



MAKE EVERY VOTE COUNT—ALWAYS!

PPR123: 'Perfect Proportional Representation' + 'Instant Runoff Voting' = 'True' Democracy!

Overcoming Obstacles

Achieving **PPR123** won't likely be as easy as it ought to be. On merit, the case for **PPR123** is uncontested. But that will certainly not deter its opponents, who will stop at nothing to stop **PPR123**.

Some who oppose **PPR123** will be opponents of any form of electoral reform. Some will present themselves as *advocates* of one of the other forms of electoral reform, probably MMP. Most of the *sincere* advocates of MMP would probably switch to **PPR123** once they learn of it, and recognize it as a superior alternative.

Alas, there will be some advocates of electoral reform who are very *insincere*. There will undoubtedly be some *political backroom operators* playing on each side of any electoral reform debate—*playing with a hidden agenda to defeat any reform* if possible, or to channel public support to their most favourable alternative (MMP) if necessary. MMP gives the political backrooms more power over the parties—with the power to dispense 'party list seats' to the favored few. But their advocacy of electoral reform is a sham—they act as its promoters with a proven game plan to achieve its defeat—as demonstrated in BC, Ontario, PEI and Quebec.

Why would political backroom operators do such things—and if they did, how could they get away with it? Let's understand that the voting system means much more to them than to most Citizens—that electoral reform poses a real threat to them, to their power, and their capacity to control politics in the interests of their party's backers. And these are the masters of messaging, and the political arts of negative campaigning, demagogic misrepresentation and dirty tricks etc. So it should only be expected that they'd use their talents to protect their own turf. Also, everyone needs to understand that big-league politics is a game of hard-ball—while the electoral reform advocates always play slow-pitch softball. Of course the dirty tricksters take off their partisan political uniforms, and wear different sweaters when they're playing to lose in the game of electoral reform. [As an expert opinion, watch former pundit Christy Clark (now BC Premier) blow the whistle on such duplicity by backroom operatives: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uhcpcz14IbQ>]

The best defense against the predictable covert campaigning to defeat electoral reform, by associates of the major parties, is to alert the public to their long history of successfully having done so, and to 'call out' the perpetrators where and when they attempt it again.

Another potential move by opponents of **PPR123** might be to play the constitution card—with the claim that **PPR123** doesn't conform with Canada's Constitution. The Constitution could of course be amended—if necessary—but the Government would undoubtedly want to avoid that due to potentially divisive consequences. In any case, as will now be explained, there's no good reason to reject **PPR123** from consideration a priori.

The proposal is that **PPR123** should be implemented in two stages:

1. this Parliament should adopt **IRV** as the voting system to be used in the 2019 election;
2. a referendum to switch to **PPR** as the new parliamentary voting system should be held coincident with the 2019 election.

Clearly the adoption of IRV (used in Australia since 1919, and briefly in BC in the 1950s) would not present a constitutional problem. (Some concern was expressed that a constitutional issue might arise from PR, if it

might lead to less stable governments, which might require some changes in the powers and responsibility of the Governor General in some hypothetical circumstances. However, IRV would certainly not raise the risk of less stable governments.)

It would seem highly likely that a referendum on **PPR** would most likely receive overwhelming public support. If so, the next Government would be obligated to adopting it as the parliamentary voting system as soon as possible. If that might require a constitutional amendment, the Government would have a very clear mandate to do so as soon as possible, on the specifically narrow change limited to the implementation of **PPR123**. In the meantime (and for as long as necessary), Parliament would continue to use the existing *one-member = one-vote* system.

Moreover, in the unlikely defeat of the referendum on **PPR**, the parliamentary voting system would remain as-is, while IRV would remain the voting system for future elections.

As a side note, careful consideration should be given to the issue of government stability under *any* form of PR (due to the likelihood of minority or coalition governments). **PPR123** provides two strong advantages that should effectively remove this issue.

Firstly, **PPR123** promotes more cooperative and constructive politics, and political relationships between the parties. Under **IRV**, secondary support from those who support other parties would probably make the difference between *winning* and *losing* most ridings. So politics should become more respectful and less adversarial and personal. Also, under **PPR**, minority and possibly coalition governments would probably become the norm. This would hopefully foster more collaboration to get on with the job of providing good government—with much less temptation to force a premature election to gain political advantage.

Secondly, it is suggested that it might be more appropriate to change the criterion to defeat a government to require a ‘double majority’—i.e. a majority of both the members votes as well as a majority of Citizens’ votes. Given that members would be elected under **IRV**, this would even provide much greater stability than now. If the Government had a majority of members, this would shield it from defeat—unless Parliament had become so dysfunctional that the Government chose its own defeat so as to precipitate an early election.

The point of this analysis is to outline some of the unique advantages and flexibility of **PPR123**. Also to challenge and invite the critics of **PPR123** to get positive—and look for ways to overcome any obstacles.

Looking beyond the obstacles, **PPR123** provides both an exceptional opportunity and a unique challenge. **PPR123** is not merely one possible electoral reform alternative—it presents an historic date with destiny!

We believe in the power of the Idea. And we believe that the Idea of **PPR123** will ultimately prove too powerful to be denied. We believe that **PPR123** will be adopted somewhere, sometime—probably soon. And when it is, we believe that **PPR123** will spread widely and rapidly, throughout the *free world* of democracies!

The historic distinction of being first to adopt **PPR123** will be long remembered, with great pride by that nation, and with a lasting honour attributed to them by citizens of the world.

We hope that this distinction will be claimed by Canada—here and now—by this Government, by this leadership and this Parliament! **PPR123** would become their lasting legacy: their tribute honouring their ancestors; their gift to their Citizens and their descendants; and Canada’s gift to the other people and nations of the world!