



MAKE EVERY VOTE COUNT—ALWAYS!

“**PPR123+**” = **Perfect Proportional Representation + Democratic Legitimacy + Demographic Balance + Voter Equality = True Democracy!**

“**PPR123+**” ... **FURTHER ANALYSIS OF AV AND BALANCED REPRESENTATION!**

PPR123+ is a major extension of the basic principles of **PPR123**—enhanced by much greater use of its flexible capacity to create ‘**At-Large**’ / **Regional** (i.e. ‘top-up’) seats—to provide more **Balanced Representation**: by party, by province/region, by gender and demographic diversity.

From the original conception of **PPR123**, and as stated in its presentation to the ERRE Committee, it was noted that:

- “Some accommodation(s) should be provided to avoid wasting votes for small parties and independent candidates.”
- “Some accommodation should be provided to ensure that the Government has representation from all provinces and/or regions. “Similar accommodations should probably be considered for the Official Opposition.”
- “Clear guidelines or formulae should be established for each party to follow in their reassignment of all votes for their defeated candidates to their elected candidates. This should address the possibility of more balanced demographic distribution of parliamentary voting power.”

From a broader perspective gained through other testimonies to the ERRE Committee and further reflection on concerns regarding representation as expressed by ERRE members (Ms May and Mr Cullen in particular—see excerpts from the transcript of my testimony (Sept.28) at the end of this document), it became clear that the ideal voting system should provide more than simply *Perfect Proportional Representation*, as **PPR123** alone could achieve. **PPR123+** was needed—to more effectively and directly address the need for more **Balanced Representation** of all kinds.

PPR123+ was outlined in the document “Announcing ‘**PPR123+**’ ... **Perfect Proportional Representation—plus!**” Briefly, through its commitment to truly ‘*Make Every Vote Count*’, all votes for losing candidates (51.7% or more than 9 million in Canada’s 2015 election) are retained by each party and reassigned amongst their MPs. This enormous reservoir of votes—rather than simply being wasted (as under other voting systems)—provides **PPR123+** with unparalleled flexibility that can be quite effectively (*and entirely democratically*) used to provide the Parliamentary voting power for the creation of as many ‘At-large’ / Regional ‘top-up’ seats as deemed appropriate. **PPR123+** thereby fulfills the two essential characteristics of an ideal electoral system—**Perfect Proportional Representation + demographically **Balanced Representation!****

This is *not* to suggest excessive use of this flexible capacity. The table on the following page illustrates the impact from the creation of between **3 ‘At-large’ / Regional representatives** (i.e. the minimum number, to provide representation for the votes for Independent candidates and small parties without elected representation), up to **129 ‘top-up’ representatives** [note that the latter would be about 20% less than the number needed under MMP; also, for both voting systems, the appropriate additional number of members could be lessened by reducing the number of ridings].

As previously explained for **PPR123** (also applicable to **PPR123+**), the Parliamentary voting power of each party is directly derived from and exactly equal to their total of all 1st-choice votes (i.e. for their elected *and* defeated candidates)—which is equitably allocated amongst all of their MPs (i.e. both those elected *and* any ‘top-up’ or ‘At-Large’ / Regional MPs). [In the following table, these are expressed as the “Avg. (Citizens’) Votes per Seat”, or converted into the “**Equivalent Seats’ per MP’s vote**”.]

The table on the following page is a **revised analysis** showing how **MP voting power can be equalized** via ‘top-up’ seats under **PPR123+**:

- **FPTP**: the actual results under FPTP, show that the winning Liberals needed far fewer votes per seat than any other party.
- (1) **PPR123+** with **12** ‘top-up’ seats—for the ‘*minimum*’ level of *balanced* representation of small parties and independents.
- (2) **PPR123+** with **37** ‘top-up’ seats—for a ‘*basic*’ levels of *balanced* representation (i.e. **vote equality for all Opposition parties**).
- (3) **PPR123+** with **56** ‘top-up’ seats—for a ‘*moderately balanced*’ representation of all parties.
- (4) **PPR123+** with **75** ‘top-up’ seats—for ‘*well*’ *balanced*’ representation of all parties.
- (4) **PPR123+** with **93** ‘top-up’ seats—for ‘*highly*’ *balanced*’ representation of all parties.
- (6) **PPR123+** with **129** ‘top-up’ seats—for ‘*fully*’ *balanced*’ representation, with **vote equality for MPs of all parties**.

NB:

1. With **PPR123+**, the addition of ‘top-up’ seats **would NOT change the total voting power of any Party in Parliament !!!**
2. Each party would allocate its ‘top-up’ seats so as to achieve the most demographically **balanced** and **inclusive** representation, by awarding them to the most fitting **defeated candidates** as per pre-defined prioritized and objective **criteria**, e.g.: (1) by province/region; (2) by gender; (3) demographic diversity.
3. Official Parliamentary voting records would likely remain expressed as numbers of MP seats—hence the total Citizens’ votes entrusted in each MP would be converted into the corresponding fractional number of ‘**Equivalent Seats’ per MP’s vote**’—for equitability with any province that is constitutionally guaranteed a specified number of seats.

While it would be for Parliament to decide on the appropriate level of ‘top-up’ to achieve the desired forms and degrees of demographically balanced representation (based on **gender parity** and **diversity** objectives), the mid-range alternatives [see table on following page] appear to achieve excellent levels of MP-vote *proportionality* (noting again that **PPR123** always ensures *perfect* Party-vote *proportionality*), along with substantially enhanced **representational balance**, with a much smaller number of additional MPs than required under MMP.

Election Analysis under 'PPR123+' with different levels of 'top-up' for more Balanced Representation

2015 Election Results by Party	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Total Votes	818,652	5,600,496	605,864	6,930,136	3,461,262	142,943	17,559,353
Votes for Elected representatives	190,764	2,748,271	37,070	4,616,449	891,978		8,484,532
Votes for Defeated candidates	627,888	2,852,225	568,794	2,313,687	2,569,284	142,943	9,074,821
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44		338
Proportional seats (i.e. under PR)	15.8	107.8	11.7	133.4	66.6	2.8	338
Over (Under) representation	(5.8)	(8.8)	(10.7)	50.6	(22.6)	(2.8)	0.0
FPTP actual results	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
Top-up seats (none)							
Total seats	10	99	1	184	44		338
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	81,865	56,571	605,864	37,664	78,665		51,951
(1) 'PPR123+' plus 12 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Minimum' top-up	1		7		2	2	12
Total seats	11	99	8	184	46	2	350
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	74,423	56,571	75,733	37,664	75,245	71,472	50,170
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	1.48	1.13	1.51	0.75	1.50	1.42	1.00
(2) 'PPR123+' plus 37 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Basic' balanced representation top-up	5	2	10		18	2	37
Total seats	15	101	11	184	62	2	375
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	54,577	55,450	55,079	37,664	55,827	71,472	46,825
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	1.17	1.18	1.18	0.80	1.19	1.53	1.00
(3) 'PPR123+' plus 56 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Moderately' balanced top-up	6	12	11		25	2	56
Total seats	16	111	12	184	69	2	394
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	51,166	50,455	50,489	37,664	50,163	71,472	44,567
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	1.15	1.13	1.13	0.85	1.13	1.60	1.00
(4) 'PPR123+' plus 75 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Well' balanced top-up	8	21	12		31	3	75
Total seats	18	120	13	184	75	3	413
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	45,481	46,671	46,605	37,664	46,150	47,648	42,517
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	1.07	1.09	1.10	0.89	1.09	1.12	1.00
(5) 'PPR123+' plus 93 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Highly' balanced top-up	9	31	13		37	3	93
Total seats	19	130	14	184	81	3	431
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	43,087	43,081	43,276	37,664	42,732	47,648	40,741
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	1.06	1.05	1.06	0.92	1.05	1.17	1.00
(6) 'PPR123+' plus 128 top-up seats	BQ	Cons.	Green	Liberal	NDP	Indep.	Total
Seats won	10	99	1	184	44	0	338
'Fully' balanced representation top-up	12	49	15		48	4	128
Total seats	22	148	16	184	92	4	466
Avg. Citizens' Votes per Seat	37,211	37,841	37,867	37,664	37,622	35,736	37,681
'Equivalent Seats' per MP's vote	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00

Please also consider the following points regarding the AV (Alternative Vote) voting system:

1. **PPR123** is based upon the AV voting system for the following reasons:
 - AV liberates Citizens to cast their 1st-choice vote for their *true* preference—understanding that **this vote will be cast by a representative of that party with all votes in Parliament!** This vote is never wasted.
 - AV also enables Citizens to cast their 2nd or 3rd-choice vote as a so-called '*strategic*' vote for other acceptable alternatives—if they should choose to do so. Hence, even if a Citizen's 1st-choice is for a candidate who is defeated, all voters always have a second and third chance to contribute to the outcome in their riding.
2. The most common criticism of AV, its tendency to converge to the middle, does not apply to its application as the electoral foundation for **PPR123**—given that, under **PPR123**, the **voting power of each party in Parliament is based only on the 'true' 1st-choice votes of all voters** (i.e. 2nd and 3rd-choices have no impact on party voting power, and are used only to elect the local representative who is most acceptable to a majority of constituents).

 - AV also provides excellent protection against the '*vote splitting*' problem—whereby two parties competing in the same part of the political spectrum divide the vote—ensuring their mutual defeat under FPTP (e.g. the former Reform and PC parties). With AV, where the weaker of those parties is eliminated, most of its votes would probably transfer to the other similar party.
 - All parties compete for all voters. The political centre is more strongly contested than the left or right. A party on the left or right might expand its appeal by spinning off a centrist party that could become a natural coalition partner (i.e. the opposite of the Reform-PC merger; under **PPR123**, the present Conservative Party might well attract more total votes by going back to the Reform and PC parties, where the latter would likely compete more strongly as a centre-right party).
 - Under **PPR123+**, even if AV resulted in a slightly higher number of MPs from the political centre, this could easily be rectified by an appropriate 'top-up' adjustment to compensate any under-represented parties, while also providing improved demographic and regional representation.

3. The AV electoral process is the same way that all parties elect their leaders.
 - If it's the best way to elect party leaders, then AV is also the best way to elect all Members of Parliament!
 - AV eliminates the possibility of MPs being elected by less than 30% of voters (as occurred in the last election under FPTP).