

Mixed Member Proportional

Review of your model and outstanding issues

Your Working MMP Model

Single member
seats

90

Ratio of local
to list seats

70:30

Number of
list seats

39

Size of
legislature

129

Creating a province with 90 local seats

- To be determined by the Boundary Commission
- See *On Local Representation in MMP*

The Secondary Decisions

- Thresholds: Single province-wide 3%
- Number of Votes: 2
- Allow Overhang: Yes
- Formula: Hare
- Type of List: Closed
- Local Vote: Single member plurality
- Dual Candidacy allowed

What we heard about your model

- low ratio for proportional tier offset by province-wide list
- assumptions about simulation were 'reasonable'
- results could change if assumptions vary
- more overhangs if major changes in assumptions (e.g., much less vote splitting or if one party sweeps local elections)

What we heard about your model

- 3% legal threshold could be challenged but is defensible
- model results in strong proportionality
- ‘eminently reasonable’ and ‘a great job’

Outstanding issue: nomination of list candidates

- You chose province-wide, closed lists
- Should we simply expect parties to develop their lists to achieve regional and demographic balance?

Outstanding issue: nomination of list candidates

- If more ...
- Full public disclosure of the list and how it was created
 - Filed with Elections Ontario before elections
 - Made known to all voters

Outstanding issue: nomination of list candidates

- If more ...

- A legal standard the party has to meet?

 - e.g., “required to make a reasonable effort”

 - e.g., “democratic process”

- An independent review and assessment?

 - Elections Ontario?