

by Michael Canzi

October 2, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my strong support for Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) as the means by which Members of Parliament (MPs) are elected in Canada. I am also writing to express my strong opposition to ranked balloting (a.k.a. Alternative Vote) for this same purpose. I believe that MMP would most accurately reflect the will of the electorate *and* be most likely to result in a diversity of experiences and opinion being considered during decision-making. I believe that better decisions and stronger legitimacy would be outcomes of the switch to MMP.

Decision-making benefits when a variety of experiences and opinions are considered. In government, this is most reliably delivered by coalitions of parties whose popular vote together represents a majority of the votes cast, which is the usual outcome of elections run under MMP.

Decision-making suffers when the range of experiences and opinions considered is limited, as with the false majorities that result from FPTP, and the lowest-common-denominator, one-party dynasty that is likely to result from ranked balloting.

In addition to ensuring proportionality and the consideration of diverse perspectives, MMP would ensure the continuation of local representation, which is important to many, many Canadians. Local representatives elected by FPTP would be augmented by MPs from party lists to ensure the proportion of the seats in the House of Commons (House) mirrors the parties' popular vote.

To protect against instability under MMP, I suggest the use of fixed election dates. This would mean that if the party with the largest number of seats is unable to form or maintain a coalition representing at least 50% plus 1 of the seats in the House, the party with the second largest number of seats would be given the opportunity, and so on, until the next fixed election date.

I would support a minimum vote threshold as a means of limiting the number of small parties in the House and further ensuring stability; however, I think the threshold should be low, at 2%, say. This would ensure that the government reflects the will of the electorate and considers diverse perspectives, leading to better decisions and more legitimacy of rule.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my point of view.