



## Deliberation Phase Meeting Notes

Weekend 4 – March 31 & April 1 2007

### In Attendance

#### Members, Public & Staff

- 103 Assembly members, including the Chair
- 13 Secretariat staff
- 10 small group facilitators
- 32 public observers

#### Guest Speakers

- Brian Lambie, Redbrick Communications

#### Advisors & Technical Support

- Evaluator: Lynn McDonnell, Institute on Governance
- Facilitation advisor: Beth Allan
- Process advisor: Amy Lang, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Technical support: TV Ontario, Seneca College, Mediaco; Osgoode Hall Law School; Raw Edge Photography
- Simultaneous translation: International Conference Interpreters

### Objectives for Session

- To complete the design of models for a Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) and a Single Transferable Vote (STV) system
- To select the best alternative system for Ontario

### Proceedings

1. The session began with approval of meeting notes from the previous session and an open forum.
2. The Assembly agreed that for formal votes, three Assembly members will be randomly selected to oversee the counting of the ballots.
3. Jonathan Rose reported that electoral system experts have commented positively on the MMP working model. The feedback raised a concern that the potential for overhangs may be higher than originally anticipated. During medium group and plenary discussions, the Assembly discussed the issue of overhangs and decided not to change its working model. The Assembly noted the need for further information and discussion on the likelihood of overhangs should MMP be selected as the preferred alternative model.
4. Following medium group and plenary discussions, the Assembly added the following element to its working model for MMP:

- The process a party uses to create its list and the list itself should be transparent and made broadly available to the voters before an election

With this addition, the Assembly approved the design of its MMP model to weigh against STV.

5. Jonathan Rose reported that electoral system experts have commented positively on the STV working model. Following medium group and plenary discussions, the Assembly added the following elements to the working model:
  - Number of districts: 27
  - Size of the legislature: 135 seats

With these additions, the Assembly approved the design of its STV model to weigh against MMP. The Assembly noted the need for further information and discussion on seat vacancies should STV be selected as the preferred alternative model.

6. In an evening session, the members heard a presentation from communications expert Brian Lambie on techniques for communicating effectively with the public and media.
7. In medium group and plenary discussions, the Assembly weighed their MMP and STV models against the guiding principles and priority objectives. In a vote held by secret ballot, the Assembly decided that the MMP model is the best alternative system for Ontario. With one member absent this weekend and one having to leave early, 101 members (excluding the Chair) cast ballots. MMP received 75 votes; STV received 25 votes; and there was one spoiled ballot.
8. During the next weekend session, the Assembly will weigh its MMP model against Ontario's First-Past-The-Post system.

## **Follow-up Items**

### **Members**

9. Members will:
  - Review the presentation on ancillary issues in Tab Q of the Weekend 4 binder and give comments, if any, to Kelly Burke.

### **Secretariat**

10. The Secretariat will:
  - Send advance materials to help members prepare for Weekend 5
  - Ask for interested Assembly members to do further work before Weekend 5 on the likelihood of overhangs in the MMP model.

--Prepared by Karen Cohl, Executive Director and Recording Secretary