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**IF PARLIAMENT BE HUNG…**

The rule, “that the will of a majority should be paramount… is *not* the foundation of democracy.”

The late Sir Michael Dummett

*Principles of Electoral Reform*, p 71.

The two-option majority vote was (sort of) OK for a two-party parliament, (but it is adversarial). A multi-party parliament should have multi-option voting.

The German *Bundestag* has constructive votes of no confidence.

The Danish *Folketinget* often uses plurality voting (though usually only on three options).

The Norwegian *Storting* has provision for the two-round system (TRS) of multi-option voting, (but it was last used in 1972).

Multi-option voting, usually TRS, has also been deployed, worldwide, in many referendums, the first in 1894: three-option ballots in Chile (1925) and Sweden (1980), for example; five options in Uruguay (1966) and New Zealand (1992); and so on. What’s more, multi-option voting was authorised by Westminster in 1949, for use in Newfoundland’s constitutional plebiscite.

There is, then, no reason at all – apart from convention – why the future government of the UK must be able to command the confidence of the House in a yes-or-no ballot. Instead, the executive could be chosen in a preferential multi-option vote, the outcome being the most acceptable option, i.e., the option with the highest average preference.

Furthermore, there would be nothing undemocratic about an all-party government of national unity (which is what was recommended for Kenya in 2008, Iraq in 2011, Ukraine in 2014, not to mention Northern Ireland in 1998, and which is what has existed in Switzerland since 1959).

“Borda’s criterion – (i.e., multi-option voting) – is the soundest method of identifying [the option which] is most generally popular.” (*Ibid*.)
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