3	3.4	21.5
	seats	--	--	35.3	11.8	--	--	52.9
1965	votes	2.8	17.7	43.0	6.6	7.6	3.2	17.3
	seats	--	--	42.9	14.3	--	--	42.9