November 3, 2017

Dr. Jonathan Rose
Email: jonathan.rose@queensu.ca

Dear Dr. Rose,

Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice

As you may be aware, on Oct. 4, 2017 B.C.'s Attorney General the Honourable David Eby took the first steps towards asking British Columbians if they want a change to the current voting system. The Bill sets out the terms for a province wide referendum to be scheduled before the end of November 2018.

In order for all British Columbians to have their say, the Ministry of Attorney General is launching an education and awareness engagement process in the coming days.

I would like to formally invite you to provide your advice to the Attorney General and ministry staff on the content of its public engagement materials.

As a noted academic authority with expertise in electoral systems, survey design and/or public engagement, we would appreciate your review of a proposed online questionnaire and related materials, to help ensure the accuracy and neutrality of the information provided. The Ministry intends to use these materials to consult with voters on the development of the referendum ballot question, among other topics, and to inform other communications and administrative elements of the referendum campaign.

You are one of four academics invited to provide advice and would be privy to confidential information, including draft materials and related commentary. As a condition of your participation, we ask that you agree to abstain from public comment or academic research related to the B.C. government's survey methodology, survey results or consultation process.

Your contribution to the development of the survey would be publicly credited, but not constitute an endorsement of the survey or related materials. We expect that your participation would require between four to eight hours over the next week, though this commitment could be extended at the invitation of the Minister and with your agreement.

.../2

Ministry of Attorney General   Justice Services Branch

Assistant Deputy Minister

Mailing Address:
PO Box 9222 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J1
Telephone: 250-356-6582
Facsimile: 250-356-2721

Location:
8th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria BC

I look forward to a response at your earliest convenience. Please reply directly to Neil Reimer at Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca.

Sincerely,

Kurt Sandstrom
Assistant Deputy Minister, Justice Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General

cc.   Neil Reimer
        Director, Strategic Initiatives

        Peter MacLeod, Principal
        MASS LBP

From:	Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX
Sent:	Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:51 AM
To:	'Peter Loewen'; Max Cameron
Cc:	jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject:	RE: B.C. Referendum media requests

Hi Peter and Max,

I certainly hear your concerns and frustrations at how your voluntary assistance to us is being characterised in the media. I have reached out to our ministry communications team who are looking into this on all our behalf.

Thanks once again to all of you for your assistance to date,
Kevin

From: Peter Loewen [mailto: s.22
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:29 AM
To: Max Cameron
Cc: Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX; jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

s.22

Kevin, we should have a longer conversation about how our participation is being communicated. Like the others, I provided some feedback on the survey you've constructed. Others also provided very helpful recommendations on how voting systems should be described. But that's about it.

s.22

On Nov 29, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Cameron, Maxwell <max.cameron@ubc.ca> wrote:

Hello, Kevin.

This is insane: http://www.timescolonist.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-get-informed-on-referendum-1.23107305
s.22

Cheers, Max

1

On 2017-11-27, 7:29 AM, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

We understand you may receive media requests on the topic of electoral reform and your role in the review of government's education material and questionnaire. Please feel free to comment on the wider referendum process and on your positions regarding voting systems. As indicated in the letter requesting your participation, please refrain from commenting on the specific advice you provided and whether that advice was followed.

All other media inquiries concerning government decision regarding the public engagement (ex: selection of experts, design of the public engagement and its components), should be directed to the Ministry of Attorney General media line at 778 678-1572.

Thanks again for all your help to date,
Kevin

Kevin Atcheson
Senior Policy & Legislation Analyst
Justice Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
Mobile: s.17

2

From:	Cameron, Maxwell <max.cameron@ubc.ca>
Sent:	Wednesday, November 29, 2017 3:22 PM
To:	Jonathan Rose; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Cc:	Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX; Peter Loewen; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; Peter MacLeod; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX; Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Subject:	Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

Yes, thanks, Tiffany. I agree with Jonathan. This is very helpful. ^{s.22}
s.22   Cheers, Max

Maxwell A. Cameron, Director
Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions
School of Public Policy and Global Affairs
& Professor
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia
C425-1866 Main Mall
Vancouver BC V6T 1Z1
Email: Max.Cameron@ubc.ca

From: Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
Date: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 at 12:25 PM
To: "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca>, Peter Loewen <s.22   >, Microsoft Office User <Max.Cameron@ubc.ca>, Genevieve Fuji Johnson <gfjohnso@sfu.ca>, Peter MacLeod <peter@masslbp.com>, "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>, "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

Thanks Tiffany. I appreciate that some might draw false inferences in what we were asked to do and this goes a long way in correcting those facts — though from my experience at the federal level, may not change perceptions.

It's also something we can refer to if asked. And that's helpful.

Jonathan Rose.

On Nov 29, 2017, at 2:35 PM, Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi everyone – we certainly appreciate the frustration with such inaccuracies. This morning we issued a statement to the TC from the Ministry to correct information regarding your roles and to explain the Ipsos Online Panel, which was also confused in the piece.

Please call Megan or I any time to discuss, including any plans you may have to respond as well.

Statement from Ministry of Attorney General:

1

"Four academics advised government on the development of the questionnaire and website content (engage.gov.bc.ca/HowWeVote) that describes voting systems in use in B.C. and elsewhere in the world. The experts were approached for their knowledge of voting systems and to help ensure accuracy, and were not paid for their services. They are not responsible for the content, but their advice was appreciated and considered.

"These experts are <u>not</u> overseeing the 2018 referendum. Their contribution to the process is complete.

"Elections BC will conduct the 2018 referendum, including administering voting and tallying results, as with all provincial referenda.

"The online panel (mentioned at the Nov. 23 media availability) is an additional method that Government's Citizen's Engagement unit uses to ensure it hears the views of British Columbians. The Ipsos Online panel will be made up of about 1000 citizens from around the province of varying age, gender and ethnicity who will respond to the questionnaire to ensure government hears the views and perspectives of people beyond just those who have chosen to take the questionnaire. The panel helps ensure that survey samples accurately reflect the makeup of the broader population based on Census and other reliable data."

Thank you,

_____

Tiffany Nelson | Communications Manager
Ministry of Attorney General
Ph: 250 356-6334 | **s.17**

From: Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:51 AM
To: 'Peter Loewen'; Max Cameron
Cc: jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: RE: B.C. Referendum media requests

Hi Peter and Max,

I certainly hear your concerns and frustrations at how your voluntary assistance to us is being characterised in the media. I have reached out to our ministry communications team who are looking into this on all our behalf.

Thanks once again to all of you for your assistance to date,
Kevin

From: Peter Loewen [mailto: **s.22**
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:29 AM
To: Max Cameron
Cc: Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX; jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

s.22

Kevin, we should have a longer conversation about how our participation is being communicated. Like the others, I provided some feedback on the survey you've constructed. Others also provided very helpful recommendations on how voting systems should be described. But that's about it.

s.22

2

s.22

s.22

On Nov 29, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Cameron, Maxwell <max.cameron@ubc.ca> wrote:

Hello, Kevin.

This is insane: http://www.timescolonist.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-get-informed-on-referendum-1.23107305
s.22

Cheers, Max

On 2017-11-27, 7:29 AM, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

> Good morning,
>
> We understand you may receive media requests on the topic of electoral reform and your role
> in the review of government's education material and questionnaire. Please feel free to
> comment on the wider referendum process and on your positions regarding voting systems. As
> indicated in the letter requesting your participation, please refrain from commenting on the
> specific advice you provided and whether that advice was followed.
>
> All other media inquiries concerning government decision regarding the public engagement (ex:
> selection of experts, design of the public engagement and its components), should be directed
> to the Ministry of Attorney General media line at 778 678-1572.
>
> Thanks again for all your help to date,
> Kevin
>
> Kevin Atcheson
> Senior Policy & Legislation Analyst
> Justice Services Branch
> Ministry of Attorney General
> Mobile: s.17

3

From:	Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
Sent:	Wednesday, November 29, 2017 12:25 PM
To:	Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Cc:	Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX; Peter Loewen; Max Cameron; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; Peter MacLeod; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX; Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Subject:	Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

Thanks Tiffany. I appreciate that some might draw false inferences in what we were asked to do and this goes a long way in correcting those facts — though from my experience at the federal level, may not change perceptions.

It's also something we can refer to if asked. And that's helpful.

Jonathan Rose.

On Nov 29, 2017, at 2:35 PM, Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi everyone – we certainly appreciate the frustration with such inaccuracies. This morning we issued a statement to the TC from the Ministry to correct information regarding your roles and to explain the Ipsos Online Panel, which was also confused in the piece.
Please call Megan or I any time to discuss, including any plans you may have to respond as well.
<u>Statement from Ministry of Attorney General:</u>
"Four academics advised government on the development of the questionnaire and website content (engage.gov.bc.ca/HowWeVote) that describes voting systems in use in B.C. and elsewhere in the world. The experts were approached for their knowledge of voting systems and to help ensure accuracy, and were not paid for their services. They are not responsible for the content, but their advice was appreciated and considered.
"These experts are <u>not</u> overseeing the 2018 referendum. Their contribution to the process is complete.
"Elections BC will conduct the 2018 referendum, including administering voting and tallying results, as with all provincial referenda.
"The online panel (mentioned at the Nov. 23 media availability) is an additional method that Government's Citizen's Engagement unit uses to ensure it hears the views of British Columbians. The Ipsos Online panel will be made up of about 1000 citizens from around the province of varying age, gender and ethnicity who will respond to the questionnaire to ensure government hears the views and perspectives of people beyond just those who have chosen to take the questionnaire. The panel helps ensure that survey samples accurately reflect the makeup of the broader population based on Census and other reliable data."
Thank you,

_____
Tiffany Nelson | Communications Manager
Ministry of Attorney General
Ph: 250 356-6334 | **s.17**
_____

From: Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:51 AM
To: 'Peter Loewen'; Max Cameron
Cc: jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: RE: B.C. Referendum media requests
Hi Peter and Max,

1

I certainly hear your concerns and frustrations at how your voluntary assistance to us is being characterised in the media. I have reached out to our ministry communications team who are looking into this on all our behalf.

Thanks once again to all of you for your assistance to date,

Kevin

From: Peter Loewen [mailto:] s.22

Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:29 AM

To: Max Cameron

Cc: Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX; jonathan.rose@queensu.ca; gfjohnso@sfu.ca; peter@masslbp.com; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX

Subject: Re: B.C. Referendum media requests

s.22

Kevin, we should have a longer conversation about how our participation is being communicated. Like the others, I provided some feedback on the survey you've constructed. Others also provided very helpful recommendations on how voting systems should be described. But that's about it.

s.22

On Nov 29, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Cameron, Maxwell <max.cameron@ubc.ca> wrote:

Hello, Kevin.

This is insane: http://www.timescolonist.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-get-informed-on-referendum-1.23107305

s.22

Cheers, Max

On 2017-11-27, 7:29 AM, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

> Good morning,
> We understand you may receive media requests on the topic of electoral reform and your role
> in the review of government's education material and questionnaire. Please feel free to
> comment on the wider referendum process and on your positions regarding voting systems. As
> indicated in the letter requesting your participation, please refrain from commenting on the
> specific advice you provided and whether that advice was followed.
> All other media inquiries concerning government decision regarding the public engagement (ex:
> selection of experts, design of the public engagement and its components), should be directed
> to the Ministry of Attorney General media line at 778 678-1572.
> Thanks again for all your help to date,
> Kevin
> Kevin Atcheson
> Senior Policy & Legislation Analyst
> Justice Services Branch
> Ministry of Attorney General
> Mobile: s.17

From:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Sent:	Thursday, November 23, 2017 4:23 PM
To:	'gfjohnso@sfu.ca'; 'Cameron, Maxwell'; 'jonathan.rose@queensu.ca'; 'peter.loewen@utoronto.ca'
Cc:	'Peter MacLeod'; Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX
Subject:	Engagement site has been launched

Hello again. I'm just writing to let you know that the Ministry's public engagement was launched this afternoon by the Attorney General. The link to the site is here: https://engage.gov.bc.ca/howwevote/ .

Thank you all again for your input and constructive comments. It is much appreciated.

s.22   If you have any need to communicate with our ministry, please contact my colleague Kevin, who is copied here.

Regards,

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

British Columbia Voting Systems Questionnaire

B.C. is holding a referendum in the Fall of 2018 to ask voters whether Government should keep the current First Past the Post voting system or change to a proportional representation voting system. This questionnaire will help B.C.'s Attorney General understand the preferences and expectations of B.C. voters regarding the referendum and campaign leading up to it.

We appreciate you taking the time to fill out the survey, which should take about 10 minutes to complete.

The information you provide will help the Attorney General to:

· Understand what voters value about different voting systems;

· Determine whether the referendum ballot should offer the choice between two voting systems, or more than two voting systems;

· Determine whether government should provide public funds to registered advocacy campaigns, both for and against voting system reform; and

- Determine if and how to regulate advertising activities during the referendum period.

> **Comment [Rose1]:** This is a lot to ask in a ten minute survey!

Privacy information / How do we prevent people from filling out the survey multiple times?

> **Comment [Rose2]:** This is a large problem. In the federal case, I think they tracked the ip addresses. But if it is not tracked there could be a large problem with it being co-opted by Fair Vote or other pro-reform groups.
>
> One method would be to provide a ticket that can only be used once but I'm not sure how to do that. Other solutions like forcing login with a SIN number has obvious privacy issues.

Sections:

1. Profile
2. General outlook
3. Voting system preferences
4. Ballot options
5. Public funding and advertising

Section 1: Your profile

Please provide ~~your~~ basic demographic information to help us better understand the preferences of British Columbians throughout the province. Your identity cannot be determined by answering these questions.

Profile_Q1 - What is your gender?
- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Other (3)
- ~~Prefer not to say (4)~~

Profile_Q2 – What are the first three characters in your postal code?
- [3 character field]

Profile_Q3 - How old are you?
- [insert standard age ranges used by BC]

Profile_Q4 - What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
- Some high school, elementary school or home schooling (2)
- High school (3)
- Apprenticeship or trades certificate (4)
- College diploma or degree(5)
- Bachelor's degree (6)
- Master's degree (7)
- Professional degree (8)
- Doctorate (9)

Profile_Q5 - Do you identify with any of the following groups?
- Visible minority (1)
- First Nations (2)
- Inuit (3)
- Métis (4)
- Persons with disabilities (5)
- LGBTQ2 (6)
- None of the above

Section 2: General outlook

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your interest in, and familiarity with, voting systems.

Outlook_Q1 - Generally speaking, how interested are you in politics?
- Not interested at all (1)
- Not very interested (2)
- Somewhat interested (3)
- Very interested (4)

Outlook_Q2 - How frequently do you follow news and current affairs?
- Never (1)
- Rarely (2)
- Several times each month (3)
- Once a week
- Several times each week (4)
- Daily (5)

Outlook _Q3 - How closely have you followed the public debate on electoral reform in B.C.?
- Not closely at all (1)
- Somewhat closely (2)
- Very closely (3)

Outlook _Q4 - Did you vote in either the 2005 or 2009 provincial referendum on electoral reform?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)
- Not eligible (4)

Outlook _Q5 - How often have you discussed provincial electoral reform with others?
- Not at all (1)
- Occasionally
- Somewhat often (2)
- Very often (3)

Outlook _Q6 - How often do you vote in provincial elections?
- I am not eligible to vote (1)
- Never (2)
- Rarely (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Most of the time (5)
- All of the time (6)

Outlook _Q6b [only appears if "Never (2)" or "Rarely (3) or Sometimes (4)" are selected in Intro_Q4] - What are the biggest barriers preventing you from voting? (Please select all that apply.)

- Lack of time (1)
- Lack of information (2)
- Disability or mobility issues (3)
- Voting location isn't convenient (4)
- Do not feel included (5)
- Frustration with politics (6)
- Don't like the voting system (7)
- I was not eligible to vote (8)
- Lack of interest
- Other (9) [Open text]

Outlook_Q7 – Have you read the background information on this website regarding the various voting systems?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Outlook_Q8 - In general, how satisfied are you with how the current First Past the Post voting system works to elect MLAs to the BC legislaturein British Columbia?

- Not at all satisfied (1)
- Not very satisfied (2)
- Somewhat satisfied (3)
- Very satisfied (4)
- Don't know (5)

> **Comment [Rose3]:** First-past-the-post

Outlook_Q9 - How knowledgeable do you feel about the differences amongbetween voting systems?

- Not at all knowledgeable (1)
- Not very knowledgeable (2)
- Somewhat knowledgeable (3)
- Very knowledgeable (4)
- Don't know (5)

> **Comment [Rose4]:** Or do you want to ask about how knowledgeable they are about the different ways politicians can be elected? I wonder if voting systems is too jargony?

Outlook_Q10 – If you were to vote in the referendum today, how confident would you feel about selecting a voting system and making an informed choice about the ideal voting system?

- Not at all confident (1)
- Not very confident (2)
- Somewhat confident (3)
- Very confident (4)
- Don't know (5)

Section 3: Voting system preferences

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your values and preferences regarding how MLAs are elected, how governments are formed and how the legislative assembly operates.

Preferences_Q1 Please select up to five values from the list below that are most important to you. I value most:

. It is importantGovernments that governments collaborate with other parties in the legislature. Legislature

A voting system should allowthat allows you to select your preferred candidate or party., without having to consider strategically who is most likely to win

Single-party majority governments ensure greater accountability. where it is clear who is accountable for decisions

MLAs shouldwho focus on the interests ofwhat is best for the province as a whole instead of his or her riding.

It's important that theA voting systemprocess that is easy to understand.

Governments with MLAs need to representrepresenting every region in the province.

Voters should be allowed to vote for a party and a candidate. Allowing voters to express several preferences for candidates or political parties when voting

A voting system should ensure governments are able to act decisively.Governments that make decisions quickly

The legislature should help ensureBetter representation of groups currently underrepresented groups. in the Legislative Assembly

It is important for MLAs towho focus primarily on the interests of their

DRAFT CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR CIRCULATION

local community.

. A voting system should encourageIncreasing the presence of smaller parties in the Legislature.

A voting system should ensure that a party's vote share matches its seat share in the Legislature. A legislature where the number of seats each party holds closely matches their support across the province

A voting system that encourages political parties to reach beyond their supporters and appeal to other parties' voters

A voting system should providethat provides opportunities for Independent candidates. (not running for a political party) to be elected

MinorityA voting system that produces minority or coalition governments are desirable.

MLAs who continue to represent the same number of citizens as they do now

It is importantA voting system that allows a voter to rank a political party's candidates.

A voting system that allows a voter should be allowed to vote for a political party.

Preferences _Q2 Which would you prefer?
Having several small parties in the Legislature representing a diversity of views or fewer big parties that try to appeal to a broad range of people?
- Several small parties (1)
- A few big parties (2)

Preferences _Q3 Which would you prefer?

- Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who do what their party promised, even if it means going against what their constituents want.
- MLAs who do what their constituents want, even if it means going against what their party promised.

Preferences _Q4 Which best describes your views?

- Ballots should allow voters to select one candidate or political party.
- Ballots should allow votes to select more than one candidate or political party.

Preferences_Q5 Which would you prefer?

- A Legislative Assembly where one party governs, without requiring the support of another party to make decisions.
- A Legislative Assembly where two or more parties must collaborate to make decisions.

Preferences_Q6 Which would you prefer?

- The number of MLAs should remain the same (currently 87) (1)
- There should be more MLAs to better reflect voters' preferences (2)
- ~~There should be fewer MLAs.~~

Preferences_Q7 There should be greater diversity of views in the provincial legislature.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Preferences_Q8 All views of British Columbians, no matter how marginal, should be represented in the Legislative Assembly.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Preferences_Q9 Voters should be able to express multiple preferences on the election ballot, even if this means that it takes longer to count the ballots and announce the election result.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

> **Comment [Rose17]:** This latter point is a red herring. It's a bit irrelevant.

Preferences_Q10 A ballot should be easy to understand, even if it means voters have fewer options to express their preferences.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

> **Comment [Rose18]:** Id delete this question. I cant imagine a complex ballot that decreases voters' preferences. I don't understand what it's getting at.

Preferences_Q11 It is better for several parties to have to govern together than for one party to make all the decisions in government, even if it takes longer.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Preferences_Q12 A party that wins the most seats in an election should have to compromise with other parties, even if it means changing some of its policies.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Preferences_Q13 It should always be clear which party is accountable for decisions made by government, even if this means that decisions are only made by one party.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Preferences_Q14 - Please indicate which you prefer:

- Each electoral district is represented by one MLA
- Each electoral district is represented by several MLAs, possibly from different parties
- One MLA represents a specific electoral district, and other MLAs, possibly from different parties, represent a larger region or the province as a whole.

Preferences_Q15 Please indicate which you prefer:

- Voters vote with a single 'X' for the candidate or political party of their choice
- Voters can rank the candidates or parties in order of preference

Comment [Rose19]: The important tradeoff of the size of districts is not communicated in this. So I might want several MLAs but wouldn't choose this if the districts were much larger.

Comment [Rose20]: This last one is, I think a description of a mixed system but does not get at it adequately. Maybe: One MLA represents a specific district and the other MLAs represent a region or the province as a whole.

Section 4: Referendum Ballot Options

In Fall 2018, B.C. voters will have the opportunity to vote for either retaining the current First- Past-the- Post voting system or adopting a proportional voting system. Please answer the following questions to help us understand the choices you would like to see on the referendum ballot.

Ballot Options_Q 1 Which do you prefer?
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current ~~first-past~~ First Past ~~the-post~~ the Post voting system and ONE proportional representation voting system.
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current First Past the Post voting system and MORE THAN ONE proportional representation voting system

Ballot Options_Q 2 If the government offers a choice of more than one proportional representation voting system, which do you prefer?
- Voters should indicate their support for only one system
- Voter should rank order their support for all the proposed systems

Ballot Options_Q 3: Alongside the option of keeping the First Past the Post voting system, which system or systems of proportional representation would you like to see on the ballot? Please select all that apply. (With mouse-over summary text from web 101 pages)
- List Proportional Representation
- Mixed Member Proportional
- Single Transferable Vote
- Mixed Member Majoritarian
- Other: *Please describe*

Comment [Rose21]: This is usually hyphenated.

Comment [Rose22]: This is far too early to ask these sorts of questions when voters haven't given much thought to 'other systems' let alone whether they'd like to rank them or chose one.

Comment [Rose23]: The summary text will be key here but I suspect that you will capture those who understand the system (ie reform advocates) and those who may not fully. Why ask this before a public education campaign? Shouldn't this be asked later?

Section 5: Public funding and advertising in the referendum

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your expectations with regards to public funding for advocacy groups and campaign advertising during the referendum.

Public Funding_Q 1 The government should provide public funds to designated groups to campaign for their preferred voting system
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Public Funding_Q 2 There should be spending limits imposed on any group that campaigns for its preferred voting system
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Public Funding_Q 3 The provincial government should provide voters with high-quality and impartial information prior to the referendum.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Public Funding_Q 4 The provincial government should ensure that paid advertisements that appear during the campaign period are produced only by groups that must register, disclose their identity in their advertising and disclose their contributors and expenses after the referendum.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

From:	Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
Sent:	Friday, November 24, 2017 12:23 PM
To:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Cc:	gfjohnso@sfu.ca; Cameron, Maxwell; peter.loewen@utoronto.ca; Peter MacLeod; Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX
Subject:	Re: Engagement site has been launched

Hello Neil
Congratulations on getting the content up so quickly. There are a few factual errors in the glossary that are an easy fix.

1. Under Mixed Member Majoritarian (MMM) you call it "A Proportional system. See MMP" . It is a semi-proportional system as you correctly describe in the section on Parallel ("A semi-proportional voting system. Also referred to as Mixed Member Majoritarian voting system")
2. Also under the MMM entry you need to say "See Parallel" not "See MMP"
3. Your heading for "Proportional" needs to be changed to "Proportionality" as you describe "a measure of how closely a political party's share of the votes it receives matches the share of seats it receives". (Actually, it would be clearer if you just deleted "it receives")
4. "Plurality voting systems" reads "Voting systems in which the winning candidate or political party is the one that has obtained more votes than any other candidate or political party, even if it is not more than 50% of the total votes cast." You need to say this is "in a given electoral district" as it could be interpreted as province-wide which of course was not true for Gordon Campbell's Liberals in 1996!
5. "Single Transferable Vote" reads "A preferential voting system" but there is no glossary for preferential voting system. It also says "See STV" but it's not hyperlinked.

Best, Jonathan.

On Nov 23, 2017, at 7:22 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hello again. I'm just writing to let you know that the Ministry's public engagement was launched this afternoon by the Attorney General. The link to the site is here: https://engage.gov.bc.ca/howwevote/ . Thank you all again for your input and constructive comments. It is much appreciated.
s.22   If you have any need to communicate with our ministry, please contact my colleague Kevin, who is copied here.
Regards,

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

1

British Columbia Voting Systems Questionnaire

Version 2.1 | Nov. 15, 2017 |

The B.C. government is holding a referendum in the fall of 2018 to ask voters whether the province should keep the current first-past-the-post voting system or change to a proportional representation voting system. This questionnaire will help B.C.'s Attorney General understand the preferences and expectations of B.C. voters about the referendum.

There are two parts to this survey. Part one asks key questions about your values and general outlook as to how we vote for Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs), and for how the legislature functions. Part two asks more detailed questions about your preferences regarding electoral reform, voting systems and the referendum process. At the end of each part, you will have the opportunity to provide further written feedback.

Each part of the questionnaire will take approximately 5-8 minutes to complete. We ask that you complete this survey only once.

Privacy Statement

Personal information collected through this feedback form will inform the development of a ballot for a November 2018 electoral reform referendum by the Ministry of Attorney General, under the authority of s.26 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. If you have any questions about the collection, use and disclosure of your personal information, please contact:

Neil Reimer
Director, Director, Strategic Initiatives
Ministry of Justice
Victoria BC
Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca

Part 1

Section 1: Profile

Please provide this general profile information. Your identity cannot be determined by answering these questions.

Profile_Q2 – What are the first three characters in your postal code (this is a required field)?
- [3 character field]

Profile_Q3 - How old are you?
- Under 18
- 18 - 39 years
- 40 - 64 years
- 65 - 75 years
- Over 75 years
- Prefer not to answer

Profile_Q1 - Please indicate your gender:
- Man (1)
- Woman (2)
- X: _____[text box] (3)
- Prefer not to answer

Profile_Q5 - Do you identify with any of the following groups? Please select all that apply
- Visible minority (1)
- First Nations (2)
- Inuit (3)
- Métis (4)
- Persons with disabilities (5)
- LGBTQ2 (6)
- None of the above (7)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your interest in, and familiarity with, current affairs and voting in elections.

Outlook_Q1 - Generally speaking, how interested are you in politics and current affairs?
- Not interested at all (1)
- Not very interested (2)
- Somewhat interested (3)
- Very interested (4)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook _Q4 - How often do you vote in provincial elections?

- I am not eligible to vote (1)
- Never (2)
- Rarely (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Most of the time (5)
- All of the time (6)
- First time voter in 2017 (7)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook _ Which, if any, of the following have been barriers that have kept you from voting?
(Please select all that apply.)
- Not enough time (1)
- Not enough information (2)
- Disability or mobility issues (3)
- Voting location isn't convenient (4)
- Do not feel included (5)
- Frustration with politics (6)
- Don't like the voting system (7)
- I was not eligible to vote (8)
- Not interested in politics (9)
- I feel like my vote doesn't count (10)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook_Q6 – If you were to vote in a referendum to choose a voting system today, how confident would you feel about making an informed choice?
- Not at all confident (1)
- Not very confident (2)
- Somewhat confident (3)
- Very confident (4)
- Don't know (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q1 Please select up to five values from the list below that are most important to you.
I value most:
[note to reviewers: the sequence of value statements below will be rotated randomly for each user.]

Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who focus primarily on what is best for the province as a whole
Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who focus primarily on the interests of their local community
A voting system that is easy to understand
Better representation of groups that are currently under-represented in the Legislative Assembly

Increasing the number of political parties in the Legislative Assembly to represent more points of view
A Legislative Assembly where the share of seats each party holds closely matches the share of the popular vote it receives across the province
A Legislative Assembly where the share of seats each party holds is fairly similar to the share of the popular vote it receives across the province
A voting system that encourages political parties to appeal to other parties' voters
A voting system that makes it easier for independent candidates (those not running for a political party) to be elected
A voting system that allows a voter to rank a political party's candidates (1, 2, 3, etc.)
Single-party majority governments that are clearly accountable for their decisions
A Legislative Assembly where two or more parties co-operate to make decisions
Other:

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your values and preferences regarding how MLAs are elected, how governments are formed and how the Legislative Assembly operates.

Preferences_Q6 Which would you prefer?
- The number of MLAs should remain the same (1)
- There should be more MLAs to better reflect voters' interests (2)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q7 There should be greater diversity of views represented in the Legislative Assembly.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q12 The party that wins the most seats in an election should have to compromise with other parties, even if it means changing some of its campaign commitments.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q13 It should always be clear which party is accountable for decisions made by government, even if this means that decisions are only made by one party.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following question to help us understand the choices you would like to see on the referendum ballot.

Ballot Options_Q 1 Which would you prefer?

- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and ONE proportional representation voting system.
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and MORE THAN ONE proportional representation voting system
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and proportional representation, with a specific voting system to be established by legislation after the referendum.
- Prefer not to answer

[Text box]
Are there any other comments you would like to make about voting systems or the upcoming referendum? [Limit to 200 characters]

This is the end of Part 1 of the questionnaire. Part 2 asks further questions about your preferences regarding electoral reform and the referendum ballot. You may submit your responses to Part 1 now and leave the survey, or continue on to Part 2.

SUBMIT AND LEAVE   CONTINUE TO PART 2

Part 2

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your interest in electoral reform.

Outlook _Q2 - How closely have you followed public debate on electoral reform?
- Not closely at all (1)
- Somewhat closely (2)
- Very closely (3)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook _Q3 - Did you vote in either the 2005 or 2009 B.C. referendum on electoral reform?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)
- Not eligible (4)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your values and preferences regarding how Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) are elected, how governments are formed and how the Legislative Assembly operates.

Preferences _Q2 Which would you prefer?
Having more small parties represented in the Legislature or fewer big parties?
- A few big parties (1)
- More small parties (2)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences _Q3 Which would you prefer?
- Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who do what their party promised.
- MLAs who do what their constituents want.
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences _Q4 Ballots should allow voters to choose more than one candidate or political party by ranking them in order of preference.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q8 All votes should contribute to electing an MLA, even if it means the ballot is longer or more complicated.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)

- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q10 An election ballot should be easy to understand, even if it means voters have fewer options to express their preferences.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q11 It is better for several parties to have to govern together than for one party to make all the decisions in government, even if it sometimes takes longer to form government after an election.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q14 - Please indicate which you prefer:
- Each electoral district is represented by one MLA
- Each electoral district is represented by several MLAs
- Some MLAs represent an electoral district, while other MLAs represent larger regions or the province as a whole.
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand the choices you would like to see on the referendum ballot.

Ballot Options_Q 2 If the government offers voters a choice of more than one proportional representation voting system, which do you prefer?
- Voters should indicate their support for only one proposed system
- Voter should rank order their support for all the proposed systems
- Prefer not to answer

Ballot Options_Q 3: Alongside the option of keeping the first-past-the-post voting system, which system or systems of proportional representation would you like to see on the ballot? Please select all that apply. (With mouse-over summary text from web 101 pages that does not click to a new page)
- List Proportional Representation
- Mixed Member Proportional

- Single Transferable Vote
- Mixed Member Majoritarian
- Other: *Please describe*
- Prefer not to answer

Ballot Options_Q 4: If B.C. changes to a system of proportional representation, there should be a second referendum after a trial period (for example, two elections) on whether to keep the new system.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Section 5: Public funding and advertising in the referendum

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your expectations with regards to public funding for advocacy groups and campaign advertising for particular voting systems during the referendum.

Public Funding_Q 1 The government should provide public funds to designated groups to campaign for their preferred voting system
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 2 There should be spending limits imposed on any group that campaigns for its preferred voting system
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 3 The provincial government should provide the public with impartial information during the referendum campaign period.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)

- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 4 The provincial government should ensure that paid advertisements that appear during the referendum campaign period are produced only by groups that must register, disclose their identity in their advertising and disclose their contributors and expenses after the referendum.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

[Text box]
Are there any other comments you would like to make about voting systems or the upcoming referendum? [Limit to 200 characters]

From:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Sent:	Wednesday, November 15, 2017 5:45 PM
To:	'gfjohnso@sfu.ca'; 'Cameron, Maxwell'; 'jonathan.rose@queensu.ca'; 'peter.loewen@utoronto.ca'
Cc:	'Peter MacLeod'
Subject:	Questionnaire version 2
Attachments:	BCVSS Version 2.1 to advisors.docx

Hello again. As I mentioned in my previous email, we have made significant changes to the questionnaire and would welcome your further input. The changes reflect a number of your comments, as well as further discussion and review among staff. Our minister's office has also had input.

In particular:

- To address issues of length and degree of dauntingness (that is a word, I looked it up), the questionnaire is now divided into two parts, with the first more focused on values and higher-level preferences, and the second asking more specific questions on voting systems;
- Users can choose to complete only Part 1, or go on and complete Part 2 as well;
- The total number of questions has been reduced;
- The "table of values" in part 1 has been reduced from 18 to 12, and users can enter their own text at the bottom to articulate a value not listed;
- Open-text boxes at the end of both Part 1 and Part 2 for further comments;
- Tweaking of wording in various questions.

Could I ask that you provide any further comments by **noon Friday PST**? I wish we could give you longer but we intend to launch the engagement next week and need to work within the timelines we've been given.

Also, we would like to acknowledge your input with a reference on the website. Could you advise me if you have any issues with, or suggestions for, the following:

"The Government of British Columbia gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the following external academic advisers, who reviewed the questionnaire and voting system information presented on this site. They are not responsible for the information's design or contents."

Dr. Max Cameron
Director, Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions School of Public Policy and Global Affairs Professor
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia

Dr. Genevieve Fuji Johnson
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Peter Loewen
Director, School of Public Policy

1

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science
University of Toronto

Dr. Jonathan Rose
Associate Professor, Department of Political Studies
Queen's University

Regards and as always, please call or email if you have any questions.

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

Petrova, Yulia AG:EX

From:	Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
Sent:	Tuesday, November 14, 2017 10:14 AM
To:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject:	Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2

Great to hear and happy to talk things through if what I wrote is not as clear as it might be. I can appreciate that you have a lot on your plate.   Jonathan

> On Nov 13, 2017, at 5:44 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:
>
> Thank you, Jonathan. That's a lot to chew on and we'll review closely. We did look at the sites you mentioned, and found some (like ACE) too academic for the purposes of a general engagement effort. But we do intend to provide links to all of them so that voters can access different descriptions of the systems.
>
>
> Regards
>
> Neil
>
> _____
> From: Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
> Sent: November-12-17 7:47 PM
> To: Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
> Cc: Peter MacLeod; Genevieve Fuji Johnson; Cameron, Maxwell; Peter Loewen
> Subject: Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2
>
> Dear Mr. Reimer:
>
> Attached are the two documents you have asked us to review and I've made many comments throughout.
>
> For the glossary, you may want to link to or borrow (with attribution) the many excellent resources about electoral systems that have already been written and are widely available. Samara <https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.samaracanada.com%2Fsamara-in-the-classroom%2Felectoral-reform&data=02%7C01%7Cjonathan.rose%40queensu.ca%7C7fc0c6d3677f4a5aa52e08d52ae8153e%7Cd61ecb3b38b142d582c4efb2838b925c%7C1%7C0%7C636462098636193760&sdata=cEFmHjSj4ZHU8HrDZKtnYE%2BComrS48h2SOhTBm6dkHE%3D&reserved=0> created an excellent guidebook about electoral systems which might be repurposed for you. It's non-partisan, non technical but clearly and succinctly written. Both the BC and Ontario citizens' assemblies also created glossaries that might also serve as a good basis as they were written for citizens without a background in the material. The Ontario one is here<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.citizensassembly.gov.on.ca%2Fassets%2FFrom%2520Votes%2520to%2520Seats.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cjonathan.rose%40queensu.ca%7C7fc0c6d3677f4a5aa52e08d52ae8153e%7Cd61ecb3b38b142d582c4efb2838b925c%7C1%7C1%7C636462098636193760&sdata=gzkyfXNw7%2FUyVOIh8yec8iQmuavt%2BxY4jdfKYc5tVrU%3D&reserved=0> but there are other web sites such as the Ace Project<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Faceproject.org&data=02%7C01%7Cjonathan.rose%40queensu.ca%7C7fc0c6d3677f4a5aa52e08d52ae8153e%7Cd61ecb3b38b142d582c4efb2838b925c%7C1%7C0%7C636462098636193760&sdata=JZmTI%2Fg8PQ%2FmiW2XY58UxVYywviWCaxgIdLYWQgVCgQ%3D&reserved=0> or IDEA<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.idea.int&data=02%7C01%7Cjonathan.

1

rose%40queensu.ca%7C7fc0c6d3677f4a5aa52e08d52ae8153e%7Cd61ecb3b38b142d582c4efb2838b925c%7C1%7C0%7C636462098636193760&sdata=sImgx9jexvh6NvhmSTtyLgczQBhEIH1tmmz%2Bey1VPaM%3D&reserved=0> which should be consulted.
>
> In terms of the voting system information document, I think it requires some serious re-thinking about language, framing and degree of complexity. Not doing so would run the risk of potentially embarrassing the government or appearing to discount one system or favour another.
>
> I am not certain what options the government is considering for the public education campaign but having open list PR and closed list PR is, in my mind adding unnecessary complexity. I think you should describe the principles of PR making a distinction between regional and province-wide allocation of seats and mention that the list can be open or closed. It's important to remember that most open list systems allow for a voter to vote for a party and most voters recognize they get more 'bang for their buck' by doing so. The open list pr system described sounds similar to Finland and Brazil but not the norm of open lists.
>
> One of the strengths of list pr that is not mentioned is the potential to have a diverse party list; the list is created prior to (not "at the start)" of the election and its diversity is often used as an election plank. Ignoring this in the document ignores one of the most important reasons for PR.
>
> The document also uses language like 'small parties' which is a bit confusing because it's not clear what kind of small party you are thinking of. The success of small parties is dependent on a number of variables that is not discussed in this document such as the number of small parties, the formal threshold, the district magnitude, the political culture of the province and the counting and seat allocation rules.
>
> Related to this is the most important point in PR systems that is alluded to in a few places but not fully discussed. The number of MLAs elected per electoral district (the district magnitude) is arguably the most important variable in proportionality. The comments about the highly proportional tendencies elide this.   I think the document needs to indicate that STV and Mixed systems will be proportional in urban areas but quite unlikely in rural areas especially in the north. (Counting province-wide but allocating regionally would offset this).   Providing maps would be the easiest way to communicate this but is fraught because these design decisions about the size of districts need to be fully thought-out.
>
> The counting explanation in STV is not quite as clear as it might be. The BCSTV model counts surplus votes of those who reach the quota then the last placed candidates are re-distrubuted. The document correctly characterizes STV as a multi-member electoral district, so too are both versions of List PR but that is not mentioned. I would maintain consistency of description.
>
> Im mixed systems, FPTP seats is described as "local electoral district (electoral district seats)" but the clearer distinction in mixed seats some are single member and some are multi member (or single member seats vs. party list seats). In this section and throughout both documents, terms and definitions are used that are not typical or mischaracterizations that might not catch the eye of most citizens but would would certainly raise the ire of electoral reformers or advocates of a system. I can't overstate the importance of getting this right. Describing electoral systems in a neutral and even handed way is certainly tough but not thinking it through carefully is a sure recipe for disaster.
>
> I'm copying my colleagues here so that they need not point out some of the basic errors I have identified. Hope that these are helpful and seen in the constructive way they are meant to be.
>
> Sincerely, Jonathan Rose.
>
>
> On Nov 10, 2017, at 8:35 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>> wrote:
>

> I'd like to thank you all for providing your comments on the first draft of the BC government's questionnaire respecting the planned referendum on electoral reform. We have reviewed all the comments and are making a number of changes.
>
> The biggest change will address the perception that the questionnaire was too long and could be daunting for many users: we intend to split the questionnaire into two parts, with everyone who participates completing the first part (shorter, more focussed on values), then being invited to continue on to the second part (questions about voting system preferences) or to exit/submit at that point.
>
> If you're amenable, we would value your input on the second draft, given the structural and wording changes. It is still undergoing edits and approvals, and I anticipate forwarding it to you on Tuesday, if not before.
>
> In addition to the questionnaire, we have drafted information on different voting systems, including a glossary of terms, which would be posted to a different page of the website. Users would be encouraged to review the information prior to completing the questionnaire. We would value your comments on this information as well, particularly in regard to neutrality and even-handedness in describing the different systems.
>
> What's been drafted so far is, we realize, very text heavy. We intend to include graphics of sample ballots for each system, and will build further, more user-friendly web content as the engagement period progresses. There will also be numerous hyperlinks that will permit users to get to a term in the glossary as they read through the material.
>
> We certainly are aware of the time required for you to review and provide comments on this material, particularly in the middle of an academic semester. While we of course welcome your input, please do not feel obligated to comment on this second piece, which I understand was not part of your initial discussions with Peter.
>
> If you are able to review the attached documents, we would appreciate feedback by end of day Tuesday.
>
> Thanks and please don't hesitate to call or email me with any questions. My cell number is s.17
>
> Regards,
>
> Neil Reimer
> Director, Strategic Initiatives
> Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
> 1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC   Tel: 250 356-8303
>
> <Draft engagement material voting systems v.0.7.docx><Draft engagment glossary v.0.2.docx>

From:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Sent:	Monday, November 13, 2017 2:44 PM
To:	Jonathan Rose
Subject:	Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2

Thank you, Jonathan. That's a lot to chew on and we'll review closely. We did look at the sites you mentioned, and found some (like ACE) too academic for the purposes of a general engagement effort. But we do intend to provide links to all of them so that voters can access different descriptions of the systems.

Regards
Neil

From: Jonathan Rose
Sent: November-12-17 7:47 PM
To: Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Cc: Peter MacLeod; Genevieve Fuji Johnson; Cameron, Maxwell; Peter Loewen
Subject: Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2
Dear Mr. Reimer:

Attached are the two documents you have asked us to review and I've made many comments throughout.

For the glossary, you may want to link to or borrow (with attribution) the many excellent resources about electoral systems that have already been written and are widely available. Samara created an excellent guidebook about electoral systems which might be repurposed for you. It's non-partisan, non technical but clearly and succinctly written. Both the BC and Ontario citizens' assemblies also created glossaries that might also serve as a good basis as they were written for citizens without a background in the material. The Ontario one is here but there are other web sites such as the Ace Project or IDEA which should be consulted.

In terms of the voting system information document, I think it requires some serious re-thinking about language, framing and degree of complexity. Not doing so would run the risk of potentially embarrassing the government or appearing to discount one system or favour another.

I am not certain what options the government is considering for the public education campaign but having open list PR and closed list PR is, in my mind adding unnecessary complexity. I think you should describe the principles of PR making a distinction between regional and province-wide allocation of seats and mention that the list can be open or closed. It's important to remember that most open list systems allow for a voter to vote for a party and most voters recognize they get more 'bang for their buck' by doing so. The open list pr system described sounds similar to Finland and Brazil but not the norm of open lists.

One of the strengths of list pr that is not mentioned is the potential to have a diverse party list; the list is created prior to (not "at the start)" of the election and its diversity is often used as an election plank. Ignoring this in the document ignores one of the most important reasons for PR.

The document also uses language like 'small parties' which is a bit confusing because it's not clear what kind of small party you are thinking of. The success of small parties is dependent on a number of variables that is

1

not discussed in this document such as the number of small parties, the formal threshold, the district magnitude, the political culture of the province and the counting and seat allocation rules.

Related to this is the most important point in PR systems that is alluded to in a few places but not fully discussed. The number of MLAs elected per electoral district (the district magnitude) is arguably the most important variable in proportionality. The comments about the highly proportional tendencies elide this. I think the document needs to indicate that STV and Mixed systems will be proportional in urban areas but quite unlikely in rural areas especially in the north. (Counting province-wide but allocating regionally would offset this). Providing maps would be the easiest way to communicate this but is fraught because these design decisions about the size of districts need to be fully thought-out.

The counting explanation in STV is not quite as clear as it might be. The BCSTV model counts surplus votes of those who reach the quota then the last placed candidates are re-distrubuted. The document correctly characterizes STV as a multi-member electoral district, so too are both versions of List PR but that is not mentioned. I would maintain consistency of description.

Im mixed systems, FPTP seats is described as "local electoral district (electoral district seats)" but the clearer distinction in mixed seats some are single member and some are multi member (or single member seats vs. party list seats). In this section and throughout both documents, terms and definitions are used that are not typical or mischaracterizations that might not catch the eye of most citizens but would would certainly raise the ire of electoral reformers or advocates of a system. I can't overstate the importance of getting this right. Describing electoral systems in a neutral and even handed way is certainly tough but not thinking it through carefully is a sure recipe for disaster.

I'm copying my colleagues here so that they need not point out some of the basic errors I have identified. Hope that these are helpful and seen in the constructive way they are meant to be.

Sincerely, Jonathan Rose.

On Nov 10, 2017, at 8:35 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

I'd like to thank you all for providing your comments on the first draft of the BC government's questionnaire respecting the planned referendum on electoral reform. We have reviewed all the comments and are making a number of changes. The biggest change will address the perception that the questionnaire was too long and could be daunting for many users: we intend to split the questionnaire into two parts, with everyone who participates completing the first part (shorter, more focussed on values), then being invited to continue on to the second part (questions about voting system preferences) or to exit/submit at that point.
If you're amenable, we would value your input on the second draft, given the structural and wording changes. It is still undergoing edits and approvals, and I anticipate forwarding it to you on Tuesday, if not before.
In addition to the questionnaire, we have drafted information on different voting systems, including a glossary of terms, which would be posted to a different page of the website. Users would be encouraged to review the information prior to completing the questionnaire. We would value your comments on this information as well, particularly in regard to neutrality and even-handedness in describing the different systems.
What's been drafted so far is, we realize, very text heavy. We intend to include graphics of sample ballots for each system, and will build further, more user-friendly web content as the engagement period progresses. There will also be numerous hyperlinks that will permit users to get to a term in the glossary as they read through the material.

We certainly are aware of the time required for you to review and provide comments on this material, particularly in the middle of an academic semester. While we of course welcome your input, please do not feel obligated to comment on this second piece, which I understand was not part of your initial discussions with Peter.

If you are able to review the attached documents, we would appreciate feedback by end of day Tuesday.

Thanks and please don't hesitate to call or email me with any questions. My cell number is s.17

Regards,

Neil Reimer

Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

101 Home Page – intro text
What are voting systems?

Voting systems govern how we elect members of British Columbia's Legislative Assembly. They are the rules for how ballots are marked and counted, and how our votes elect candidates to become Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs).

There are a number of different voting systems in use around the world. This section of the website will provide you basic information about our current voting system (First Past the Post or FPTP) and other voting systems that provide proportional representation (or PR) in the legislature.

> **Comment [JR1]:** Usually hyphenated
>
> **Comment [JR2]:** This sounds like FPTP is a system that provides PR. You also should not describe PR in a manner that explains its outcome. You don't' say FPTP that provides ....

We hope these resources will help you understand the different voting systems and options available in the referendum.

Once you've read through this section, please complete the questionnaire to help government understand your views and preferences about the voting systems that may be included on the referendum ballot.

Voting system summaries

Voting system: First Past the Post (FPTP)

Definition: This is the current voting system in British Columbia. It is a system in which the candidate who gets the most votes in an electoral district wins and represents that district in the legislature as its Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA). Each electoral district elects one MLA. The phrase "first past the post" is often compared to horse racing, where a winning candidate only needs to place first among the candidates in their respective field, without needing the majority of votes. It is sometimes referred to as a "winner-take-all" system.

> **Comment [JR3]:** Actually the horse race metaphor is really about the irrelevance of the second place horse which can be a hair's distance behind or very far behind.

Voting and Results:

- Voters in each electoral district ~~vote to~~ elect a single MLA
- Voters use a single ballot listing the candidates for the electoral district
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
- The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district

> **Comment [JR4]:** Im not sure what this means or how it's different than what follows

Tendencies:

- Does not usually produce proportional results – that is, a political party's share of the popular vote may not match its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly
- Usually results in single-party majority governments
- Coalition and minority governments are less common than with other voting systems
- Elects candidates of larger political parties and only rarely candidates of small parties and independent candidates
- Usually clear on election night who will form government

> **Comment [JR5]:** Data on the number of elections in BC vs the number of majority govts would be easy to find an add here.
>
> **Comment [JR6]:** This is not right and begs the question of what is a smaller party? Small parties like the NDP regularly get seats in the federal election

Perceived strengths:

- Clear local representation – every electoral district represented by single member
- Simple ballot – easy to understand, single choice
- Simple process to determine results
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments

Perceived weaknesses:

- Often produces single-party majority governments that win less than a majority of the popular vote

- Rewards parties that concentrate their support in specific regions; discourages parties with support that is more dispersed across the province
- Difficult for voters to hold party and candidate separately accountable — voters cannot vote for a party and candidate separately. ~~may vote for a candidate a voter dislikes if they represent the party the voter does like, and vice versa~~
- Can feature a higher number of "safe seats" (electoral districts in which the candidate for a particular political party is very likely to win), which may lead to elections that focus on a smaller number of more competitive electoral districts
- Majority governments often mean the governing party is not required to collaborate with other parties in the legislature
- Only votes cast for winning candidates elect an MLA so other votes viewed as "wasted" which means that the votes are not used to elect a candidate

Voting system: Open List Proportional Representation (List PR – Open)

Definition: Voting system in which the proportion of votes received by each political party (provincially or regionally) determines the share number of seats each party receives in the Legislative Assembly. Each party prepares a list of candidates prior to at the start of the election based on the number of seats to be filled, either in several regional electoral districts or a single province-wide election. Voters mark their ballot for a candidate. The number of seats each party receives matches its share of the popular vote. The candidates in an open list voting system are elected in the order of the number of votes each candidate receives.

Voting and Results:

- A single election is held for all seats in the region or province
- A single ballot lists the political parties and each of their candidates
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
- Each political party whose candidates collectively receive more votes than an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the seats in the Legislative Assembly equal to the percentage of the vote the party's candidates collectively received in the region or province
- The political party's seats are filled by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (e.g. 2% or 5%) may be established, below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Highly proportional results (party's share of popular vote closely matches its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly)
- Large electoral districts with multiple members (either regionally based or province-wide)
- Elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Highly proportional

Comment [JR7]: This ignores a complexity of the system that individual candidates are not likely to move up the list as a vote for a party list (which is not mentioned here but is a feature of open list PR) favours the order of the list candidates.

Comment [JR8]: This is a design feature you are deciding and stating as axiomatic and this design feature is not common. In most open list pr systems voters can choose to vote for a party or candidate. Your description ignores this and while not incorrect, is not the norm for open list pr systems.

Comment [JR9]: Again, this is a design decision. You need not have a threshold and if you do have one need to specify what it will be as the threshold greatly affects proportionality.

Comment [JR10]: It's actually an electoral formula.

Comment [JR11]: Fairly big difference here explained as seemingly not significant. It is.

Comment [JR12]: Not necessarily so. Depends on the district magnitude and the threshold. If counting and allocating seats is done regionally (like in the north for example) it would not likely be proportional at all as there would be few seats.

Comment [JR13]: Big difference for above point.

Comment [JR14]: The system you have described above where there is no opportunity for a party vote would actually encourage independent/famous candidates.

Comment [JR15]: Highly is wrong. Depends on the variables of the system.

- Increased voter choice on the ballot because voters can choose between candidates of the same party
- Multiple political parties in the Legislative Assembly, resulting in greater number of viewpoints represented.
- Most votes count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")

Perceived weaknesses:

- Reduced connection between communities and MLAs because of large, even province-wide, electoral districts
- May result in many small parties being represented in the Legislative Assembly, making government accountability more difficult
- May be a large number of candidates on a single ballot, making choices more difficult
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

> **Comment [JR16]:** I don't understand how the existence of smaller parties affect government accountability

Voting system: Closed List Proportional Representation (List PR – Closed)

Definition: Voting system in which the proportion of votes received by each political party (provincially or regionally) determines the number of seats each party receives in the Legislative Assembly. Each party prepares a list of candidates prior to ~~at~~ the start of the election based on the number of seats to be filled, either in several regional electoral districts or a single province-wide election. Voters mark their ballot for a political party, not a candidate. The number of seats each party receives matches its share of the popular vote. The candidates in a closed list voting system are elected in the order they appear on the party list.

Voting and Results:

- A single election is held for all seats in the region or province
- A single ballot lists the political parties
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the political party of their choice
- Each political party that receives votes above an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the seats in the Legislative Assembly that corresponds with the percentage of the vote the party received in the region or province
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- The political party's seats are filled by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election

Tendencies:

- Highly proportional (party's share of popular vote closely matches its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly)
- Large electoral districts with multiple MLAs (either regions, or provincewide)
- Elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and only rarely independent candidates Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Highly proportional
- Simple ballot to mark and count
- Multiple political parties in the Legislative Assembly, resulting in greater number of viewpoints represented
- Most votes count toward electing MLAs (few "wasted votes")
- Party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates

Perceived weaknesses:

- Reduced connection between communities and MLAs because of large, even province-wide, electoral districts
- May result in many small parties being represented in the Legislative Assembly, making government accountability more difficult
- Voters do not have the ability to hold individual MLAs accountable because voters vote for parties, not candidates
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Comment [JR17]: Since much of the wording in this section is the same as open list pr, I have not made the similar observations but in almost all cases, the same issues are evident.

Voting system: Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Definition: Voting system in which multiple MLAs are elected in each electoral district and voters rank the candidates according to their preferences (1, 2, 3, etc.). A formula determines the quota, or minimum number of votes a candidate must receive to be elected. Any candidates who reach the quota based on voters' first choices are elected. If any seats remain unfilled, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the other candidates until all seats are filled. How proportional the results are is dependent on how many MLAs are elected in each electoral district.

Voting and Results:

- Voters elect multiple MLAs in each electoral district
- A single ballot lists the candidates for an electoral district
- Voters rank candidates according to their preferences
- The candidates who receive votes at least equal to the quota for that electoral district win a seat to represent that district in the Legislative Assembly
- If any seats are unfilled after the first choices have been counted, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the remaining candidates until all seats are filled

Tendencies:

- Mostly proportional results; the more MLAs in an electoral district, the more proportional the results will be
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than under First Past the Post, and each district elects multiple MLAs
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and independent candidates.
- Minority or coalition governments are common
- Candidates from the same party compete against each other
- Encourages candidates to seek support from voters for whom they are not the first choice to increase their likelihood of being elected

Perceived strengths:

- Provides proportional results if~~n~~ electoral districts have ~~with~~ a large number ~~several~~ MLAs
- Provides local representation, although in larger electoral districts than First Past the Post
- Maximizes voter choice on the ballot because voters can support multiple candidates from one or more political parties

- Preferences of voters whose first choices are eliminated may still be considered
- Candidates of smaller political parties have a greater likelihood of being elected
- Provides independent candidates the greatest likelihood of being elected
- ~~Most votes~~ A greater number of ballots than in FPTP count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")

Perceived weaknesses:

- Electoral districts with only two or three MLAs do not produce proportional results
- Candidates who receive more first-preference votes may lose to candidates who receive fewer first-preference votes after all the vote transfers occur
- Larger electoral districts may reduce connection between local communities and MLAs
- Difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

> **Comment [JR26]:** This is true but a very complicated idea to communicate and one that might confuse.

Voting system: Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP)

Definition: Voting system in which FPTP and Closed List PR are both used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly and voters have a separate vote under each system. Some seats are filled at the electoral district level under FPTP, while other seats are filled at the regional or provincial level under List PR – for example, there may be 50 seats from electoral districts and 30 seats from the party list. The party list seats are allocated specifically to compensate for any disproportional results from the first past the post electoral district-level vote, so that the overall result is proportional.

Voting and Results:

- Voters cast two votes on a ballot – one vote to elect a single MLA for an electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or province-wide list (closed List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
  - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("electoral district seats").
    - Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
    - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district
  - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or province-wide ("list seats")
    - A single election is held for all the list seats in the region or province
    - Lists may be open (voters vote for a candidate of their choice) or closed (voters vote for a party of their choice)
    - Whether list seats are open or closed would be set out in the law governing the voting system
    - A single ballot lists the political parties (closed list) or candidates (open list)
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the electoral district candidate they support or a different party)
    - The list seats are used to "top up" the number of electoral district seats each party won so that the percentage of the total seats in the Legislative Assembly matches the percentage of the vote each party receives on Part 2 of the ballot
    - For example, a party that received 20% of the province-wide vote for the list seats but only received 15% of the electoral district seats will receive

> **Comment [JR27]:** This isn't quite right because those in the region are alos in electoral districts. Better to call them fptp district vs regional electoral districts

> **Comment [JR28]:** While there are open list MMP systems, they are quite exotic and having voters choose an open list MMP system would I think make it unnecessarily complex. Why not just have the MMP system closed? If you do have it open be sure to explain the rules around dual candidacies as they will be a greater issue in open list mmp.

> **Comment [JR29]:** This level of ambiguity (open vs. closed) really changes the way this system works and allows for greater opportunity for flaws to found in it. I would choose one open or closed system not say it could be either.

additional list seats so it holds 20% of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly

- The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election (closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (e.g. 2% or 5%) may be established below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Proportional results
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than under FPTP, or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties, and only rarely independent candidates Minority or coalition governments are common

> **Comment [JR30]:** This is a bit meaningless as I'm not sure what "smaller parties" are.

Perceived strengths:

- Largely proportional, and can be highly proportional depending on the mix of electoral district and list seats
- Identifiable local representation
- Voter choice (both a local candidate and a party)
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- Closed party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates
- Open party list enables voters to vote for party candidate they prefer
- Most party seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA

> **Comment [JR31]:** It's only largely proportional if the ratio between the two tiers is at least 25% list seats and the number of those seats is sufficient to offset disproportionalities.

Perceived weaknesses:

- Creates two "classes" of MLAs – those who represent a local district and those who are elected from a larger region or province-wide do not
- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how list votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

> **Comment [JR32]:** The issue of dual candidacy is a real one but it's difficult to explain with just this one bullet. I can easily imagine voters being confused by this – though it's correct.

> **Comment [JR33]:** If this is a weakness it also needs to be included in list pr sections.

If a political party receives more electoral district seats than its province-wide vote share would entitle them to, either the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly must increase to address this over-representation or the other political parties receive fewer list seats than they would otherwise be entitled to

Comment [JR34]: These are the two options for overhang. Isn't it better to choose one? If not, why state it as what you've said is a fact of the system. Again, without broader context, it's statement could create confusion.

Voting system: Mixed-Member Majoritarian (MMM) (also called Parallel)

Definition: A mixed voting system that is very similar to MMP in which voters cast two ballots. The first ballot uses FPTP to elect a candidate to represent an electoral district. The second ballot is for a political party according to List PR. A predetermined number of seats are filled using each system – for example, there may be 50 seats from electoral districts and 30 seats from the list. Unlike MMP, in MMM the List PR seats are not allocated to compensate for any disproportional results from the electoral districts vote – instead, the List PR seats are allocated proportionally only amongst themselves. While MMM produces more proportional results than FPTP, it does not necessarily produce closely proportional results overall and is usually referred to as a semi-proportional system.

Voting:

- Voters cast two votes – one vote to elect a single MLA for an electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or province-wide list (List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
    - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("electoral district seats").
        - Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
        - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
        - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district
    - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or provincewide ("list seats")
        - A single election is held for all the list seats in the region or province
        - Lists may be "open" (voters vote for a candidate of their choice) or "closed" (voters vote for a party of their choice)
        - Whether list seats are open or closed would be set out in the law governing the voting system
        - A single ballot lists the political parties (closed list) or candidates (open list)
        - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the electoral district candidate they support or a different party)
        - Each political party that receives more votes than an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the list seats in the Legislative Assembly that corresponds with the percentage of the vote the party received in the list seat vote across the region/province

<div style="float:right">

Comment [JR35]: You should follow the same pattern as in MMP above for this sentence.

Comment [JR36]: Im not sure what this means. How about:
" List PR seats are allocated to parties in addition to the FPTP seats. The effect of this is to give all parties, both large and small, a seat bonus. For this reason it's called a semi-proportional system."

Comment [JR37]: According to this document there are two systems open list pr and closed list pr. You have collapsed them here.

Comment [JR38]: All seats allocated in electoral districts. Some are just single member and smaller and others are multi-member and larger

</div>

- These list seats are not "top up" seats and do not ~~account for~~take into account any disproportional results from the electoral district vote
- The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election (closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote may be established (e.g. 2% or 5%) below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Somewhat proportional (more proportional than FPTP but less than List PR, STV or MMP)
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than currently under FPTP, or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments may occur, but are less likely than under List PR, STV or MMP

Perceived strengths:

- Identifiable local representation
- Increased voter choice (both a local MLA and a party)
- Closed party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates
- Open party list enables voters to vote for party candidate they prefer
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- Most list seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments than List PR, STV or MMP but less than FPTP

Perceived weaknesses:

- How proportional results are is highly dependent on the number of <u>first past the</u>post ~~electoral~~ district seats vs. the number of list seats
- Creates two "classes" of MLAs – those who represent local districts and those who do not

Comment [JR39]: See my comments re mmp here

- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Glossary DRAFT

Term	Proposed definition
Citizens' Assembly	An independent, non-partisan assembly of randomly selected individuals with a mandate to examine an issue over an extended period of time and make a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly. The B.C. Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform was mandated in 2004 to look at how votes cast in provincial elections translate into seats in the Legislative Assembly. Their final report and recommendation to the people of B.C. was submitted to a referendum in 2004 ~~on December 10, 2004, and the Assembly then disbanded~~. The Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform was given a similar mandate in 2006. Their final report and recommendation to a referendum in 2007. ~~the Legislative Assembly was submitted on May 15, 2007, and the Assembly then disbanded.~~]
Closed list PR	A form of List PR in which voters vote for a political party and the seats that party receives are filled based on a list prepared by the political party ~~at~~ prior to the start of the election— for example, if the party receives 5 seats, then the first 5 candidates on the party list are elected.
Coalition government	Two or more political parties that form government by formally sharing power in the Legislative Assembly. Usually, the cabinet ministers will be drawn from all coalition parties.
Electoral district	A geographic area that elects one or more members of the Legislative Assembly. Sometimes referred to as a "constituency" or "riding".
Electoral district seats	Seats that are won by candidates or filled by candidates of political parties on the basis of the results of the vote in an electoral district.
Governing party	A political party whose leader is called upon by the Lieutenant Governor to form a government because the party can maintain the confidence of the Legislative Assembly in order to govern.
Legislative Assembly	The lawmaking body of the province of British Columbia, consisting of all the elected Members.
Legislature	The Legislative Assembly as well as the Lieutenant Governor and the Executive Council (the cabinet of government ministers).
Lieutenant Governor	The representative of the Queen in British Columbia who carries out constitutional, vice-regal and ceremonial duties on behalf of the Crown. The Lieutenant Governor selects the Premier, summons and prorogues the Legislature, and gives Royal Assent to bills.
List seats	Seats that are filled by candidates of political parties in proportion to the percentage of the vote the party receives. Seats are filled based on lists of candidates prepared by parties. See "closed list" and "open list".
Majority government	A single governing party or a formal coalition of like-minded parties that holds more than half of the seats in the Legislative Assembly.
Majority voting systems	Voting systems in which the winning candidate ~~or political party~~ must obtain at least 50% of the vote. Majority voting systems are not proportional representation voting systems.
Minority government	The governing political party holds fewer than half of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly.

Comment [JR1]: Spell out?

Comment [JR2]: I'm not sure this is needed. Seems a bit obvious that electoral district seats are seats won in an electoral district.

Comment [JR3]: Lieutenant governor is not part of the legislature

Comment [JR4]: You don't' discuss either alternative vote or two round system. Why discuss it here?

Mixed voting system	Voting system in which more ~~first-past-the-post is combined with List PR~~ than one type of voting method is used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly. Voters choose a candidate and a party. ~~and voters have a separate vote under each method.~~ MMP and MMM/Parallel are examples the two kinds of mixed voting systems.
Open list PR	A form of List PR in which voters have the option of voting ~~e~~ for a candidate from a list of candidates prepared by a political party. The political party receives a percentage ~~number~~ of seats equal to the percentage of the vote received by all of the candidates for the party. The party's seats are filled in the order of the number of votes each candidate received – for example, if the party receives 5 seats, then the 5 candidates from that party who got the most votes are elected.
Plurality voting systems	Voting systems in which the winning candidate or political party is the one that has obtained more votes than any other candidate or political party, even if it is not more than 50% of the total votes cast. First Past the Post is an example of a plurality voting system.
Proportional voting system	A voting system that allocates seats in the Legislative Assembly in proportion to the percentage of the votes cast for political parties – for example, a party that wins 30 per cent of the votes will receive close to 30 per cent of the seats.
Quota	The minimum number of votes that a candidate must receive in order to be elected under the STV voting system. The quota is determined by a formula based on the number of seats in the electoral district and the total number of valid votes cast.
Semi-proportional voting system	A voting system that allocates seats in the Legislative Assembly relatively but not closely in proportion to the percentage of the votes cast for political parties. Mixed Member Majoritarian or Parallel is an example of a semi-proportional voting system.
Threshold	The minimum percentage of votes that a political party must receive in order to be eligible for to win a seat under some proportional systems – for example a party list seat under List PR or MMP. This is called the natural threshold and is a mathematicl by-product of the system. The threshold can be legislated as an artificial cut off (such as in Germany where it is 5%). This is called a formal threshold.
Voting system	A system for electing members to a legislative body, including the rules that govern how ballots are marked and counted, and how votes are turned into seats.
Voting system families	A grouping of voting systems that share similar characteristics. The primary characteristics used to distinguish families of voting systems are the degree to which they are proportional and whether they are mixed systems. The main voting system families are: Plurality/Majority, Proportional Representation, Mixed, and Other (such as Single Non-Transferable Vote).

Comment [JR5]: This over simplifies open list pr where a vote for a party is a vote for all the candidates. Candidates rarely move up the list but this explanation makes it seem like the norm.

Comment [JR6]: Since you don't' discuss this in your other document, I don't see a reason to do so here.

From:	Jonathan Rose <jonathan.rose@queensu.ca>
Sent:	Sunday, November 12, 2017 7:47 PM
To:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Cc:	Peter MacLeod; Genevieve Fuji Johnson; Cameron, Maxwell; Peter Loewen
Subject:	Re: Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2
Attachments:	Draft engagement material voting systems v.0.7 ROSE.docx; Draft engagment glossary v.0.2 ROSE.docx

Dear Mr. Reimer:

Attached are the two documents you have asked us to review and I've made many comments throughout.

For the glossary, you may want to link to or borrow (with attribution) the many excellent resources about electoral systems that have already been written and are widely available. Samara created an excellent guidebook about electoral systems which might be repurposed for you. It's non-partisan, non technical but clearly and succinctly written. Both the BC and Ontario citizens' assemblies also created glossaries that might also serve as a good basis as they were written for citizens without a background in the material. The Ontario one is here but there are other web sites such as the Ace Project or IDEA which should be consulted.

In terms of the voting system information document, I think it requires some serious re-thinking about language, framing and degree of complexity. Not doing so would run the risk of potentially embarrassing the government or appearing to discount one system or favour another.

I am not certain what options the government is considering for the public education campaign but having open list PR and closed list PR is, in my mind adding unnecessary complexity. I think you should describe the principles of PR making a distinction between regional and province-wide allocation of seats and mention that the list can be open or closed. It's important to remember that most open list systems allow for a voter to vote for a party and most voters recognize they get more 'bang for their buck' by doing so. The open list pr system described sounds similar to Finland and Brazil but not the norm of open lists.

One of the strengths of list pr that is not mentioned is the potential to have a diverse party list; the list is created prior to (not "at the start)" of the election and its diversity is often used as an election plank. Ignoring this in the document ignores one of the most important reasons for PR.

The document also uses language like 'small parties' which is a bit confusing because it's not clear what kind of small party you are thinking of. The success of small parties is dependent on a number of variables that is not discussed in this document such as the number of small parties, the formal threshold, the district magnitude, the political culture of the province and the counting and seat allocation rules.

Related to this is the most important point in PR systems that is alluded to in a few places but not fully discussed. The number of MLAs elected per electoral district (the district magnitude) is arguably the most important variable in proportionality. The comments about the highly proportional tendencies elide this. I think the document needs to indicate that STV and Mixed systems will be proportional in urban areas but quite unlikely in rural areas especially in the north. (Counting province-wide but allocating regionally would offset this). Providing maps would be the easiest way to communicate this but is fraught because these design decisions about the size of districts need to be fully thought-out.

1

The counting explanation in STV is not quite as clear as it might be. The BCSTV model counts surplus votes of those who reach the quota then the last placed candidates are re-distrubuted. The document correctly characterizes STV as a multi-member electoral district, so too are both versions of List PR but that is not mentioned. I would maintain consistency of description.

Im mixed systems, FPTP seats is described as "local electoral district (electoral district seats)" but the clearer distinction in mixed seats some are single member and some are multi member (or single member seats vs. party list seats). In this section and throughout both documents, terms and definitions are used that are not typical or mischaracterizations that might not catch the eye of most citizens but would would certainly raise the ire of electoral reformers or advocates of a system. I can't overstate the importance of getting this right. Describing electoral systems in a neutral and even handed way is certainly tough but not thinking it through carefully is a sure recipe for disaster.

I'm copying my colleagues here so that they need not point out some of the basic errors I have identified. Hope that these are helpful and seen in the constructive way they are meant to be.

Sincerely, Jonathan Rose.

On Nov 10, 2017, at 8:35 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

I'd like to thank you all for providing your comments on the first draft of the BC government's questionnaire respecting the planned referendum on electoral reform. We have reviewed all the comments and are making a number of changes. The biggest change will address the perception that the questionnaire was too long and could be daunting for many users: we intend to split the questionnaire into two parts, with everyone who participates completing the first part (shorter, more focussed on values), then being invited to continue on to the second part (questions about voting system preferences) or to exit/submit at that point.

If you're amenable, we would value your input on the second draft, given the structural and wording changes. It is still undergoing edits and approvals, and I anticipate forwarding it to you on Tuesday, if not before.

In addition to the questionnaire, we have drafted information on different voting systems, including a glossary of terms, which would be posted to a different page of the website. Users would be encouraged to review the information prior to completing the questionnaire. We would value your comments on this information as well, particularly in regard to neutrality and even-handedness in describing the different systems.

What's been drafted so far is, we realize, very text heavy. We intend to include graphics of sample ballots for each system, and will build further, more user-friendly web content as the engagement period progresses. There will also be numerous hyperlinks that will permit users to get to a term in the glossary as they read through the material.

We certainly are aware of the time required for you to review and provide comments on this material, particularly in the middle of an academic semester. While we of course welcome your input, please do not feel obligated to comment on this second piece, which I understand was not part of your initial discussions with Peter.

If you are able to review the attached documents, we would appreciate feedback by end of day Tuesday.

Thanks and please don't hesitate to call or email me with any questions. My cell number is ˙s.17

Regards,

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

101 Home Page – intro text

What are voting systems?

Voting systems govern how we elect members of British Columbia's Legislative Assembly. They are the rules for how ballots are marked and counted, and how our votes elect candidates to become Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs).

There are a number of different voting systems in use around the world. This section of the website will provide you basic information about our current voting system (First Past the Post or FPTP) and other voting systems that provide proportional representation (or PR) in the legislature.

We hope these resources will help you understand the different voting systems and options available in the referendum.

Once you've read through this section, please complete the questionnaire to help government understand your views and preferences about the voting systems that may be included on the referendum ballot.

Voting system summaries

Voting system: First Past the Post (FPTP)

Definition: This is the current voting system in British Columbia. It is a system in which the candidate who gets the most votes in an electoral district wins and represents that district in the legislature as its Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA). Each electoral district elects one MLA. The phrase "first past the post" is often compared to horse racing, where a winning candidate only needs to place first among the candidates in their respective field, without needing the majority of votes. It is sometimes referred to as a "winner-take-all" system.

Voting and Results:

- Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
- Voters use a single ballot listing the candidates for the electoral district
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
- The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district

Tendencies:

- Does not usually produce proportional results – that is, a political party's share of the popular vote may not match its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly
- Usually results in single-party majority governments
- Coalition and minority governments are less common than with other voting systems
- Elects candidates of larger political parties and only rarely candidates of small parties and independent candidates
- Usually clear on election night who will form government

Perceived strengths:

- Clear local representation – every electoral district represented by single member
- Simple ballot – easy to understand, single choice
- Simple process to determine results
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments

Perceived weaknesses:

- Often produces single-party majority governments that win less than a majority of the popular vote

- Rewards parties that concentrate their support in specific regions; discourages parties with support that is more dispersed across the province
- Difficult for voters to hold party and candidate separately accountable —may vote for a candidate a voter dislikes if they represent the party the voter does like, and vice versa
- Can feature a higher number of "safe seats" (electoral districts in which the candidate for a particular political party is very likely to win), which may lead to elections that focus on a smaller number of more competitive electoral districts
- Majority governments often mean the governing party is not required to collaborate with other parties in the legislature
- Only votes cast for winning candidates elect an MLA so other votes viewed as "wasted"

Voting system: Open List Proportional Representation (List PR – Open)

Definition: Voting system in which the proportion of votes received by each political party (provincially or regionally) determines the number of seats each party receives in the Legislative Assembly. Each party prepares a list of candidates at the start of the election based on the number of seats to be filled, either in several regional electoral districts or a single provincewide election. Voters mark their ballot for a candidate. The number of seats each party receives matches its share of the popular vote. The candidates in an open list voting system are elected in the order of the number of votes each candidate receives.

Voting and Results:

- A single election is held for all seats in the region or province
- A single ballot lists the political parties and each of their candidates
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
- Each political party whose candidates collectively receive more votes than an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the seats in the Legislative Assembly equal to the percentage of the vote the party's candidates collectively received in the region or province
- The political party's seats are filled by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (e.g. 2% or 5%) may be established, below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Highly proportional results (party's share of popular vote closely matches its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly)
- Large electoral districts with multiple members (either regionally based or province-wide)
- Elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Highly proportional

- Increased voter choice on the ballot because voters can choose between candidates of the same party
- Multiple political parties in the Legislative Assembly, resulting in greater number of viewpoints represented.
- Most votes count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")

Perceived weaknesses:

- Reduced connection between communities and MLAs because of large, even province-wide, electoral districts
- May result in many small parties being represented in the Legislative Assembly, making government accountability more difficult
- May be a large number of candidates on a single ballot, making choices more difficult
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Voting system: Closed List Proportional Representation (List PR – Closed)

Definition: Voting system in which the proportion of votes received by each political party (provincially or regionally) determines the number of seats each party receives in the Legislative Assembly. Each party prepares a list of candidates at the start of the election based on the number of seats to be filled, either in several regional electoral districts or a single provincewide election. Voters mark their ballot for a political party, not a candidate. The number of seats each party receives matches its share of the popular vote. The candidates in a closed list voting system are elected in the order they appear on the party list.

Voting and Results:

- A single election is held for all seats in the region or province
- A single ballot lists the political parties
- Voters mark an 'X' beside the political party of their choice
- Each political party that receives votes above an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the seats in the Legislative Assembly that corresponds with the percentage of the vote the party received in the region or province
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- The political party's seats are filled by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election

Tendencies:

- Highly proportional (party's share of popular vote closely matches its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly)
- Large electoral districts with multiple MLAs (either regions, or provincewide)
- Elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and only rarely independent candidates Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Highly proportional
- Simple ballot to mark and count
- Multiple political parties in the Legislative Assembly, resulting in greater number of viewpoints represented
- Most votes count toward electing MLAs (few "wasted votes")
- Party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates

Perceived weaknesses:

- Reduced connection between communities and MLAs because of large, even provincewide, electoral districts
- May result in many small parties being represented in the Legislative Assembly, making government accountability more difficult
- Voters do not have the ability to hold individual MLAs accountable because voters vote for parties, not candidates
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Voting system: Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Definition: Voting system in which multiple MLAs are elected in each electoral district and voters rank the candidates according to their preferences (1, 2, 3, etc.). A formula determines the quota, or minimum number of votes a candidate must receive to be elected. Any candidates who reach the quota based on voters' first choices are elected. If any seats remain unfilled, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the other candidates until all seats are filled. How proportional the results are is dependent on how many MLAs are elected in each electoral district.

Voting and Results:

- Voters elect multiple MLAs in each electoral district
- A single ballot lists the candidates for an electoral district
- Voters rank candidates according to their preferences
- The candidates who receive votes at least equal to the quota for that electoral district win a seat to represent that district in the Legislative Assembly
- If any seats are unfilled after the first choices have been counted, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the remaining candidates until all seats are filled

Tendencies:

- Mostly proportional results; the more MLAs in an electoral district, the more proportional the results will be
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than under First Past the Post, and each district elects multiple MLAs
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and independent candidates.
- Minority or coalition governments are common
- Candidates from the same party compete against each other
- Encourages candidates to seek support from voters for whom they are not the first choice to increase their likelihood of being elected

Perceived strengths:

- Provides proportional results in electoral districts with several MLAs
- Provides local representation, although in larger electoral districts than First Past the Post
- Maximizes voter choice on the ballot because voters can support multiple candidates from one or more political parties
- Preferences of voters whose first choices are eliminated may still be considered

DRAFT – CONFIDENTIAL

8

- Candidates of smaller political parties have a greater likelihood of being elected
- Provides independent candidates the greatest likelihood of being elected
- Most votes count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")

Perceived weaknesses:

- Electoral districts with only two or three MLAs do not produce proportional results
- Candidates who receive more first-preference votes may lose to candidates who receive fewer first-preference votes after all the vote transfers occur
- Larger electoral districts may reduce connection between local communities and MLAs
- Difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Voting system: Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP)

Definition: Voting system in which FPTP and List PR are both used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly and voters have a separate vote under each system. Some seats are filled at the electoral district level under FPTP, while other seats are filled at the regional or provincial level under List PR – for example, there may be 50 seats from electoral districts and 30 seats from the party list. The party list seats are allocated specifically to compensate for any disproportional results from the electoral district-level vote, so that the overall result is proportional.

Voting and Results:

- Voters cast two votes – one vote to elect a single MLA for an electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or provincewide list (List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
  - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("electoral district seats").
    - Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
    - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district
  - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or province-wide ("list seats")
    - A single election is held for all the list seats in the region or province
    - Lists may be open (voters vote for a <u>candidate</u> of their choice) or closed (voters vote for a <u>party</u> of their choice)
    - Whether list seats are open or closed would be set out in the law governing the voting system
    - A single ballot lists the political parties (closed list) or candidates (open list)
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the electoral district candidate they support or a different party)
    - The list seats are used to "top up" the number of electoral district seats each party won so that the percentage of the total seats in the Legislative Assembly matches the percentage of the vote each party receives on Part 2 of the ballot
    - For example, a party that received 20% of the province-wide vote for the list seats but only received 15% of the electoral district seats will receive

additional list seats so it holds 20% of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly

- The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election (closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (e.g. 2% or 5%) may be established below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Proportional results
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than under FPTP, or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties, and only rarely independent candidates Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Largely proportional, and can be highly proportional depending on the mix of electoral district and list seats
- Identifiable local representation
- Voter choice (both a local candidate and a party)
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- Closed party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates
- Open party list enables voters to vote for party candidate they prefer
- Most party seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA

Perceived weaknesses:

- Creates two "classes" of MLAs – those who represent a local district and those who do not
- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how list votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

If a political party receives more electoral district seats than its province-wide vote share would entitle them to, either the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly must increase to address this over-representation or the other political parties receive fewer list seats than they would otherwise be entitled to

Voting system: Mixed-Member Majoritarian (MMM) (also called Parallel)

Definition: A mixed voting system that is very similar to MMP in which voters cast two ballots. The first ballot uses FPTP to elect a candidate to represent an electoral district. The second ballot is for a political party according to List PR. A predetermined number of seats are filled using each system – for example, there may be 50 seats from electoral districts and 30 seats from the list. Unlike MMP, in MMM the List PR seats are not allocated to compensate for any disproportional results from the electoral districts vote – instead, the List PR seats are allocated proportionally only amongst themselves. While MMM produces more proportional results than FPTP, it does not necessarily produce closely proportional results overall and is usually referred to as a semi-proportional system.

Voting:

- Voters cast two votes – one vote to elect a single MLA for an electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or provincewide list (List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
  - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("electoral district seats").
    - Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
    - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district
  - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or provincewide ("list seats")
    - A single election is held for all the list seats in the region or province
    - Lists may be "open" (voters vote for a candidate of their choice) or "closed" (voters vote for a party of their choice)
    - Whether list seats are open or closed would be set out in the law governing the voting system
    - A single ballot lists the political parties (closed list) or candidates (open list)
    - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the electoral district candidate they support or a different party)
    - Each political party that receives more votes than an established minimum threshold receives a percentage of the list seats in the Legislative Assembly that corresponds with the percentage of the vote the party received in the list seat vote across the region/province

- These list seats are not "top up" seats and do not account for any disproportional results from the electoral district vote
- The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election (closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)
- Election law will establish rules to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote may be established (e.g. 2% or 5%) below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Somewhat proportional (more proportional than FPTP but less than List PR, STV or MMP)
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than currently under FPTP, or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments may occur, but are less likely than under List PR, STV or MMP

Perceived strengths:

- Identifiable local representation
- Increased voter choice (both a local MLA and a party)
- Closed party list enables political parties to determine mix of candidates
- Open party list enables voters to vote for party candidate they prefer
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- Most list seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments than List PR, STV or MMP but less than FPTP

Perceived weaknesses:

- How proportional results are is highly dependent on the number of electoral district seats vs. the number of list seats
- Creates two "classes" of MLAs – those who represent local districts and those who do not

- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

Glossary DRAFT

Term	Proposed definition
Citizens' Assembly	An independent, non-partisan assembly of randomly selected individuals with a mandate to examine an issue over an extended period of time and make a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly. The B.C. Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform was mandated in 2004 to look at how votes cast in provincial elections translate into seats in the Legislative Assembly. Their final report and recommendation to the people of B.C. was submitted on December 10, 2004, and the Assembly then disbanded. The Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform was given a similar mandate in 2006. Their final report and recommendation to the Legislative Assembly was submitted on May 15, 2007, and the Assembly then disbanded.
Closed list	A form of List PR in which voters vote for a political party and the seats that party receives are filled based on a list prepared by the political party at the start of the election– for example, if the party receives 5 seats, then the first 5 candidates on the party list are elected.
Coalition government	Two or more political parties that form government by formally sharing power in the Legislative Assembly. Usually, the cabinet ministers will be drawn from all coalition parties.
Electoral district	A geographic area that elects one or more members of the Legislative Assembly. Sometimes referred to as a "constituency" or "riding".
Electoral district seats	Seats that are won by candidates or filled by candidates of political parties on the basis of the results of the vote in an electoral district.
Governing party	A political party whose leader is called upon by the Lieutenant Governor to form a government because the party can maintain the confidence of the Legislative Assembly in order to govern.
Legislative Assembly	The lawmaking body of British Columbia, consisting of all the elected Members.
Legislature	The Legislative Assembly as well as the Lieutenant Governor and the Executive Council (the cabinet of government ministers).
Lieutenant Governor	The representative of the Queen in British Columbia who carries out constitutional, vice-regal and ceremonial duties on behalf of the Crown. The Lieutenant Governor selects the Premier, summons and prorogues the Legislature, and gives Royal Assent to bills.
List seats	Seats that are filled by candidates of political parties in proportion to the percentage of the vote the party receives. Seats are filled based on lists of candidates prepared by parties. See "closed list" and "open list".
Majority government	A single governing party or a formal coalition of like-minded parties holds more than half of the seats in the Legislative Assembly.
Majority voting systems	Voting systems in which the winning candidate or political party must obtain at least 50% of the vote. Majority voting systems are not proportional representation voting systems.
Minority government	The governing political party holds fewer than half of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly.

Mixed voting system	Voting system in which more than one type of voting method is used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly and voters have a separate vote under each method. MMP and MMM/Parallel are examples of mixed voting systems.
Open list	A form of List PR in which voters vote for a candidate from a list of candidates prepared by a political party. The political party receives a number of seats equal to the percentage of the vote received by all of the candidates for the party. The party's seats are filled in the order of the number of votes each candidate received – for example, if the party receives 5 seats, then the 5 candidates from that party who got the most votes are elected.
Plurality voting systems	Voting systems in which the winning candidate or political party is the one that has obtained more votes than any other candidate or political party, even if it is not more than 50% of the total votes cast. First Past the Post is an example of a plurality voting system.
Proportional voting system	A voting system that allocates seats in the Legislative Assembly in proportion to the percentage of the votes cast for political parties – for example, a party that wins 30 per cent of the votes will receive close to 30 per cent of the seats.
Quota	The minimum number of votes that a candidate must receive in order to be elected under the STV voting system. The quota is determined by a formula based on the number of seats in the electoral district and the total number of valid votes cast.
Semi-proportional voting system	A voting system that allocates seats in the Legislative Assembly relatively but not closely in proportion to the percentage of the votes cast for political parties. Mixed Member Majoritarian or Parallel is an example of a semi-proportional voting system.
Threshold	The minimum percentage of votes that a political party must receive in order to be eligible for to win a seat under some proportional systems – for example a party list seat under List PR or MMP.
Voting system	A system for electing members to a legislative body, including the rules that govern how ballots are marked and counted, and how votes are turned into seats.
Voting system families	A grouping of voting systems that share similar characteristics. The primary characteristics used to distinguish families of voting systems are the degree to which they are proportional and whether they are mixed systems. The main voting system families are: Plurality/Majority, Proportional Representation, Mixed, and Other (such as Single Non-Transferable Vote).

From:	Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Sent:	Friday, November 10, 2017 5:35 PM
To:	'gfjohnso@sfu.ca'; 'Cameron, Maxwell'; 'jonathan.rose@queensu.ca'; 'peter.loewen@utoronto.ca'
Cc:	'Peter MacLeod'
Subject:	Electoral Reform Engagement Advice - Round 2
Attachments:	Draft engagement material voting systems v.0.7.docx; Draft engagment glossary v.0.2.docx

I'd like to thank you all for providing your comments on the first draft of the BC government's questionnaire respecting the planned referendum on electoral reform. We have reviewed all the comments and are making a number of changes.

The biggest change will address the perception that the questionnaire was too long and could be daunting for many users: we intend to split the questionnaire into two parts, with everyone who participates completing the first part (shorter, more focussed on values), then being invited to continue on to the second part (questions about voting system preferences) or to exit/submit at that point.

If you're amenable, we would value your input on the second draft, given the structural and wording changes. It is still undergoing edits and approvals, and I anticipate forwarding it to you on Tuesday, if not before.

In addition to the questionnaire, we have drafted information on different voting systems, including a glossary of terms, which would be posted to a different page of the website. Users would be encouraged to review the information prior to completing the questionnaire. We would value your comments on this information as well, particularly in regard to neutrality and even-handedness in describing the different systems.

What's been drafted so far is, we realize, very text heavy. We intend to include graphics of sample ballots for each system, and will build further, more user-friendly web content as the engagement period progresses. There will also be numerous hyperlinks that will permit users to get to a term in the glossary as they read through the material.

We certainly are aware of the time required for you to review and provide comments on this material, particularly in the middle of an academic semester. While we of course welcome your input, please do not feel obligated to comment on this second piece, which I understand was not part of your initial discussions with Peter.

If you are able to review the attached documents, we would appreciate feedback by end of day Tuesday.

Thanks and please don't hesitate to call or email me with any questions. My cell number is ˢ·²²

Regards,

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303