

Comparing MMP & STV

DOES THERE HAVE TO BE A TRADE OFF BETWEEN LOCAL REPRESENTATION & PROPORTIONALITY?

At the start of our process, the BC Assembly was strongly in favour of MMP. It seemed like a very sensible, simple and direct system which solved the need for Local Representation and Proportionality. I thought MMP was a slam dunk, and we didn't need 13 weekends to figure that out. STV seemed like a lot of math, for no apparent benefit over MMP.

But then came Local Representation and the understandable unwillingness of many people to let go of it. A Mayor of one of BC's northern towns summarized it quite clearly to us during our public consultation process:

"Proportionality yes, but not at the cost of Local Representation."

In BC, we had to find a solution to the apparent trade off between Proportionality & Local Representation. We found a system that dramatically improves both Proportionality & Local Representation and created the possibility of many other, unexpected improvements. We also found a system much better for women's representation & diversity.

The more we looked at MMP, the more we saw problems with it. The more we looked at STV, the more we liked it.

We had much more time for this process to take place than the Ontario Assembly. This report is an attempt to share the extra time we had, by letting the OCA know what we found. This report is obviously a clear endorsement of STV. Someone needs to make the case for STV. I hope this helps. It really is a remarkable electoral system.

Values or Positions

- **Values or Positions:** Decisions can be made based on taking a position (already knowing the answer) or by establishing values and evaluating how potential solutions satisfy those values (a deliberative process).
- **Keeping an Open Mind:** The success of the Assembly will depend on the ability of its members to keep an open mind, and to address values instead of taking positions.

Myths

- **FPTP provides stable government.** In practice, giving a party absolute power leads to broad policy swings, creating a very unstable policy situation for investors and voters.
- **MMP has more familiar features than STV.** MMP's "local representation", that only 50% of voters get, is familiar. The two tier voting, a closed provincial list and a special "Independent Review Body", are not familiar.
- **There must be a trade off between proportionality and local representation.** With MMP, there is a trade off. With STV, both are improved.
- **Adding MPPs will allow MMP to retaining local representation.** LR doesn't exist for 50% of voters in SMDs (MMP & FPTP). MMP-129 has 18.9% more voters/MPP than FPTP-107 & STV-107 (& 43% more than FPTP-129 & STV-129).
- **MMP is the best system for providing better representation for women and more diversity.** MMP-129 keeps 90 single-member districts, which will continue to discriminate against women and others. STV has no SMDs, therefore this discrimination will not occur.
- **STV is too complex.** If STV is too complex, what is MMP? STV is easy to use. The only thing challenging is a little math, that a computer deals with. People in Ireland, Malta and Australia understand it. Surely Canadians can.
- **BC-STV failed in the BC referendum.** It might not have passed the 60/60 double threshold, but it came very close. It passed in 77 of 79 districts showing both strong urban & rural support. It received 57.7% support. It got more votes than have ever been received by a political party in BC.

Opportunities

- **Local Representation Can Be Dramatically Improved:** With SMDs, only about 50% of voters get local representation. With multi-member districts, this can be increased to a minimum of 75% to 87.5% of voters. See p 12
- **Local Proportionality Can Be Added:** Currently, communities are represented by a single point of view. Local PR ensures that all points of view are heard.
- **Provincial Proportionality Can Be Added:** Both MMP & STV add provincially proportional.
- **Improved Voter Choice & Accountability:** Every real choice is an opportunity for accountability. The greatest choice is the prospect that your vote will actually elect the MPP you desire. Choices are also reasons to vote. See p 4-7
- **Better Representation of Women & Others:** The discrimination caused by single-member districts (FPTP & MMP) is unacceptable. Period. See p 9-11
- **The Fun Things About STV:** There are dozens of secondary effects which can fun(damentally) improve how our democracy works. See p 4-7

Practicality

- **Increasing The Number of MPPs Is Very Risky:** Even if only 10% of voters think there are too many politicians now, the Referendum will be lost in a double 60/60 vote.
- **Closed Provincial Lists Aren't Worth The Risk:** For those who don't trust political parties, this is a deal breaker. If 10% of voters feel this way, the Referendum is lost.
- **"Independent Review Body" Doesn't Seem Very Transparent or Workable:** This is an obvious band-aid for a system that simply can't accomplish what is required.
- **Compare MMP-129 with STV-107:** Not really fair to STV, but STV-107 accomplishes all values plus many more, without risk of making the Referendum about the number of MPPs. Let Queen's Park take the hit for more MPPs.
- **Don't Make A Recommendation:** Until Queen's Park commits to mailing out OCAs Final Report to all households.

F P T P

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR

130 MPPs in 130 Single-Member Districts
Local Rep: 50% get it (lower half), 50% don't (upper half)

M M P

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR

129 MPPs in 90 Single-Member Districts + 39 List MPPs
Local Rep: 50% get it (lower half), 50% don't (upper half)

S T V

3	75% LR	4	4	4	4	4
3	75% LR	80% LR	80% LR	80% LR	80% LR	80% LR
3	75% LR	4	6		5	83.3% LR
3	75% LR	80% LR	85.7% LR		5	83.3% LR
5	83.3% LR		6		5	83.3% LR
5	83.3% LR		85.7% LR		5	83.3% LR
7	87.5% LR			6	6	
7	87.5% LR			85.7% LR	85.7% LR	
7	87.5% LR			6	6	
7	87.5% LR			85.7% LR	85.7% LR	

130 MPPs in 26 Multi-Member Districts
Local Rep: 75% to 87.5% get it. DM: 3 to 7 (Average=5)

PREPARED BY: CRAIG HENSCH, BURNABY, BC

COMPARING 129 MEMBER SYSTEMS

(130 MPPs are used for the FPTP & STV diagrams to better fit in rectangles)

LOCAL REPRESENTATION (HOW MANY VOTERS GET AN MPP?)
Should democracy apply to everyone, or just those who vote for the winning candidate? Shouldn't every voter get a local MPP?
Local representation provides local information & local understanding to help make better public policy decisions.

FPTP & MMP: In the 2003 Ontario election, about 50% of voters got an MPP of their choice. The other 50% didn't get an MPP to represent their point of view. Single-member districts provide representation only to those who vote for the winner. **Is this type of LR worth keeping?**

MMP: The 90 SMD MPPs in MMP-129 have 43% more voters per local MPP than both FPTP-129 and STV-129 (& 18.9% more than FPTP-107 & STV-107).

STV: Minimum number of voters who get LR varies with DM: DM-3 (75%), DM-4 (80%), DM-5 (83.3%), DM-6 (85.7%), DM-7 (87.5%). These numbers get even better when "hung up quota" voters' next preferences are looked at.

LOCAL PROPORTIONALITY (REPRESENTING COMMUNITIES)
Communities have many points of view. For entire communities to prosper, shouldn't all points of view be represented?

FPTP: Represents one point of view in each community.
MMP: Represents one point of view in each community.
STV: Represents several points of view in each community depending on the DM & the preponderance of that point of view in the community.

PROVINCE WIDE PR (VOTERS GET EQUAL SHARE OF AN MPP)
Should each MPP represent the same number of voters? Should each voter have the same share of an MPP's vote in Legislature? MMP & STV accomplish PR differently & with different biases.

FPTP: Not PR. Voters/MPP in 2003: L = 29,028, PC = 64,966, NDP = 94,390
MMP: Party Based Corrective Method: Favours parties with thin, province wide support that can get 3% of votes provincially.
STV: Candidate Based Quota Method: Favours individuals and parties with strong local support. "Next Preferences" make this effective.

VOTER'S CHOICE & ACCOUNTABILITY (VOTER POWER)
Limits to Choice: Plurality voting, safe seats, strategic voting, parties' candidate selection process. Choice gives voters power.

Every Real Choice = Real Accountability = A Reason to Vote
FPTP: In many ways, no choice at all, especially in safe seats. No guarantee of electing an MPP & getting representation. 50% don't get an MPP.
MMP: Same limited choices as FPTP locally, with added party vote. Closed Lists remove choice & accountability for 39 MPPs (30% of MPPs).
STV: Preferential voting provides enormous choice. No need to strategically vote. No safe seats for bad incumbents & candidates. Voters have final say in Parties' candidate selection process. Who gets elected is determined by voters, not political parties. Likely to actually elect an MPP.

WOMEN & DIVERSITY (REMOVING SYSTEMIC BARRIERS)
Single-member districts discriminate against women & others. Multi-member districts allow parties to balance candidates with either Voluntary Quotas (+/- 35%) or Required Quotas (50%).

- FPTP:** • 129 SMD seats x 25% = 32 women = 25% (In 2003: 23% women)
- MMP:**
- With Voluntary List Quotas: (90 SMD x 25%) + (39 x 35%) = 36 = 28%
 - With Required List Quota: (90 SMD x 25%) + (39 x 50%) = 42 = 33%
 - Mathematical upper limit of women's rep with MMP-129 = 33%.
 - Requires zip'd closed Lists. **How do you zipper for diversity?**
 - Added women & diversity from List will be in opposition not gov't.
- STV:**
- With Voluntary Quotas: 129 x 35% = 45 = 35%
 - With Required Quota: 129 x 50% = 64.5 = 50% No upper limit.
 - Additional women & diversity will be in both gov't & opposition.

FPTP-107, MMP-129 & STV-107

(110 MPPs are used for the FPTP & STV diagrams to better fit in rectangles)

FPTP

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR

110 MPPs in 110 Single-Member Districts
Local Rep: 50% get it (lower half), 50% don't (upper half)

MMP

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR	50% LR

129 MPPs in 90 Single-Member Districts + 39 List MPPs
Local Rep: 50% get it (lower half), 50% don't (upper half)

STV

3	75% LR	3	75% LR	6	85.7% LR	4	80% LR
3	75% LR	3	75% LR	6	85.7% LR	5	83.3% LR
6	85.7% LR	6	85.7% LR	5	83.3% LR	5	83.3% LR
6	85.7% LR	6	85.7% LR	5	83.3% LR	5	83.3% LR
7	87.5% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR
7	87.5% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR
7	87.5% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR
7	87.5% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR	4	80% LR

110 MPPs in 22 Multi-Member Districts
Local Rep: 75% to 87.5% get it. DM: 3 to 7 (Average=5)

PREPARED BY: CRAIG HENSCH, BURNABY, BC

LOCAL REPRESENTATION (HOW MANY VOTERS GET AN MPP?)

Should democracy apply to everyone, or just those who vote for the winning candidate? Shouldn't every voter get a local MPP?

Local representation provides local information & local understanding to help make better public policy decisions.

FPTP & MMP: In the 2003 Ontario election, about 50% of voters got an MPP of their choice. The other 50% didn't get an MPP to represent their point of view. Single-member districts provide representation only to those who vote for the winner. **Is this type of LR worth keeping?**

MMP: The 90 SMD MPPs in MMP-129 have 18.9% more voters per local MPP than both FPTP-107 and STV-107.

STV: Minimum number of voters who get LR varies with DM: DM-3 (75%), DM-4 (80%), DM-5 (83.3%), DM-6 (85.7%), DM-7 (87.5%). These numbers get even better when "hung up quota" voters' next preferences are looked at.

LOCAL PROPORTIONALITY (REPRESENTING COMMUNITIES)

Communities have many points of view. For entire communities to prosper, shouldn't all points of view be represented?

FPTP: Represents one point of view in each community.
MMP: Represents one point of view in each community.
STV: Represents several points of view in each community depending on the DM & the preponderance of that point of view in the community.

PROVINCE WIDE PR (VOTERS GET EQUAL SHARE OF AN MPP)

Should each MPP represent the same number of voters? Should each voter have the same share of an MPP's vote in Legislature? MMP & STV accomplish PR differently & with different biases.

FPTP: Not PR. Voters/MPP in 2003: L = 29,028, PC = 64,966, NDP = 94,390
MMP: Party Based Corrective Method: Favours parties with thin, province wide support that can get 3% of votes provincially.
STV: Candidate Based Quota Method: Favours individuals and parties with strong local support. "Next Preferences" make this effective.

VOTER'S CHOICE & ACCOUNTABILITY (VOTER POWER)

Limits to Choice: Plurality voting, safe seats, strategic voting, parties' candidate selection process. Choice gives voters power.

Every Real Choice = Real Accountability = A Reason to Vote

FPTP: In many ways, no choice at all, especially in safe seats. No guarantee of electing an MPP & getting representation. 50% don't get an MPP.
MMP: Same limited choices as FPTP locally, with added party vote. Closed Lists remove choice & accountability for 39 MPPs (30% of MPPs).
STV: Preferential voting provides enormous choice. No need to strategically vote. No safe seats for bad incumbents & candidates. Voters have final say in Parties' candidate selection process. Who gets elected is determined by voters, not political parties. Likely to actually elect an MPP.

WOMEN & DIVERSITY (REMOVING SYSTEMIC BARRIERS)

Single-member districts discriminate against women & others. Multi-member districts allow parties to balance candidates with either Voluntary Quotas (+/- 35%) or Required Quotas (50%).

- FPTP:** • 107 SMD seats x 25% = 27 women = 25% (In 2003: 23% women)
- MMP:**
- With Voluntary List Quotas: (90 SMD x 25%) + (39 x 35%) = 36 = 28%
 - With Required List Quota: (90 SMD x 25%) + (39 x 50%) = 42 = 33%
 - Mathematical upper limit of women's rep with MMP-129 = 33%.
 - Requires zip'd closed Lists. **How do you zipper for diversity?**
 - Added women & diversity from List will be in opposition not gov't.
- STV:**
- With Voluntary Quotas: 107 x 35% = 37 = 35%
 - With Required Quota: 107 x 50% = 53.5 = 50% No upper limit.
 - Additional women & diversity will be in both gov't & opposition.

FUN THINGS ABOUT STV

Prepared by: Craig Henschel, Burnaby, BC

As a former member of the BC Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform, I remember listening to a presenter during one of our consultation phase public hearings. He said:

"Everyone can't win an election. Someone wins and someone loses. That's how it works."

Old Style Democracy: The point of FPTP and MMP constituency elections is to find a single representative for all the voters in your geographic area, even if the MPP doesn't represent the point of view of 40% to 60% of the voters.

STV Democracy: The point of STV is to make sure that as many voters as possible actually have a representative that they want. This is a completely different concept. All voters win, not just those who vote for the plurality winner.

Democracy doesn't have to be only for those who vote for the single winning candidate. Democracy can & should be for all of us.

Some Fun Things about STV

STV reduces "False Representation".

- On average in FPTP & MMP, about 50% of the voters in a local district don't vote for the winning candidate. This results in constituency representatives that falsely represent half their voters. It means that only half of the people in every single-member district are actually getting "Local Representation".
- STV, by providing local proportionality and MPPs who are each elected by the same number of voters, results in much less false representation and a significant increase in the number of voters who are actually represented in the way they would choose.

The effectiveness of local representation increases everywhere with STV, including sparsely populated rural districts.

- Multi-member districts make local proportionality possible. This ensures that several points of view will be represented from each district to Queen's Park. This is

especially important in remote areas which aren't very well understood in other parts of the province.

- Even in large rural districts, adding three districts together makes it possible to add a significant component of local proportionality and dramatically reduce false representation.

Independents have a real chance to get elected.

- In Ireland almost 8% of their MPs are independents.
- Well known local people can get elected, especially with "next preferences". Extremist candidates will have difficulty getting elected because of the need for next preferences, which they're unlikely to get due to their extremist nature.
- This provides a practical way for MPPs to dissent from their party's policies and not commit political suicide at the same time. They will be able to leave their party and still get elected as an independent in the next election. They won't have to go to another political party right away.

Communities have more than one point of view, they need more than one MPP.

- As a group, your MPPs will form a (formal or informal) "Local Caucus", taking a basket of ideas from your district to Queen's Park. Communities are built by all of its members. To be successful, all of these ideas need to be expressed and heard, so that the policy that helps build and protect the entire community is chosen, rather than the policy that only serves a plurality of the voters.
- This caucus will be able to forcefully represent local interests in both government and opposition.

Local Multi-Party Caucus may take a united stand on important local issues.

- MPPs from different parties, but from the same district, might come together and take a united stand on issues that are important to the local area; for instance, the closing of a hospital.

No more disappearing MPPs.

- During their term of office, it won't be possible for your MPP to just take off to Queen's Park and re-appear, back in your riding in four years, for the next election.
- When one MPP goes back to the district to discuss issues in the local papers, or in public forums, the other MPPs will have to scurry back to the district to get their faces in front of the voters. They are going to be discussing local issues. What they learn, they will take back to Queen's Park.
- Sometime, they'll be cooperating on issues that are important to everyone in the district, sometimes not. But there will be a discussion about local issues, something that doesn't happen now.
- **With Single-Member Districts (FPTP & MMP):** There's very little discussion during the term of office because there's only one local MPP. With MMP, the regional MPPs will be spending time where it counts for them, with the party power brokers, not with the voters.
- **With Multi-Member Districts (STV):** MPPs are going to be in your neighbourhood, discussing issues, because they'll

be running their campaigns for the four years in between elections; not just in the 28 days before the election.

Getting things done with your MPP.

- If voters have a particular issue that needs to be addressed, there will usually be an MPP from the government and MPPs from opposition parties that they can go to. They can make their case to both sets of MPPs.
- **With STV: Voters will almost always be able to find an MPP who has a sympathetic ear, to address their concerns.**

The STV counting system tries its best to make sure your highest preferences get elected. It doesn't just look at your ballot, throw it in a pile and then forget about you.

- Almost all voters in Ontario would get representation they find acceptable in Queen's Park.
- After stacking all the ballots up with the first preferences, the counting system picks up your ballot and ask how you would like to proceed.
- If your candidate has received twice the votes she needs, the counting system uses only the amount of your vote needed to elect your candidate, freeing up a portion of your vote to help elect subsequent preferences. In this way, your vote is not wasted and you don't have to vote strategically.
- If your first choice doesn't stand a chance of winning, the counting system will ask who your next preference is, and your vote will be transferred to that candidate.
- This counting process continues until all the seats are filled and the most preferred candidates in the district are elected.
- Because STV electoral districts have multiple-members, even if your ballot gets stuck on a candidate who can't get elected, it's reasonable to assume that you will have an MPP available to represent you from a party that reflects your point of view, and that you can support.
- The STV counting system is more involved than that of FPTPs and MMPs. However, the added care and attention given to your ballot is worth the extra algebra that a computer handles so easily. You don't have to know exactly how your car works to drive it 100 kph down the highway.

Strategic Voting – Not needed.

- The best strategy for a voter, is to vote honestly, because strategic voting doesn't work in STV. There is no strategic voting except to vote for your first preference first, your second preference next and not actually voting for someone who you don't want to get elected. Strategic voting is difficult and prone to errors because it's often impossible to know who to vote for.

There will be more female candidates and a greater diversity of candidates.

- Political parties can't do the same thing that happens in single-member districts right now, where they put up the most likely person they think will win; who too often happens to look like a middle aged white guy. They're going to have to put up more people from diverse backgrounds and more women, or they will lose votes.

- Multi-member districts make it possible for political parties to adopt voluntary quotas or for the legislature to require a quota.
- **STV reduces systematic discrimination against women and others, in all districts, for all candidates.**
- They won't be stuck in districts in which they don't stand a chance of winning. They'll be running in all districts, where they actually can get elected, without the need for closed zippered lists.

STV doesn't discriminate like FPTP & MMP against women and others who want to become constituency or government MPPs.

- Because MMP systems retain the single-member constituency districts, they also retain the discrimination that SMDs create. Most government members come from MMP constituency seats. This combination hurts women. The women MMP adds will likely end up in opposition.
- In STV's multi-member districts, the major parties will have the greatest requirement to provide diversity in each district. They will also be the most likely to form government. This helps women to get into government and into Cabinet.
- **Under STV: All MPPs are the same type. All STV MPPs represent essentially the same number of voters. All STV MPPs are elected using the same electoral system. All STV MPPs are equal.**

STV creates the possibility of different kinds of constituencies.

- Right now, constituencies are just geographic. With STV, there can be different types of constituencies. They might relate to the environment, the arts, health care, cultural relations, social or business issues. If women's representation is important to a voter, they can select all women, from different parties, or even zipper their vote.
- Instead of portraying yourself as a one dimensional, right-wing or left-wing person to the voting system, voters can portray themselves in a multi-dimensional way.
- For instance, a person might portray himself, or herself, as fiscally conservative first, an environmentalist second, socially progressive third, and a health care advocate fourth. These preferences can either be with one party, or across party lines.

- This multi-dimensional sketch of who you are will be put on your ballot and then counted. The counting system will take this into account when it counts your ballot.

"Next Preference Votes" are important and will be sought out by most candidates.

- This means that there will be a tendency to avoid attack ads and confrontational election campaigns which will turn off voters whose second preferences a candidate needs. Candidates will have to rely on issues more than smear tactics.
- Extremist candidates, who cannot gain second preferences, will find it more difficult to get elected.

Members from the same party will be competing against each other during elections and during their terms of office.

THIS IS A VERY GOOD THING

- With multi-member districts, parties will put up several candidates in the same district, typically one or two more than they think they'll win. So, there may be four or five candidates from the same party running against each other, probably to get three seats. This brings up some interesting possibilities, all fuelled by competition to get support from the electorate, both during elections and throughout their terms of office.
- **With STV:** Instead of just having to curry favour with the political party power brokers to get their party's nomination, MPPs will have to pay attention to the voters, because it will be the voter that makes the final selection.

With STV's multi-member districts and preferential voting, every voter has a direct say in the candidate selection process of the political parties.

- If the party puts up four candidates, and one is not desirable, the voter gets to choose which of those three will get elected, because they vote for the worse choice last, or not at all. So, if you have an incumbent MPP who is not doing a good job, that incumbent MPP can be un-elected.
- This means that there are no safe seats for candidates. There may be safe seats for parties, but not safe seats for candidates. This results in increased accountability.
- With STV, a voter truly gets to vote for both the person and the party they support.

Preferential voting helps shape political parties.

- STV's preference based selection mechanism can help to shape parties' policies and direction. If environmentalists are preferred by the voters, the parties and the candidates will learn this and adjust their policies and candidates accordingly.
- Over time, voters, and not just the political party leadership, will help shape the nature of each party and its policies, by determining who's in the elected party's hierarchy.
- By helping to select the parties' candidates, the voter will have more control over a political parties' policies. When powerful incumbents lose touch with the voters, they'll be removed by the voters, which will provide a useful cleaning up service to the political parties.
- Currently, in safe districts for a political party, the real decision about who will be your MPP happens in the political party's candidate selection process. Your vote on Election Day is often irrelevant.
- **With STV:** There are no safe seats for candidates. Elections in every district are meaningful.
- STV helps political parties to rejuvenate and remain relevant when voters don't support powerful but ineffective and counter productive candidates.

Accountability improves under STV.

- You will be able to support your party of choice, but you will also be able to vote against a candidate from that party who has not been doing a good job. So, accountability of

individual MPPs will increase. You can also vote against your party of choice, or party that is an incumbent governing party, if they haven't been doing a good job.

Majority, Minority & Coalition Governments.

- With STV, voters can elect minority, majority and coalition governments, depending on how they cast their ballots.

"Kicking the bums out" accountability not needed as much.

- The important thing to understand about policy swings and the inevitable "kicking the bums out" accountability process, is that by having absolute power during their term in office, FPTP governments are free to go down the wrong roads, without constraint. Eventually they screw up so much, offend so many people, that they are kicked out of office at the next election by an angry electorate.
- **Wouldn't it be better for there to be the checks of a coalition government to keep it out of trouble in the first place and save the public having to endure often very harmful and disruptive policies?**

Coalition governments provide stable government policy.

- Usually, STV (& MMP) will be electing coalition governments. That's when two or more parties come together and through dialogue and discussion, either before or after an election, make an agreement to govern the province giving the coalition a majority of seats in the legislature.
- Coalitions have enough power in the legislature to carry on a program of policy development and governing, in much the same way that majority governments do right now, but with greater consent of the people.
- Coalition governments tend to result in more consensual decision making. This is seen throughout the world wherever there are proportional governments.
- The United Nations Human Development Index clearly shows that proportional governments perform very well for their jurisdictions.

Policy swings will be less extreme, providing more stable government policy.

- Coalition governments in Ontario would reduce the number and degree of wild swings from the right to the left, and back again, with policy being undone, made over and changed back again.
- When labour policy is changed, manufacturing policy is changed, and environment policy is radically changed, that creates, not a stable governing situation, but an unstable governing situation. It creates a province where investors don't know what to expect. It makes it very difficult for citizens who are directly affected by government policy.
- Coalition governments tend to have more moderate, more middle of the road, more consensus based policy, addressing more of the concerns of a greater number of people in the province. The policy swings, when governments change, will tend to be more gradual. There won't be wild swings from one side to the other.

More stable investment climate.

- With reduced policy swings, home grown and external investors will have less risk and will be more willing to invest in Ontario. Unpredictable changes of business, labour, resource, and manufacturing regulations scare away investment.
- When a government uses incentives to attract investment and then those programs are discontinued by the next government, jobs leave the province.

Absolute power corrupts absolutely.

- **Because the Premier will have to reach across party lines for support, and there will be more than one party represented in Cabinet, it will be less likely that ill considered ideas that pop into the Premier's head will actually see the light of day.**
- There will be someone else in the room to add balance to the decision making process.
- Through coalition governments and increased MPP accountability, STV will tend to reduce the power of the Premier's office and the political parties in determining what government and party policy will be.
- This power to influence policy will tend to devolve to MPPs and to the Legislature, where increased levels of discussion and deliberation can lead to better policy development.

No more "Follow the Leader" politicians.

- There will be at least two party leaders who will have to discuss and agree on policy. This will be a much better environment for discussion and deliberative policy making, much better than just following the Premier's unconsidered whim.

Parties will retain strength to provide structure to political system.

- Political parties will still remain strong, continuing to provide a useful structure to our political system and culture. They will be more in touch with the voters.
- Political parties will lose some power, especially around the final candidate selection process, but even this will allow the parties to clear out the dead wood, with help from the voters. This will actually help the parties.
- If a party is to remain dynamic and relevant, and in power, it will need to change with the times. Unfortunately, it may be difficult, within a party, to get rid of powerful people who are holding the party back. The voters can help the parties in this rejuvenation processes.
- More dynamic political parties will lead to a nimbler policy development process which is important in a rapidly changing world.

MPPs will have more power.

- MPPs run for office because they want to work constructively for their communities, but find, once they're elected, that their ability to make a difference is curtailed by party and government pressures.
- MPPs will be under increased pressure by the electorate to perform for them. All MPPs will have to be more forceful within their party. As a result, party policy will be modified

by MPPs to better reflect voter's values and desires, rather than the thoughts of a few back room party officials or their party leaders. Giving voters more power will force MPPs to stand up for themselves and their constituents.

Voters will have more power.

- **When voters have more power, MPPs will demand more power within their political parties and in the Legislature.**

STV is simple to use.

- STV is different and it's new to us. But we learn about new things all the time. Microsoft is bringing out a new operating system. We will all learn how to use it. Most of us have figured out how to use cell phones. We don't have to know exactly how a compressor works to use a fridge. I have no idea what's under the hood of my car, but I drive it at 110 kph down the highway, in the rain.
- People who want to keep our current system, or who prefer a system which keeps power in the hands of the political parties (MMP & FPTP), often characterize STV as too complicated. These are usually clever people who are being disingenuous. They are using fear to accomplish political goals.
- Those who prefer plurality systems have been critical of STV. They will also be critical of MMP.
- If people in Ireland, Malta and Australia can understand and use STV, people in Ontario certainly can.
- Preference voting is simpler to use than plurality voting because you don't have to figure out how to vote effectively and accurately in a strategic way.

STV is a simpler system to understand than MMP.

- Neither STV nor MMP are too complicated to understand. However, if you think MMP is straight forward, take a look at the Ontario Citizens' Assembly Submission # 1249. MMP is definitely not simple.
- **Building an MMP system is very difficult. How easy will it be to explain it to voters?**
- **An STV system can be designed in a morning. It will be easy to explain to voters.**
- If you think FPTP is straight forward, try to explain how a party that doesn't get the most votes can form a majority government and why that's acceptable.

STV will increase voter turn out.

- Without the need to vote strategically, voters will better know who to vote for, to get their desired result.
- Preference voting accurately reflects how we normally think about things. This is my favorite, this is my next choice, and that is last. We do it all the time. It makes more sense to us than plurality voting.
- When you know your vote won't be wasted & that you'll actually elect someone, you'll be more likely vote.

**Democracy is served when more of us vote.
This will happen when we expect, and actually get, the representatives we voted for.**

Evaluating Electoral Systems

EIGHT (+1) OCA PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS PLUS: LOCAL REPRESENTATION & LOCAL PROPORTIONALITY

A good starting point for examining the options. A good place to return to at the end of the process.

Legitimacy

An electoral system should have the confidence of the people and reflect their values.

- Broadly speaking, for an electoral system to be legitimate, it should be fair for parties, treat voters equally, be non-discriminatory and result in all voters being represented in the Legislature.
- A legitimate system should foster the development and implementation of informed, well thought out, effective and broadly supported policies.

Local Representation

It's clear that Local Representation is of primary importance to voters in Ontario. An electoral system should have a component of Local Representation. It's amazing that LR wasn't one of the original 'Principles and Characteristics'.

- Is the current level and quality of Local Rep adequate?
- Voters are frustrated with our electoral system. Is this because only 50% of voters get an MPP who represents their point of view? The rest vote but get nothing.
- Are voters more frustrated with the lack of local representation, or the lack of proportionality?
- When a voter casts a ballot, should they expect to elect an MPP? Should voters expect to have representation?

Local Proportionality

For communities to prosper, all points of view and all concerns need to be integrated into policy decisions.

- Are voters frustrated that their MPP, who they didn't vote for, is running around for four years representing their community, from a point of view many don't agree with?
- Is it possible for a single MPP, from one party, to be able to speak on behalf of all members of the community?

Fairness of Representation

The Legislative Assembly should reflect the population in accordance with demographic representation, proportionality and representation by population, among other factors.

- Each MPP should represent the same number of voters.
- The percentage of votes a party gets should be roughly the same as the percentage of seats the party gets.
- Single-member districts discriminate against women and others. Is this acceptable? If there's a way to eliminate it? Don't we have an ethical obligation to remove it?
- If only 50% of voters get local representation, is this fair?

Voter Choice

An electoral system should promote voter choice in terms of quantity and quality of options available to voters.

- Real choices should actually result in something. Being able to select your representative would be a good start.
- Strategic voting removes choice because it's based on speculation about election results. Choice isn't a gamble.

Effective Parties

Political parties should be able to structure public debate, mobilize and engage the electorate, and develop policy alternatives.

- As long as the OCA keeps to its mandate, political parties will be safe and able to take care of themselves.
- Do political parties need more power, or less?

Stable & Effective Government

An electoral system should contribute to continuity of government, and governments should be able to develop and implement their agendas and take decisive action when required.

- What is "stable" government? Is stability important for the people in office, or the public policies they create? Do these types of stability work against each other?
- Is absolute power (majority governments) needed for stability? Are minority and coalition governments in Europe and elsewhere failures?

Effective Parliament

The Legislative Assembly should include a government and opposition, and should be able to perform its parliamentary functions successfully.

- For Parliament to be effective, does that mean that there should be informed discussions about issues in a deliberative manner in the Legislature, Parliamentary Committees and public hearings, or does it mean that the Premier should have absolute power to carry out his or her agenda unencumbered and unchecked?

Stronger Voter Participation

An electoral system should promote voter participation as well as engagement with the broader democratic process.

- **During Elections:** Elections should encourage debate between candidates and amongst the public. Voting should actually elect somebody. Safe seats reduce discussion.
- **During Term of Office:** MPPs should remain actively involved in policy discussions in their districts, and not just disappear until the next election.

Accountability

Voters should be able to identify decision-makers and hold them to account for their actions.

- Should accountability be for government only, or opposition parties as well? Should it be blunt or surgical?
- Should accountability be for parties only, or also MPPs?

Simplicity and Practicality

System should be understandable to the public. Simplicity may include how easy it is for voters to use the ballot and to understand the election results. Practicality involves looking at the feasibility of adopting a new system in Ontario.

- How simple does the electoral system have to be? Which voters in the world are Ontario voters not as smart as?
- If the OCA recommends STV in Ontario, this will confirm STV as the "Citizens' Choice" across Canada.

Why Bother Voting?

Mixed Member Proportional & FPTP
Not Very Democratic

- 50% of Voters Don't Get Local Representation:** In single-member districts, because only one MPP is elected in each district, only the people who vote for the winner get local representation. 50% get false representation.
- Communities Aren't Represented:** When only one point of view gets an MPP, communities are weakened.
- With Safe Seats, Elections Happen Elsewhere:** In many districts, the election result is a forgone conclusion. Who your MPP will be, is actually decided in the political party's candidate selection process, by comparatively few political party members months or years before the election. The formal election is just a rubber stamp.

WHY VOTE, IF YOUR VOTE DOESN'T ELECT ANYONE?

Our expectations are so low, we don't even remember that the main premise of a democracy is for each of us to be represented in the Legislature by an MPP of our choosing.

50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep
MMP & FPTP Local Rep							
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep	Get Local Rep
This is as good as it gets with single-member districts. More MPPs don't improve local representation.							
DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1	DM = 1

3 Reasons to Vote

Single Transferable Vote
Much More Democratic

- STV Tries to Give All Voters Local Representation:** STV is specifically designed with the premise that every voter deserves to be represented by an MPP of their choice.
Preferential voting in multi-member districts, coupled with the STV counting system, ensures that as many voters as possible are represented by their most preferred candidate.
- STV Provides Local & Provincial Proportionality:** With multi-member districts, it's possible for electors from the same district, who support different parties or candidates, to have their own MPPs. Local PR leads to provincial proportionality. STV strives to treat all voters equally.
- Voters Make The Final Choice of Party's Candidates:** Because most parties will put forward more candidates than will be elected. This gives voters a real chance to decide who their MPP will be. It also dramatically increases the accountability of MPPs.

MMP

50% Local Representation

90%
80%
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%

In the 2003 Ontario election, 50.23% of electors voted for the winning candidate. These voters got an MPP to represent them. The other 50% of voters didn't get an MPP to represent them.
In single-member districts (FPTP & MMP), it's impossible for all voters to be represented by an MPP of their choice.

STV

75%-87.5% Local Representation

90%
80%
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%

As DM increases, quotas get smaller. Higher percentage of voters get local rep.
Quota is roughly the maximum number of voters who's ballots won't contribute to electing a winner.
Number of un-represented voters will be much less than quota because next preferences will often be for already successful candidates.

< 50%	< 33.3%	< 25%	< 20%	< 16.7%	< 14.3%	< 12.5%	< 11.1%
Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without Local Rep	Without L.R.	Without L.R.	Without L.R.	Without L.R.
STV Local Rep							
> 16.7%	> 25%	> 30%	> 33.3%	> 35.7%	> 37.5%	> 38.9%	> 38.9%
Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep	Additional Local Rep
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep	SMD Level Local Rep
Reading from the left, as district magnitude increases, local PR increases, improving local representation.							
DM = 1	DM = 2	DM = 3	DM = 4	DM = 5	DM = 6	DM = 7	DM = 8