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**“Daft!” Lord Desai, (Hansard, 22.1.2003).**

**LIKEWISE, TAKING BINARY VOTES IN MULTI-AMENDMENT DEBATES**

**CAN BE DAFT!**

When there’s no majority for anything, there may be a majority against everything.

Consider the problem:

Amendment

***A*** 2nd referendum (of 2 or 3 options)

***B*** Norway +

***C*** No ‘no deal’

***D*** ………

***E*** ………

So how (the hell) does an MP vote on amendment ‘x’ when it is their 2nd preference? Or their 3rd preference!? As was said in the Lords in 2003, taking majority votes in a multi-option debate is “daft,” to quote Lord Desai; he recommended a Borda Count.

Likewise with majority voting on amendments, too much depends upon the order of voting: which amendment is where on the order paper.

The better methodology? Re-draft the amendments as complete proposals, and then take just one, multi-option, preference vote by Modified Borda Count, MBC. This voting procedure “is least likely to be subject to manipulation…” (Gerry Mackie, *Democracy Defended*, 2003, CUP, p 56), and it’s “the soundest method of identifying the [option which] is most generally popular…” (Michael Dummett, *Principles of Electoral Reform*, 1997, OUP, p 71).
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