

# PRESENTATION SUMMARY

---

POWELL RIVER PUBLIC HEARING DATED  
15 MAY 2004 AT THE CEDAR ROOM, POWELL  
RIVER RECREATION CENTRE

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PRESENTATION TO THE CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY ON ELECTORAL REFORM. IT ATTEMPTS TO CAPTURE THE KEY ISSUES AND ARGUMENTS THAT WERE PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING. IN SOME INSTANCES, THE PRESENTER HAS ALSO MADE A SUBMISSION TO THE ASSEMBLY AND THIS IS ACCESSIBLE VIA THE WEBSITE AT [WWW.CITIZENSASSEMBLY.BC.CA](http://WWW.CITIZENSASSEMBLY.BC.CA) BY CLICKING ON "GET INVOLVED". IF SUCH A SUBMISSION IS AVAILABLE, IT WILL BE NOTED AT THE END OF THIS REPORT.

# Marilynn Mackenzie

---

## DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTATION

---

In support of representational government MMP system.

---

## KEY THEMES

---

Marilynn Mackenzie spoke in support of changing the current electoral system and introducing MMP. She explained that MMP would ensure that all votes counted regardless of which candidate won the constituency, and that the electoral outcome was more representative of the popular vote. MMP would also result in a wider range of views represented in the legislature and increase the likelihood of coalition government. Ms Mackenzie argued that the extreme policy swings seen in BC under the current electoral system would be reduced by coalition or minority government, and that legislative decision making would be more consensual. She spoke against the introduction of the STV system in BC, arguing that it was far more complicated than MMP and required a computerized voting system without a verifiable paper ballots as a record of the vote.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Marilynn Mackenzie recommended the introduction of MMP in British Columbia.

---

## QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PANEL

---

There were three members of the panel who sought clarification on elements of the presentation.

Q	Do you prefer a closed list or an open list for an MMP system?
A	I'm not sure that I've really made up my mind which would be better. I would be more in favour of a closed list. Under a closed system, the party has to nominate the people on the list ahead of the election and publish it. An open list is not published prior to the election so there is not as much prior knowledge. I think I'd like more information about party lists and duplication, when a candidate contests a riding and the list, and may lose in the riding but still be elected via the list.
Q	Have you done any research into how this system would work with only 79 seats rather than 120 as is the case in NZ?
A	Because we would have to set some seats aside for party list MLAs, we would have fewer constituencies and you

	would have to redraw the boundaries to make them one third larger. I don't see this as a problem because of the modern technology available today and the interdependence of all communities in the province.
--	---

**Comment from panel:** There were no comments from the panel.

---

**QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

---

Following this presentation a member of the audience also had a question.

Q	I need more of a sense of empowerment, this is my main concern. I would like to be able to vote for a candidate and then for a party, maybe for a different party.
A	That's the main reason why I prefer an MMP system, because each one of us as an individual gets a much greater chance to have a voice. At the moment between 50 and 60 per cent of our votes are lost. At least with MMP, if your candidate is not elected, then you will still get some seats in the legislature.

**Comment:** There were no comments from the audience.

**SUBMISSION: NO**