



MAKE EVERY VOTE COUNT-ALWAYS!

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

SUMMARY: COMPARATIVE EVALUATION of ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

Electoral Systems:	PPR123	FPTP	MMP	STV (13)	IRV (AV)
Name:	<i>Perfect - Proportional-Representation</i>	<i>First-Past-The-Post</i>	<i>Mixed-Member-Proportional</i>	<i>Single-Transferable-Vote</i>	<i>Instant-Runoff-Voting -or- AlternativeVote</i>
Order of Merit (an objective evaluation--see notes below)	1	5	3	2	4
<u>Political practices & behaviours</u> (parties, politicians, voters)	Honest	Perverse	Mixed-	Honest	Honest
<u>Outcomes</u> (political climate) & <u>Results</u> ('will of the people?')	Proportional	Dishonest	Proportional	Proportional	Distorted
Electoral System Features (Primary Criteria):					
Voter Equality (Makes <u>Every</u> Vote Count?)	Always!(1)	No	No	No	No
Always elects the 'rightful' representatives? (2)	Yes	No	No	Yes (3)	Yes
Always elects the 'rightful' Government? (4)	Yes	No	Yes (12)	Yes (12)	Yes
Always fair to <u>all</u> citizens, candidates and parties? (5)	Yes	No	Yes (12)	Yes (12)	No
Voting Issues (Other Important Criteria):					
Democratic quality/degree of 'Proportional Representation'?	Perfect	None	Imperfect(6)	Imperfect(7)	None
Eliminates 'Strategic Voting'? (9)	Yes	No	No(8)	Yes	Yes
Eliminates 'Vote-Splitting'? (10)	Yes	No	No(8)	Almost	Almost
Eliminates the 'Spoiler effect'? (11)	Yes	No	No(8)	Reduced	Reduced
Easy for Voters to understand?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Broad range of Voter Expression?	High	Lowest	Medium	High	Medium
Avoids need for riding changes due to population changes?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Option: natural and permanent riding boundaries?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Option: reduce size of ridings in remote areas?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Option: ensure Government representation from <u>all</u> provinces?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Option: demographic rebalancing of Voting Power in Parliament?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

Explanatory Notes:

- 1 Voter Equality: Every (1st-choice) vote counts--always (win or lose) --for all parties with at least one elected representative.
- 2 Ensures every elected representative is the one most acceptable to a majority (>50%) of voters (including 2nd & 3rd-choices).
- 3 STV combines multiple ridings, and elects as many members--based on a complex formula (the 'Hare quota')--well below 50%.
- 4 Ensures that the party with the most voting power in Parliament is the one with the most 1st-choice votes.
- 5 Ensures that each party always has voting power in Parliament that exactly matches its share of 1st-choice votes.
- 6 MMP, not truly proportional, requires much larger ridings or more MPs (50%), creates 2nd class of MPs taken from party lists.
- 7 STV is less proportional than MMP; with much larger ridings; but more democratic (more power to voters, less to the parties).
- 8 MMP adds new defects re 'tactical' voting and potential collusion onto defects of FPTP (still used to elect a majority of members).
- 9 'Strategic Voting': Voters being coerced into voting for 'The Lesser of Evils' --rather than free to vote for their true 1st-choice.
- 10 'Vote-Splitting' between two similar parties can result in a 'wrongful' election of a third party with lower popular support.
- 11 'Spoiler effect': A losing candidate can change the outcome by 'taking' votes from a candidate who otherwise would have won.
- 12 MMP, STV and P3 might potentially (to the degree that they're not truly proportional) fail to elect the 'rightful' Government.
- 13 P3 (Proportional, Preferential, Personalized) and STV are qualitatively similar, but P3 is better designed for Canada's needs.

COMMENTARY: COMPARATIVE EVALUATION of ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

The above tabular comparison identifies many of the key differences between alternative electoral systems, but it does not explain or convey the magnitude of their substantial impact and consequences.

This commentary is intended to raise awareness of underlying issues and provide better perspective:

1. The “First-Past-The-Post” (FPTP) electoral system is even far worse than most people realize.
 - FPTP was imposed upon Canada as a British colony. *FPTP was never chosen by the People* anywhere.
 - Most democratic countries (including many former British colonies) have already rejected FPTP.
 - FPTP’s worst defect isn’t its *dishonest results*—it’s the *perverse political practices and climate* it causes.
2. All standard alternatives to FPTP are fundamentally flawed—both in conception and implementation.
 - Their common *conceptual flaw*—that dooms them to failure—is their misfocus on the members’ seats—rather than on the Citizen’s vote.
 - All produce only ‘quasi’-PR—i.e. *not truly proportional* results (despite PR being their objective).
 - None can truly claim to ‘*Make Every Vote Count*’ (although they all do much better than FPTP).
 - While all the alternatives are considerably better than FPTP, they all have significant defects.
 - All involve substantial changes in ridings or district boundaries—generally making them much larger, which is particularly problematic in a country as large and sparsely populated as Canada.
 - Under **MMP**, all of the *constituency* MPs (i.e. more than half of all MPs) are still elected under FPTP with all its negative consequences; the remainder are *undemocratically* selected from ‘*party lists*’ (hence are *beholden* to their party) as “*At-large*” provincial members (hence *not accountable* to an electorate).
 - While **STV** is objectively far superior to MMP (*BC’s Citizens Assembly on Electoral Reform* closely studied both, and 80% chose STV over MMP), STV is considerably more complicated for voters to use, and vastly more difficult for most people to understand how its vote counting process.
 - The “*Proportional-Preferential-Personalized*” (**P3**) voting system is qualitatively similar to STV, with similar pros and cons (with more focus on party balance), but it’s better adapted to Canada’s needs.
3. The benefits of a preferential ballot (STV, P3, IRV, **PPR123**) are not obvious, but are profound!
 - Voters are liberated to vote for their true 1st-choice, by eliminating the coercive forces under FPTP that compel so many voters into so-called ‘*strategic*’ voting (i.e. for the perceived ‘*lesser of evils*’).
 - The ‘*vote-splitting*’ problem and ‘*spoiler effect*’ disappear, so that two similar parties don’t ensure their mutual defeat [recall the problem of Canada’s ‘*broken democracy*’ before the ‘*right*’ united].
 - The parties and politicians must compete for *all* votes—including 2nd-choice and 3rd-choice; hence, they will be motivated to replace the negative rhetoric and divisive politics with more respectful behaviour and more constructive, cooperative politics.
4. **Perfect Proportional Representation (PPR123)** is the only alternative that is *not* conceptually flawed. It would be very easy for voters to understand and to use, and easy to implement.
 - Only **PPR123** has the correct conceptual focus— on **the Citizen’s vote**—rather than members’ seats (this is the key to **PPR123**’s success, and is expressed as the principle “*The primacy of the Citizen’s vote!*”)
 - Only **PPR123** delivers *true and perfect* PR, and fulfills the promise to ‘*Make Every Vote Count—Always*’.
 - Only **PPR123** delivers ‘*Voter Equality*’. Every voter’s 1st-choice vote always counts, regardless which party, whether their candidate won or lost, where a voter lives and how others voted.
 - Only **PPR123** is *truly fair to all Citizens, all parties and all politicians.*
 - Only **PPR123** does *not* require any expansion of riding boundaries, or multi-riding districts.
 - Only **PPR123** maintains existing ridings and local accountability of MPs.
 - **PPR123** is a *hybrid* voting system, which combines the benefits of a preferential ballot (IRV) with the unique advantages of Perfect Proportional Representation!