

OPPOSITION TO ELECTORAL REFORM

On July 11th, I applied to appear before this Committee assuming you would want to question someone vehemently opposed to changing our electoral system; three months later I am still awaiting your summons. Further to my brief of July 19th, I now submit what I would have said, supplemented with comments based on Q & A's of those witnesses you did summon.

Cathrine McKeever
Bowmanville, ON

The "ranked ballot" certainly gives new meaning to the saying "vote early, vote often".

We have an electoral system that is easy to explain, easy to understand, and easy to calculate: one person - one vote, whoever earns the most votes wins - it cannot be more democratic than that!

The voters of the ward or municipality or riding make their choice: for example, they want Candidate A to represent them. Candidate A has received the majority of votes for that position, ergo A is the winner. How easy was that to explain, to understand, to calculate? Candidates B, C & D did not garner enough support, did not convince enough voters of their capabilities ergo they did not win the position. The complaints from those who did not vote for A are: their votes did not count; that is not fair; that it is not democratic; that the majority voted against A.

Well, NO; if you insist on counting votes against rather than for, the majority voted against D, who had the least votes, followed by C, then B, with A having the least votes against - A is still the winner.

I do not know when voting against someone crept into our election process, perhaps it was when private and public sector unions along with other special interest groups decided they were entitled to more than those of us not so aligned, who have less influence of money. *STRATEGIC VOTING* enters democracy: don't vote for someone, vote against them; we must stop **them** getting the power to take **our** stuff. We must stop this democratic process, must change what words mean, must manipulate the numbers; this *strategic voting movement* is so Orwellian - maybe it started in 1984.

The previous Premier failed to end our democratic process because the voters of Ontario said no; now, with majorities provincially and federally, the Liberals are determined to take away our right to choose how we are governed - at least Premier McGuinty held a referendum - albeit Liberal style.

You can now change our democratic system to replace it with your first-past-the-post system, change what words mean: majority not the greatest amount but 50% + ?; manipulate the numbers - not one vote but infinite; you truly can engineer our election process into oblivion.

You claim you will increase voter turnout by forcing citizens to vote for representatives they do not want or even know, yet you are not interested in what those voters say about this voting. If you are so convinced you are creating the perfect system, why not allow the voters an opportunity to agree with you?

p2

You have heard repeatedly that education is vital to any election process, but you only want to explain the system YOU pick. Why not divert the taxpayer dollars going to this Committee to classes in governance and civic responsibility? Why not explain what an MP (& the gov't) actually do? For that matter, what MPPs, Mayors, Councils etc do as well. Would a few hours of unbiased explanation of our existing system of one person-one vote be too much to ask? At some point in education (as in life), multiple choice answers are abandoned in favour of definitive ones. Just because several students picked "D" does not mean the answer to $4 + 6$ is 11.

The mandate of this Committee is to impose multiple choice ballots: to have voters rank by ideology, not capability; by greed, not by need. Now is when the aforementioned special interest groups strike - while those on the "left" have multiple choices for representation, those of us who are "right" do not. Is my ballot invalid because I refuse to cast charity votes? In any of your silly systems, I only get ONE vote, but others have several - the L/NDP/G version of "Fair Vote"! To demand I rank the Flying Elephant Party, the Wash Your Dishes Daily Party and the Only Read Non-Fiction Party is a mockery. **HOW DARE YOU TELL ME WHO TO VOTE FOR!**

I find your cavalier use of "voters" fascinating. You consistently insult women, yet expect us to vote for you, you choose to interpret legitimate decisions as ones based on ignorance, we did not "diversify" enough so you will do it for us, we did not deliver the results you wanted to you will change the rules.

This whole process reminds me of Nicolae Ceausescu's trial 25 years ago - when the Romanians said they would give him a fair trial before they hanged him. The Prime Minister doesn't like our electoral system so he's going to change it to something he does.

I like our current system, although I seem to be one of the few people who actually understands how it works. Canada has 338 ridings, each riding elects their MP, whichever party elects the most MP's forms the government, next most forms the Loyal Opposition etc. You'll remember Candidate A - who received the most votes in their riding? It is up to the candidate to earn those votes, not for the system to award them, that is why A is the MP and not D - who could not sway enough voters to their beliefs. Let's face it, if you need to rely on third or fourth place choices, you're really not the one wanted, are you?

Now, D's few supporters think they should have a say in governance, otherwise their vote is "wasted". Using that reasoning - every person who stands for election should become an MP - and the next logical stop for that train is: every voter should be an MP.

This is when D's party start their Orwellian manipulation of numbers (ably abetted by our shamelessly biased media) whining about their "popular vote" share and silly chants of "false majorities", which they want to replace with - - - - "false majorities".

CM

p3

The D party takes the number of votes they gleaned nationally, then say they have 2 or 3% of the vote so they should have 2 or 3% of the seats. The other parties follow suit, because they also feel hard done by for not convincing enough voters to elect them, they want *their* percentage of the seats.

What they do not grasp is Canada doesn't have percentage seats - we have riding seats. So, instead of accepting the will of the voters in a riding, we must get rid of ridings to accommodate the will of the losers. With no ridings, we will have political parties appointing their favourites (from their special interest group supporters?) to these plum positions, all at our expense!

As with the Senate and the Supreme Court, party insiders will be appointing the House of Commons members, thereby eliminating the need for *any* elections - your Orwellian version of electoral reform - at least you will have solved the problem of low voter turnout.

SUPPLEMENT

1. There is no "post" in "FPTP", you are setting one at the 50% + line, no matter which convoluted system you lot pick;
2. Given that you believe consulting voters is "a waste of time", why are you wasting all our time and money even doing this:
3. Despite numerous variations discussed, you know you will choose the system the PM tells you to choose;
4. I am an old, white, female conservative - vilified daily in both the House of Commons and
by members of this committee - so kindly drop your pretence of wanting "gender equality"
in my government. Every L/NDP/G* in that House could be a woman, but they would not
represent **me**. I vote based on my beliefs, not my physique!!! (*We live in ON, perhaps my position would change if we lived in QC);

5. The gleeful shouts of “no more conservitard governments” heard at the commencement of this process verifies my comments. N.B. If I called you “Libertards”, I would probably be in jail before you finished reading this sentence;
6. Your contempt for women is only equalled by your contempt for so-called “first nations” - as you lump women, so you lump them. How many tribes are there? How many of them actually agree with each other? Does each of them require special treatment;

CM

p4

7. After eliminating elections, you can achieve the socially-engineered “false” diversity you crave

Based on the party hacks you appoint to the House, all from the “ABC Movement”, of course;

8. Will only the 65% of Canadians you say voted for this change have to pay these hacks;
9. Only 40% of voters wanted the Liberal version of ER, and 35ish% of voters wanted no ER, yet you are conveniently ignoring this 75%! *See, I can manipulate numbers just like you!*

Cathrine McKeever
Bowmanville, ON