JTS Box Number:IFES_67Tab Number:114Document Title:MMP and the EconomyDocument Date:1993Document Country:New ZealandDocument Language:EnglishIFES ID:CE01212



The Electoral Reform Coalition

The ERC is a non-profit society. It was formed in 1986 to campaign for a better voting system.

The ERC is not linked to any political party or business interest. It is funded by donations and subscriptions from ordinary New Zealanders.



I want MMP!

□ I can help the campaign. Please put me in touch with your local branch.

I can make a donation:

\$10	\$20	\$50	□ \$100	
\$200	\$500		Other:	

N	ame	
14	auv	•

Address:

Phone: hm ______wk ____

Send to: ERC, PO Box 38-758, Petone Phone: 04-471-1009, Auckland 09-378-8500

Who Uses PR?



Almost all the countries of Europe (30 out of 34) use proportional representation (PR). The only country to use pure First-Past-the-Post is Britain. Serbia and France use the Second Ballot system which is not proportional.

Since the collapse of the Soviet bloc, all of Eastern Europe has adopted some form of PR.

MMP is a proportional system that uses FPP to elect half or more of the MPs. Germany has used MMP since 1949. Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria and Albania have recently adopted systems similar to MMP. Referendum '93

MMP and the Economy



ELECTORAL REFORM COALTION Information Hotline: 0900-333-88

MMP: Better Government

Will MMP be good for the economy? Ruth Richardson says that MMP would spell "economic ruin" for New Zeraland. Peter Shirtcliffe says it will lead to "chaos". The Business Roundtable also opposes MMP.

Where is the evidence that MMP would harm our economy?

Independent economists in New Zealand have rejected such claims. Even the Business Roundtable's own specially commissioned report rejects instability as a likely consequence of MMP.

Most European nations have had proportional representation for many years and have an enviable record of stable "centrist" policies without the extremes of either left or right. MMP has a proven record in Germany.

Middle-of-the-road coalition government, with its greater emphasis on negotiation and consultation, gives more stability in government. It gives more certainty in economic policy. It gives more continuity from one election to another.

The wild swings in policy from one election to another that are common under First-Past-the-Post are not as likely with proportional systems like MMP. This is because no one party has "unbridled power".

New Zealand's poor economic performance, compared to that of countries with a history of PR, speaks for itself:

Economic Performance of Countries with PR

Country	Credit Rating:	GDP per	Average Annual Growth
	Standard	capita	Rate
·	& Poors	\$US 1990	1965-90
Switzerland	AAA	\$32,680	1.4%
Finland	AA	\$26,040	3.2%
Sweden	AAplus	\$23,660	1.9%
Norway	AAA	\$23,120	3.4%
Germany	AAA	\$23,320	2.4%
Denmark	AAplus	\$22,080	2.1%
Austria	AAA	\$19,060	2.9%
Netherlands	AAA	\$17,320	1.8%
Italy	AA	\$16,830	3.0%
Belgium	AAplus	\$15,540	2.6%
New Zealand	AAminus	\$12,680	1.1%

* Data from Minister of Finance and from <u>World</u> <u>Development Report</u>, (World Bank, 1992)

What People Say About MMP

Donal Curtin

BNZ Chief Economist, May 1993 "To the extent that MMP can restrain an eccentric minister of finance from running untrammelled through an economy, it has to be a good thing. MMP leads to more stability, not less."

'The Economist', May 1991

"The first-past-the-post system is undemocratic. On that ground alone it needs to be replaced. True, it tends to produce clear-cut governments. But so do some fairer systems, used in a majority of the world's democracies. And since the perception of fairness is the acid test for democracy - the very basis of its legitimacy - the unfairness argument overules all others....[FPP] does not need to be fixed, it needs to be replaced."

Roger Kerr

Chief Executive, NZ Business Roundtable July 1993

"Changes in economic thinking and practical experience are much more powerful factors than voting systems in determining economic policies. Current directions in New Zealand are in line with worldwide trends and are unlikely to change."

Royal Commission on the Electoral System December 1986

"The evidence from other democracies with proportional systems indicates that where there is a reasonable threshold which prevents the proliferation of minor parties, governments remain at least as effective, and possibly more so if proportionality results in the adoption of more consistent, consultative and broadly supported policies."