Q&A: "CITIZEN'S VOTE EMPOWERMENT"!

Everyone knows our First-Past-The-Post (FPTP) voting system produces results that are an injustice to voters, candidates and political parties. Everyone sees that FPTP produces an unjust balance of power in the Legislature—disproportionate to party vote-shares. Everyone understands that voting systems based on Proportional Representation (PR) are designed to replace FPTP because of such distortions and other flaws.

Many people know that most democratic countries use some form of PR. Many Canadians who see that FPTP violates basic democratic principles have long called for it to be replaced by some form of PR. Most of them overlook the defects of the various forms of PR, and under-estimate their resultant vulnerability to being defeated by a NO campaign in a referendum on PR.

Fortunately, there is now a much simpler and better way to free ourselves from the injustices of FPTP—while also avoiding a flawed PR alternative. The solution is to **fix FPTP—by eliminating its flaws—***through* "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"!

The profound consequences of "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" *are:*

1. It's no longer justified or acceptable to use FPTP without **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.
2. All seat-based PR alternatives are rendered obsolete by **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.

---

1. What is FPTP and where did it come from?

- FPTP (First-Past-The-Post) is the voting system used by England for centuries. [The mathematical designation is Single Member Plurality, meaning that the candidate with the most votes is elected (with no requirement to achieve a majority of 50%+1).]

- The British Empire installed FPTP as the voting system in its colonies.

- Many former British colonies (Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Scotland etc.) have upgraded to a more democratic electoral system; many (Canada, USA, India etc.) are still stuck with FPTP.

- The entire non-English speaking world of democracies rejected FPTP.

2. What is PR and where did it come from?

- PR (Proportional Representation) is a class of electoral systems designed to produce outcomes where each party's number of seats is roughly proportional to their total numbers of votes.

- PR systems were first developed by mathematicians in the 18th century, as democratic upgrades to replace FPTP.

- The two major forms of PR are MMP (Mixed Member Proportional) and STV (Single Transferable Vote)—each of which has spawned numerous variations.

- MMP works with FPTP, but adds about 50% more regional *'compensatory'* seats, allocated according to a party's degree of under-representation, to offset FPTP distortions. The extra members come from *'party lists'*—which may either be elected or controlled by the parties).

- STV replaces FPTP with multi-member electoral districts (typically 5-7 ridings). It involves a more complicated ballot with preferential voting, and a more complex iterative procedure to count the votes. STV uses a simple mathematical criterion for election (much below a majority).

3. What is "Citizen's Vote Empowerment" *and where did it come from?*

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** is a *'made-in-BC'* solution that fixes what's wrong with FPTP—making it perfectly fair for all voters, candidates (including incumbents) and parties!

- The power of **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** comes by *"making the Citizen's vote really count, where it matters most—in the Legislature"*.

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** is unique in guaranteeing perfect proportionality—along with many other benefits.

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** surpasses all seat-based forms of PR—with none of their complications, costs and vulnerabilities to defeat by a NO campaign in a referendum.

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** was designed for adoption—by:
  (1) eliminating the problems of FPTP; (2) thereby gaining public acceptance; (3) depriving opponents of any reasonable arguments against fixing what's wrong with our electoral system.

4. Why should the Citizen's vote be empowered, and why wasn't this conceived and adopted long ago?

- Most Citizens will be shocked to learn that *'We the People'* do NOT elect *'our'* Government under FPTP as it is—but will do so when FPTP is fixed by **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.

- Presently, the Government is elected by the Assembly of Representatives—which is always a major distortion of the *'Will of the People'*—often with only about 40% of Citizen's votes.

- Most Citizens will also be shocked to learn that many laws passed by the Legislature lack *'democratic legitimacy'*—because they're often only supported by about 40% of Citizen's votes.

- When FPTP is fixed by **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**, the Government and all laws will have true *'democratic legitimacy'*—with the support of a majority of voters.

- The Citizen's votes could not be counted (instantly, with perfect accuracy) in the Legislature without computers—which is why **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** was simply impossible before the digital age.

5. Why should we prefer to fix FPTP rather than replace it with PR?

- Many people like FPTP. It's so familiar and so simple. It's the only electoral system we've ever used, and many people think it's OK. Many people don't want to change to some unknown voting system. But they'd almost certainly support fixing FPTP, once they understand FPTP's problems—and how they can be easily eliminated by **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.

- Most people don't understand PR. It's unfamiliar and a lot more complicated than FPTP. There are too many confusing forms of PR, and no agreement on which is best. Change always comes with increased costs, confusion and risks.

- In a referendum on PR, the NO campaign has proven playbooks to defeat all standard forms of PR—exploiting their defects and public disinterest, doubts and cynicism about politics.

- Most people have no interest in learning anything about how voting systems work. They just want and expect that our voting system should be fair to all voters, candidates and parties.

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** also works with other voting systems—and could be used to improve any form of PR, making them perfectly proportional. But since we have FPTP, the best plan is clearly to start by fixing it, by adopting **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**. That should be followed up with a thorough review to determine what (if any) further changes may be desirable.

6. What's the core problem with FPTP?

- **'Wasted votes'**: all votes for losing local candidates (typically about half of all Citizen's votes) have zero electoral value—and are essentially *'thrown away'*; they are unrepresented in the legislature, and hence have no impact in electing the Government. <u>This is FPTP's core problem</u>.
  Even worse, this means that laws passed by the legislature usually don't have the support of a majority (i.e. more than half) of voters—hence, they lack *'democratic legitimacy',* and cannot truly be claimed to reflect and serve the *'Will of the People'*.
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

7. What are the subsidiary problems with FPTP?

- **'Strategic voting'** [aka *'tactical voting'*]: to avoid wasting their vote, many citizens (typically about one-third) are coerced by FPTP to *'hold their nose'* and vote for the *'lesser of evils'*—trying to block some other party from becoming Government.
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- The **'Two-party system'** [aka the *'duopoly'*]: due the *'wasted votes'* problem and consequent common practice of *'strategic voting'*, FPTP typically devolves into a 'Two-party' system—where only two parties have any realistic chance of forming Government—and other parties are relegated to a role of *'spoilers'* (i.e. they can't win, but they can potentially determine the winner).
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'False majority'**: most FPTP elections produce a majority government with more than half the seats (and 100% of the power) often with much less than half of the votes (typically 40%).
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Vote-splitting'**: where two similar parties competing for the same voter segment usually result in their mutual defeat which is unfair to both the parties and voters.
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Safe seats'**: typically about two-thirds of seats have only one party with a realistic chance to win, hence reducing voter turnout, as no vote in such ridings can make any difference.
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Wrong winners'**: e.g. BC1996 produced an NDP *'false majority'* Government with just 39% of the votes, while the losing Liberals won 41% of the votes (i.e. '*false'* democracy).
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Blow-out elections'**: e.g. BC2001 produced a Liberal landslide; even though 42% voted for other parties, there were only two opposition members elected (i.e. '*broken'* democracy).
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Fragile minority Government'**: e.g. BC2017, where the two main parties were almost tied in both seats and votes; the Greens won the balance of power with only three seats—despite winning almost 17% vote-share (i.e. equivalent 15 seats under PR). The close margin makes the Government much more vulnerable than it would be under PR, with the temptation under FPTP being much stronger to force an early election. Government stability could be improved with **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** by requiring a *'double-majority'* (i.e. Citizen's and Representative's votes) for non-confidence votes.
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

- **'Gerrymandering'** is the intentional rigging of electoral boundaries to the advantage of one party. Under FPTP, the electoral boundaries can convey such an advantage—whether intentional or not. There's no possibility of geographical bias under **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**—because all votes count equally!
  Is this fair? NO. Would this problem be corrected by "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"? YES!

8. What's required to fix the problems with FPTP?

- *"Do Democracy 'right', by making the Citizen's vote <u>really</u> count, where it matters most—in the Legislature!"* This eliminates FPTP's *'wasted vote'* problem.

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** requires no changes to ridings, voting procedures, or how Representatives are elected.
  The only changes are to the way voting is done in the Legislature:

  o Make the Citizen's vote the unit of voting power in the Legislature!

  o Each party would have exactly as many votes in the legislature as won by all their candidates (i.e. elected and defeated).

  o Each party's votes should be equitably assigned among their Representatives, according to established rules, with party Leaders holding any unassigned votes that may remain.

  o As each Representative casts their single vote in the Legislature, this would automatically be converted by computer into their assigned number of Citizen's votes (i.e. *'proxy voting'*). [Computers can instantly convert the Representative's votes into Citizen's votes—and instantly count millions of Citizen's votes with absolute accuracy and transparency to all Representatives. In the digital age, this is clearly the right way to do voting in the Legislature!]

- By eliminating FPTP's *'wasted vote'* problem, **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** thereby removes all of FPTP's subsidiary problems—making it perfectly fair to all voters, candidates and parties!

9. How does Citizen's Vote Empowerment *relate to PR?*

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** renders all seat-based PR obsolete.

- Only **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** can:

  o guarantee perfect proportionality

  o without needing to change ridings

  o without more complicated voting procedures

  o without changing how Representatives are elected

  o without reducing the accountability of Representatives to their constituents

  o without needing more seats or 'party lists'

  o without any possibility of rural-urban bias

  o without any additional complications, costs or risks

10. How does Citizen's Vote Empowerment *relate to the 'Will of the People'?*

- The *'Will of the People'* is expressed as the sum of all Citizen's votes.

- The true *'Will of the People'* is expressed as the sum of all Citizen's uncoerced votes (i.e. without 'strategic voting').

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**—founded on democratic principle, is the perfect fulfillment of the true *'Will of the People'*—a distinction that no other voting system can claim.

11. What is the primary goal of PR?

- The identified goal of PR is to produce electoral outcomes where the number of seats for each party are roughly proportional to their total votes.

- The implicit higher goal of PR is to reflect the *'Will of the People'* as expressed in the total votes for each party.

12. How well do seat-based PR systems achieve their goal of proportionality?

- All seat-based PR systems are of course much more proportional than FPTP, but not perfect.
- The Gallagher Index is a mathematical measure of the disproportionality of a voting systems and election outcomes [modelled by Byron Weber Becker for the ERRE Committee].
- To achieve higher proportionality, MMP requires a larger ratio of *'compensatory'* or *'party list'* regional seats to FPTP riding seats [greater than one-half—requiring some combination of about 50% more seats or 50% larger ridings].
- To achieve higher proportionality, STV requires larger electoral districts (typically 5 to 7 ridings).
- Such PR alternatives leave much to be desired—considering their costs, complications and imperfection.

13. What are some of the other problems with standard PR systems?

- They require too many changes—with too much complexity, confusion and costs.
- There's a lot of uncertainty about how well they work—and whether they would really make things better.
- Partisan political interests seem to be driving both the advocates and opponents of PR.
- The public trust in politicians and parties is extremely low.
- Refer to the submission to BC Government: "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment** ", page 11, for a detailed Critique of the Major PR Alternatives

14. Why does the NO campaign exist? Who opposes PR, and why?

- FPTP distortions always work to the benefit of the winners and detriment of losers.
- Those parties and politicians which are the routine beneficiaries of FPTP distortions don't want to lose their advantage—and fiercely resist change! They blame the victims of FPTP as being politically motivated in advocating for PR—when the losers are only seeking electoral justice!

15. How does the NO campaign routinely defeat PR in Canadian referenda?

- The backroom operators of the major parties—and their patrons and dance-partners, the corporate lobbyists—always mastermind a NO campaign to oppose PR.
- These are the masters of negative campaigning, and they have proven playbooks on how to defeat each of the standard forms of PR.
- Their campaign strategy is to raise public fears, uncertainties and doubts about PR. They exploit the known weaknesses of PR, and public apathy and anxiety.

16. What's needed to implement Citizen's Vote Empowerment?

- A majority vote in the Legislature is sufficient to adopt **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.
- Approval of **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** in a referendum would provide public legitimation.
- If there is a referendum on **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**, the campaign should be focused on democratic principles and voter's rights rather than partisan political issues.
- With reasonable media analysis and coverage, there should be no need for public funding for a referendum on **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**. Private funding should be limited and/or excluded. As **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** should be seen as a basic democratic right, its adoption should not be undermined by the powers of money.

17. *Where and when should Citizen's Vote Empowerment be implemented?*

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** could be implemented at any time (i.e. no need to wait for an election)!

- If and when **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** is adopted, it should be implemented as soon as possible.

- It would require the procurement of appropriate computer hardware and software to count the Citizen's votes in the Legislature. [This would not be expensive. With appropriate cyber security and audit controls, Representatives would be able to vote using their cell phones or tablet computers.]

- It would also require the Legislature to adopt the appropriate rules for Citizen's vote reassignment.

18. *What are some of the possible rules for Citizen's vote reassignment?*

- Any Independent Representatives would have the number of Citizen's votes they personally won.

- Political parties would have exactly the number of Citizen's votes won by all of their candidates (including those who were defeated—whose votes would normally be *'wasted'* by FPTP).

  o One vote reassignment strategy would be for each party to divide its total votes equally among its Representatives, with their Leader retaining any unassigned votes.
    This would give a different number of votes to the Representatives of different parties—depending on the degree that each party was either over-represented or under-represented (relative to pure PR).

  o Another vote reassignment strategy would be to give the same number of votes to the Representatives of each party (i.e. equal to the average number of votes per Representative for the most over-represented party), with their Leaders retaining any unassigned votes.
    This would leave large numbers of Citizen's votes being held by the Leaders of the most under-represented parties. This would draw attention to the degrees of under-representation, and facilitate a probable future enhancement to provide more balanced representation—which would draw down the reservoir of unassigned votes held by a Leader.
    [This is the strategy that seems preferable, on balance.]

  o Another possible vote reassignment strategy might be to provide gender balance of voting power in the Legislature—regardless the number of male and female Representatives—by dividing half of a party's total votes equally among its male and female Representatives.

- Another practical consideration might be to allow temporary reassignment of a Representatives votes in the situation of unavoidable absence from the Legislature—on the rationale that the Citizens deserve representation and should not be deprived by a Representative's absence.

- It also seems prudent that the Speaker should hold only one vote—with the remainder of Citizen's votes won by the Speaker to be reassigned by the party.

- If a Representative *'crosses the floor'*, they should retain the votes they personally won, which would be subtracted from the total of that party (and added to another party if they chose to switch parties); party vote assignments would be adjusted accordingly.

- In the event of a by-election, the simple accounting adjustments would delete the original votes and add the new votes for each party.

19. *How might "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" be enhanced to provide more balanced representation?*

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** provides exceptional flexibility that could be utilized to improve representational balance.

- Future consideration should be given to adding one or more seats in each region—especially where there is excessive regional polarization or under-representation. Such regional seats would have zero impact on the perfectly proportional balance of power between the parties; the voting power of any regional representatives would simply draw down the reservoir of unassigned votes held by party Leaders.

- As this wouldn't impact party voting power, a decision to add regional representatives could be taken by the Legislature without any need for a referendum. Also, such a decision could even be taken after an election—as needed to address representation imbalances—and targeted where needed to produce maximum representational benefits with the fewest additional seats.

- As example, in the BC2017 election, with only 10 additional seats (11%), both the Government and Official Opposition would have representation from all regions, and the grossly under-represented Green Party would get 7 regional seats. [By contrast, under MMP, about triple the number of regional seats would be needed—just to achieve approximate proportionality.]

- The regional seats could be filled by the top defeated candidate of the party in that region (i.e. no need for *'party lists'*), with consideration of demographic factors (e.g. gender, age, etc.)—which would also improve the demographic balance of representation.

20. *How might representation be provided for the unrepresented votes?*

- **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** provides exceptional flexibility that could be utilized to provide representation for the unrepresented Citizen's votes (i.e. for small parties or Independents who didn't win a seat).

- Whether and how this should be done raises complex and controversial issues that should be carefully considered. But these should not be considered now—as a secondary complicating factor that would distract from the focus on **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** as a voter's democratic right. [n.b.: In the BC2017 election, 2.5% of the Citizen's votes went to Independent candidates and 15 small parties.]

- A common practice with PR systems is to establish a threshold (e.g. 5%) to qualify for *'At-large'* representation (usually the Leader or leading defeated candidate). Care is advisable to avoid a proliferation of fringe parties (some of which might be radical).

- An *'Ombudsperson'* could be considered to provide representation of votes for independents.

21. *What are Citizen's Vote Empowerment's implications for standard PR?*

- For any country that already has some form of PR, **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** should be adopted as a clear upgrade with many benefits.
  It should probably also be considered whether the complexity and costs associated with its existing PR provide sufficient additional value. Simplification would seem to be advantageous—especially to remove issues such as *'party lists'*.

- For any country or province contemplating a standard seat-based PR, why bother?
  Citizen's Vote Empowerment has rendered all previous seat-based PR alternatives obsolete!

22. What are Citizen's Vote Empowerment's implications for FPTP?

- It's both unjustified and unacceptable to continue using FPTP without **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**—given that **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** eliminates FPTP's *'wasted votes'* problem [a Citizen's fundamental democratic right to have a vote that counts in the election of the Government], and thereby also removes its subsidiary problems that make it so 'undemocratic'.

- **Fixing FPTP is simply the right thing to do—to make our Democracy truly fair to all** voters, candidates and parties—especially given that **Citizen's Vote Empowerment** can be implemented without complications or costs!!!

23. What is the potential for a #WeToo movement to demand Citizen's Vote Empowerment and Electoral Justice Now?

- Why not! We've had enough—and we've been had *waaay* more than enough!!
  "We're mad as hell and not going to take it anymore"!!!

- The *"PowerOurVote"* movement/campaign for **Citizen's Vote Empowerment**.
  - With our voices united in common cause.
  - With champions (to emerge) advocating for the common principles of electoral justice.
  - With a simple message and a common goal.
  - With the idea that Democracy (like Freedom and Equality) is our endless journey—not a single destination.
  - With the conviction that we can and must do better—with new and better forms of Democracy for the digital age!

- Shame the parties and politicians into *'doing what's right'*—for the People—and for Democracy!

- If necessary, threaten the parties and politicians—with our votes, or a voting boycott of those who would try to prevent us from having an honest electoral system.

- *'We the People'* will win—if, and only if, we care enough about Democracy to stand up and demand it! Our ancestors and our descendants would expect us to do nothing less!

We're now living in the *Digital Age*—yet our Democracy remains hobbled by the defects of our *medieval* FPTP voting system—while electoral reform advocates urge us to boldly take a *'leap of faith'* and accept the lesser defects of their *'horse and buggy'* era PR alternatives?!? Surely we can do better!

"**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" is a true solution that **makes FPTP perfectly fair to all** voters, candidates and political parties—hence, **worthy of Democracy in the 21st century!**

Rather than replacing FPTP with some flawed PR alternative, "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" takes advantage of digital technology to eliminate the core problem of FPTP: *'wasted votes'*. As a result, "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" also removes all subsidiary problems (*'strategic voting'*, *'vote-splitting'*, *'wrong winners'*, etc.)—elevating our Democracy to a higher level. It ensures that the balance of voting power in the Legislature is directly based on the expressed *'Will of the People'* (fulfilling PR's ultimate goal), by **making the Citizen's vote *really* count, where it matters most—in the Legislature!**

As "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" works with FPTP, no voting system changes are required!

- o No changes to riding boundaries.
- o No changes to voting procedures.
- o No changes to how votes are counted and Representatives are elected.
- o No changes to the relationship and accountability of Representatives to Citizens.
- o No costs or complexities to implement "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**".
- o No costs or complexities to revoke "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" and revert to flawed FPTP (perish the thought).

Unparalleled benefits of "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"!

- o **Perfect proportionality** is automatic!
- o **No need to ever change ridings** (even as population changes)—a major future savings!
- o Since all Citizen's votes will be equal (even for losing candidates, even in *'safe seats'*) and counted in the Legislature (for all parties that win a seat), **voters are liberated from the coerced practice of *'strategic voting'*.** Everyone is empowered to vote for their true preference (knowing that their vote will not be *'wasted'*), rather than being forced to *'hold their nose'* and vote for a *'lesser of evils'* in a desperate attempt to block some other party from becoming the Government.
- o **No possibility of rural-urban or regional bias**—because all votes count equally.
- o **Eliminates the risk of tie votes** in the Legislature, and problems selecting a Speaker.
- o Facilitates future enhancements—e.g. **elimination of regional polarization** (ensuring both the Government and Official Opposition are represented in all regions), and **'balanced representation'** (reducing under-representation of *'third'* parties)—by the creation of **regional seats**, similar to MMP. But unlike MMP, such seats could even be decided after an election, on an *as-needed* basis (and targeted *where-needed*—to remedy representational deficiencies), as they would have no impact on the balance of power between the parties (they'd simply draw down the reservoir of unrepresented votes for defeated candidates—aka *'wasted votes'*). Also, only about one-third the number of *'top-up'* seats would be needed (because perfect proportionality is automatic), and they could be filled by best runners-up with consideration of demographic factors (e.g. gender balance, age, etc.).
- o **No need to wait for an election** to implement "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**"—since the only changes in voting procedures are not at the ballot box—but in the Legislature (i.e. to reflect the expressed *'Will of the People'*)!
- o **No need to waste public funds on a referendum** for "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**". With appropriate media analysis and coverage, **this should be a non-partisan campaign based on democratic principles and voter's rights**—rather than a divisive political battle.

"**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" is the **true fulfillment of the goals of PR**—and has rendered seat-based PR alternatives into a pointless pursuit of a *'horse-and-buggy'* era concept. Moreover, whereas **opponents of PR can make a plausible case against any standard PR** alternative (based on costs, complexity, confusion, larger ridings or multi-riding electoral districts, more seats, party lists, reduced accountability, rural-urban bias etc.), by contrast **there's no good reason for not fixing the problems of our existing system**—especially with a *cost-free* and *trouble-free* solution available!

"**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" is a *'made-in-BC'* perfect fix for FPTP's undemocratic and unjust flaws—which have plagued Democracy for centuries, everywhere FPTP has been used.

Adoption of "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" would become a lasting legacy of this Premier and this Government, and a truly historic gift of BC to Democracy across Canada—and around the world.

*See "***Citizen's Vote Empowerment***" for further analysis of voting systems and issues.*

---

*N.B.: **Electoral Justice Now** acknowledges that our vision of "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" was inspired by* <u>*submissions to the BC Citizens' Assembly in 2004 by Mr. John R Kennedy*</u> *of Burnaby BC.*
*We believe "**Citizen's Vote Empowerment**" would clearly be the best choice—with the best chance to become the BC2018 PR Referendum winner! However, we've also developed a comprehensive and flexible set of electoral reform options called "Citizen's Vote Empowerment +" which merit consideration as possible future refinements.*