

---

# Public Hearing: Options for Yukon's Electoral System

*Keith Archer*

*January 21, 2022*

---

# Overview

Introduction to Electoral Systems

Setting the context: election results in Yukon territorial elections, 1978 – 2021

Electoral system options and their characteristics

Special considerations

Previous attempts at electoral reform in Canada

Key issues when considering electoral reform

---

# Introduction to electoral systems

Electoral system is a set of rules through which votes in an election produce seats in a legislative assembly

3 issues:

- \* how many candidates is a person voting for?

- \* how does voter express preference?

- \* what are the rules for winning?

Party systems are shaped by the electoral system

---

# Election results in Yukon, 1978 - 1996

Year						
	Party					Vote% Seat%
		Votes	% Votes	Seats	% Seats	Difference
1978	Yukon Liberal Party	2,201	28.5	2	12.5	-16.0
	Yukon New Democratic Party	1,568	20.3	1	6.3	-14.0
	Yukon PC Party	2,869	36.9	11	68.8	+31.9
	Independent	1,096	14.2	2	12.5	-1.7
	Total	7,734		16		
1982	Yukon Liberal Party	1,564	15.0	0	0.0	-15.0
	Yukon New Democratic Party	3,689	35.4	6	37.5	+2.1
	Yukon PC Party	4,770	45.8	9	56.3	+10.5
	Independent	393	3.8	1	6.3	+2.5
	Total	10,416		16		
1985						
	Yukon Liberal Party	806	7.6	2	12.5	+4.9
	Yukon New Democratic Party	4,335	41.1	8	50.0	+8.9
	Yukon Territorial PC Party	4,948	46.9	6	37.5	-9.4
	Independent	458	4.4	0	0.0	-4.4
	Total	10,547		16		
1989						
	Yukon Liberal Party	1,303	11.1	0	0.0	-11.1
	Yukon New Democratic Party	5,275	45.0	9	56.3	+11.3
	PC Yukon Party	5,142	43.9	7	43.7	-0.2
	Total	11,720		16		
1992						
	Yukon Liberal Party	2,098	16.1	1	5.9	-10.2
	Yukon New Democratic Party	4,571	35.1	6	35.3	+0.2
	Yukon Party	4,675	35.9	7	41.2	+5.3
	Independent	1,686	12.9	3	17.6	+4.7
	Total	13,030		17		
1996						
	Yukon Liberal Party	3,464	23.9	3	17.6	-6.3
	Yukon New Democratic Party	5,760	39.8	11	64.7	+24.9
	Yukon Party	4,392	30.4	3	17.6	-12.8
	Independent	852	5.9	0	0.0	-5.9
	Total	14,468		17		

---

# Election results in Yukon, 1978- 1996

Yukon Party (or Yukon PC Party) won 3 times,  
NDP won 3 times

Clear majority 4 times, winning party with 50%  
of seats once, minority gov't once

In half the elections, winning party with less  
than 40% votes. In other half, between 41 and  
46%

Winning party often heavily over-rewarded

Party most penalized usually finished in 3<sup>rd</sup>  
place, sometimes in 2nd place, once in 1<sup>st</sup>  
place

---

# Election results in Yukon, 2000 - 2021

Year						
	Party					Vote% Seat %
		Votes	% Votes	Seats	% Seats	Difference
2000	Yukon Liberal Party	6,119	42.9	10	58.8	+15.9
	Yukon New Democratic Party	4,677	32.8	6	35.3	+2.5
	Yukon Party	3,466	24.3	1	5.9	-18.4
	Total	14,262		17		
2002	Yukon Liberal Party	4,056	29.0	1	5.6	-23.4
	Yukon New Democratic Party	3,763	26.9	5	27.8	+0.9
	Yukon Party	5,650	40.4	12	66.7	+26.3
	Independent	535	3.8	0	0.0	-3.8
	Total	14,004		18		
2006						
	Yukon Liberal Party	4,699	34.7	5	27.8	-6.9
	Yukon New Democratic Party	3,197	23.6	3	16.7	-6.9
	Yukon Party	5,506	40.7	10	55.6	+14.9
	Independent	143	1.1	0	0.0	-1.1
	Total	13,545		18		
2011						
	Yukon First Nations Party	81	0.5	0	0.0	-0.5
	Yukon Green Party	104	0.7	0	0.0	-0.7
	Yukon Liberal Party	4,008	25.3	2	10.5	-14.8
	Yukon New Democratic Party	5,154	32.6	6	31.6	-1.0
	Yukon Party	6,400	40.4	11	57.9	+17.5
	Independent	79	0.5	0	0.0	-0.5
	Total	15,826		19		
2016						
	Yukon Green Party	145	0.8	0	0.0	-0.8
	Yukon Liberal Party	7,404	39.4	11	57.9	+18.5
	Yukon New Democratic Party	4,928	26.2	2	10.5	-15.7
	Yukon Party	6,272	33.4	6	31.6	-1.8
	Independent	38	0.2	0	0.0	-0.2
	Total	18,787		19		
2021						
	Yukon Liberal Party	6,155	32.4	8	42.1	+9.7
	Yukon New Democratic Party	5,356	28.2	3	15.8	-12.4
	Yukon Party	7,477	39.3	8	42.1	+2.8
	Independent	26	0.1	0	0.0	-0.1
	Total	19,098		19		

---

# Election results in Yukon, 2000 - 2021

6 elections, 3 won by Liberals, 3 won by Yukon Party

5 elections returned majority gov't, one returned a minority gov't.

Votes for party winning most votes ranged from 39.3% to 42.9%.

Party with most votes won most seats in all elections but 2021, when Liberal and Yukon parties each won 8 seats but on 32.4% and 39.3% of the votes

Yukon Party ++ 3 times, Liberal ++ 3 times, NDP – 2 times

---

---

# Election results, consideration s

How does one evaluate this electoral system performance?

75% of elections translated minority vote into majority government. Is this good or bad?

What impacts over- and under-rewarding by electoral system – party's relative performance, or party's character?

Independent and minor parties have not done well. Is this good or bad?

---



# Voter turnout in Yukon Elections

Year	Electors on list	Voters	% Electors Voted
1978	11,051	7,783	70.43
1982	13,290	10,462	78.72
1985	13,530	10,607	78.40
1989	15,093	11,768	77.97
1992	16,900	13,104	77.54
1996	18,297	14,559	79.58
2000	18,285	14,368	78.58
2002	18,067	14,116	78.13
2006	18,681	13,611	72.76
2011	20,730	15,906	74.34
2016	23,494	18,840	76.37

---

# Voter turnout, consideration

S

Overall, turnout has remained high in Yukon, during a time in which turnout elsewhere has generally declined.

Do voter turnout rates in Yukon indicate concern or disengagement with politics?

Does electoral system appear to have impacted turnout in Yukon?

# Electing Women in the Yukon

Year	N. of candidates	Male candidates	Female candidates	% Female candidates	Male elected	Female elected	% Female MLAs
1978	52	44	8	15.4	14	2	12.5
1982	51	41	10	19.6	13	3	18.8
1985	44	36	8	18.2	13	3	18.8
1989	47	39	8	17.0	12	4	25.0
1992	52	42	10	19.2	15	2	11.8
1996	54	43	11	20.4	14	3	17.6
2000	49	33	16	32.7	12	5	29.4
2002	60	43	17	28.3	15	3	16.7
2006	58	42	16	27.6	16	2	11.1
2011	62	44	18	29.0	13	6	31.6
2016	63	38	25	39.7	12	7	36.8
2021					11	8	42.1

---

# Electing women in the Yukon, considerations

Growth in number of women candidates  
during 2000-2021

Proportion women elected generally rises  
with proportion of candidates

Currently high percentage of female MLAs

What is ideal % of women MLAs?

Is that ideal more likely under different  
electoral system? What role do parties play?

---

# Electing Indigenous members

Year	First Nations Person elected in general election	Seats in legislature	Percent First Nations Persons elected as MLA
1978	2	16	12.5
1982	3	16	18.8
1985	4	16	25.0
1989	4	16	25.0
1992	3	17	17.6
1996	3	17	17.6
2000	2	17	11.8
2002	3	18	16.7
2006	4	18	22.2
2011	2	19	10.5
2016	3	19	15.8
2021	4	19	21.1

---

# Electing Indigenous members, considerations

23% of population Indigenous, 19% single identity First Nations

In 10 of 12 elections, number of First Nations members elected was either equal to their population, or under by 1 seat

Does current system provide appropriate representation for First Nations?

Should there be guaranteed FN seats?

---

---

# Urban and rural representation

Possible to consider due to constituency-based electoral system

Role of electoral boundaries commission

Over 70% of population in Whitehorse, the rest of territory is sparsely populated

Electoral boundaries commissions have over-rewarded rural areas

11 of 19 constituencies in Whitehorse. 8 constituencies outside Whitehorse in “Regions”

On basis of population, Whitehorse should have 14 seats.

---

---

# Urban and rural representation considerations

How important is it to have direct connection between people living in a geographic area and their representative?

Is constituency representation an important value?

How important is rural over-representation in Yukon?

---



---

# **Electoral system Options and their characteristics**

Plurality and majority  
systems

Proportional  
representation systems

Mixed electoral  
systems

---

---

# Plurality and majority systems

First past the post

Alternative vote

Block vote

Two-Round  
systems

---

---

# First past the post (FPTP)

Single member districts

Winner is candidate with most votes

With two parties, winner will have majority votes. With multi-parties, winner may have less than majority.

When all seats added together, winning party may obtain majority of seats with minority of votes

System used throughout Canada, including Yukon

---

## First past the post

Total Votes	1,000 votes
Candidate 1, Party A	250 votes
Candidate 2, Party B	400 votes
Candidate 3, Party C	350 votes

Candidate 2, Party B wins. Note that 400 people voted for the winner, and 600 voted for losing candidates.

In Yukon as a whole, this system can lead to distortion between votes and seats if party wins seats with less than a majority of votes.

---

# FPTP, advantages

Direct connection between voters  
and representative in their  
community

Simple to understand

Easy to see who won

Tendency toward majority  
government

---

---

# FPTP, disadvantages

In multi-party systems, most voters may vote for losing candidate

Can be highly distorting between votes and seats

Hard for new parties, except those that are regionally concentrated

Can be barriers to entry for women and minority candidates

---

---

# FPTP, consideration s

What is assessment of performance of FPTP in the Yukon? Is there a consensus that it should be replaced?

Have perceived negative impacts of FPTP changed over time? Are they more or less problematic today?

Why is now the time to replace FPTP?

---

---

# Alternative vote (AV)

Sometimes called Preferential voting.

Uses single member constituencies, but winning candidate needs a majority of votes.

Voter ranks the candidates in order of preference

If no one gets a majority of first preferences, eliminate candidate with lowest vote, and distribute their next highest preference

Continue until one candidate has majority

---



## Alternative vote

Total votes = 1,000	First Preference	First preference + second preference of Candidate 1, Party A
Candidate 1, Party A	250 votes	eliminated
Candidate 2, Party B	400 votes	+50 = 450 votes
Candidate 3, Party C	350 votes	+200 = 550 votes

Candidate 3, Party C wins. Note that a majority of voters voted for the winning candidate. In the Yukon as a whole, there is often as much or more distortion between vote% and seat% with alternative vote as there is with first past the post.

---

# AV, advantages

Winning candidate guaranteed to have majority support

Simple to understand

Voters able to indicate a fuller range of preferences

Encourages parties to cooperate

---

---

# AV, disadvantages

Other than ensuring majority for winner, AV shares many of shortcomings of FPTP. Can be equally distorting

The preferences (other than first preference) don't always produce much change.

In Australia, about 6% of candidates elected were not leading on first preference

Large number of excluded ballots

---

---

# AV, consideration s

Does not provide much or any correction for disproportionality

For those opposing FPTP, is disproportionality the major issue?

Does current system in Yukon work against cooperation among parties?  
Would this change under AV?

Is vote-splitting currently a problem in Yukon?

---

---

# Block Vote (BV)

Similar to FPTP, except using multi-member districts.

Voters can vote for as many candidates as there are positions being filled

Votes are not rank-ordered, but rather indicated with an 'X'.

Candidates can be from same party. Winners are candidates with most votes.

---

## Block vote

Candidate	Party	Votes	status
Candidate 1	Party A	20,000 votes	elected
Candidate 2	Party B	19,500 votes	elected
Candidate 3	Party A	19,400 votes	elected
Etc.			
Candidate 19	Party C	6,810 votes	elected
Candidate 20	Party A	6,805 votes	not elected
Candidate 21	Party B	6,700 votes	not elected

Multi-member districts. Could be one district for the whole of the Yukon, with voters casting up to 19 votes. Candidates with top 19 votes win. Used in some municipal elections, generally when there are not political parties.

---

# BV, advantages

Easy to understand

Ballots counted at polling station

Direct connection between elected members and constituency they represent

Can be several parties from one constituency

---

---

# BV, disadvantages

High distortion, with no attempt to decrease distortion

Larger number of parties in legislature, as lower barrier to entry

Intraparty competition, can lead to fighting among candidates from same party

Can be very confusing for voters, with large number of candidates to choose from

---



---

# BV, consideration s

Would BV improve representation in the Yukon? What advantages would it bring?

Would the disadvantage of weakening party ties due to intraparty competition be good?

Very confusing ballot for voters, depending on number of electoral districts

Seems more appropriate for elections without political parties

---

---

# Two-Round Systems (TRS)

Sometimes called run-off system

If no candidate receives a majority of votes, a second, run-off election is held

Run-off can be between top two candidates (guaranteeing winner has majority)

Or run-off between candidates achieving some threshold votes (12.5% in France)

---

# Two-round system

*Round 1: 2,000 votes*

Candidate	Party	Votes	Status
Candidate 1	Party A	725	Eligible for run-off
Candidate 2	Party B	125	Eliminated
Candidate 3	Party C	400	Eliminated
Candidate 4	Party D	750	Eligible for run-off

*Round 2: Run-off, 2,000 votes*

Candidate	Party	Votes	Status
Candidate 1	Party A	1,050	Elected
Candidate 4	Party D	950	Not elected

The winner has majority support in their constituency. But the system is very inconvenient in an environment such as the Yukon. The result can be highly distorting.

---

# TRS, advantages

Voters can vote their “true preference” on first round, not a strategic vote

Encourages interests to coalesce around a preferred candidate. Alliance-building

Minimizes penalty for vote-splitting among otherwise similar parties

---

---

# TRS, disadvantages

Very challenging for election administration

The challenge presented to voters of turning out multiple times within short time.

Challenge also to candidates and parties, likely raising spending requirements.

Can be highly disproportionate.

---

---

# TRS, consideration S

Conducting elections in Yukon already very challenging. Is it reasonable to ask voters to do it again?

Are Yukoners interests currently addressed in legislative assembly?

Would a two-round system election change appreciably the way interests are represented?

---

---

# Assessment of plurality and majority systems

First past the post is the status quo, and the alternative against which others are assessed.

The biggest criticism of first past the post is that it can distort the vote and seat %. Both the alternative vote and two-round systems are at least as problematic in this regard.

Therefore, they don't correct for the perceived major deficiency of first past the post.

Block voting also is problematic. More suitable where there are no parties.

Therefore, limit consideration among these options to first past the post.

---

# Proportional representation

01

List Proportional  
Representation

02

Single  
Transferable Vote

03

Single Non-  
transferable Vote



---

# List Proportional Representation (List PR)

Parties present a rank-order list of candidates to voters

Candidates are elected in multi-member districts

Voters indicate their vote for a party

Parties receive seats based on proportion of votes obtained

---

## List proportional representation

2016 Yukon election under first past the post

Party	NDP	Liberal	Yukon	Green	Other	Total
Votes	4,927	7,404	6,272	145	38	18,786
Percent of votes	26.2%	39.4%	33.4%	0.8%	0.0%	
Seats	2	11	6	0	0	19
Percent of seats	10.5%	57.9%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	

## List proportional representation

2016 Yukon election, assuming the same votes, but conducted under List PR

Party	NDP	Liberal	Yukon	Green	Other	Total
Votes	4,927	7,404	6,272	145	38	18,786
Percent of votes	26.2%	39.4%	33.4%	0.8%	0.0%	
Seats	5	8	6	0	0	19
Percent of seats	26.3%	42.1%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	

## List proportional representation

Calculation of seat entitlement based on results of 2016 Yukon election

Party	Votes	1 <sup>st</sup> allocation	Votes/seats (989) * seats	Remaining votes	2 <sup>nd</sup> allocation	Final seat total
NDP	4,927	4	3,956	971	1	5
Liberal	7,404	7	6,923	481	1	8
Yukon	6,272	6	5,934	338	0	6
Green	145	0	0	145	0	0
Other	38	0	0	38	0	0
Total	18,786	17			2	19

---

# List PR, advantages

High proportionality between vote and seat percentages

Encourage formation of many political parties, as the barrier to entry is lower

Can facilitate the representation of women and minority candidates

Key is where candidate is placed on party list

---

---

# List PR, disadvantages

Majority government is very unlikely

Disproportionality in power of minor parties that are government partners

Difficult to vote a party out of power

No direct constituency tie between voters and representatives

---

---

# List PR, consideration s

Among the values in an electoral system, where does value of proportionality fit?

Proportionality increases as the number of seats increase.

In a legislature with a small number of seats, are its advantages muted?

List PR favours development of larger number of parties. Are important parties missing in Yukon?

If list PR system used in Yukon, should there be thresholds?

---

---

# Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Combines aspects of list PR and AV.

Like list PR, uses multi-member districts, and can include party lists of candidates

But like AV, voters also can rank-order the candidates

Although popular among “experts”, used rarely for national legislatures (Ireland, Malta)

Complicated method for counting ballots

---



## Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Hypothetical results with 7 candidates and 3 seats and 4000 votes. Using this system in the Yukon would be considerably more complicated. There would likely be 4 or 5 constituencies with 3 to 5 seats each.

Candidate	Party	1 <sup>st</sup> count	2 <sup>nd</sup> count Transfer Dell's votes	3 <sup>rd</sup> count Transfer Gallant's votes	4 <sup>th</sup> count Transfer Fortney's votes	5 <sup>th</sup> count Transfer Clarke's votes
Abbott	Party A	570	570	+10 = 580	580	+20 = 600
Brock*	Party A	990	990	990	990	+100 = 1090
Clarke	Party A	120	120	120	120	---
Dell*	Party B	1050	1001	1001	1001	1001
Elliott	Party B	250	+49 = 299	299	+9 = 308	308
Fortney*	Party C	910	910	+100 = 1010	1001	1001
Gallant	Indep.	110	110	---	---	---

\* Indicates elected candidate. Election threshold calculated as  $[(\text{votes}/(\text{seats}+1)) + 1] = [(4000/4)+1] = 1001$

---

# STV, advantages

Similar advantages to other PR systems.  
Higher proportionality than FPTP, but not  
as high as List PR

Lower barrier to entry for parties

Maintains connection between voters and  
elected members, by enabling people to  
vote for individual, not just party

Parties have less of an iron grip on  
selection of candidates who win office

---

---

# STV, disadvantages

Very complicated method for calculating winners.

Combines the allocation of “excess” votes among elected candidates, with subsequent preferences among eliminated candidates.

Voters may be choosing among very large number of candidates, depending on how many are elected per district

---

---

# STV, consideration s

Although widely endorsed by political science experts, not widely used.

Complicated process of counting votes

Would this be acceptable in Yukon if vote counting process is not clear to voters?

Allowing voters to rank-order candidates can lead to intraparty competition.

---

---

# Single Non-transferable Vote (SNTV)

Similar to Block Vote, in which voters cast a ballot for a multi-member electoral district

Unlike Block Vote, where voters cast as many votes as seats, in SNTV voter casts single vote

Proportionality is based on proportion of candidate votes, not proportion of party vote.

---

# SNTV

An example with 4 seats, 6 candidates and 1000 voters. Each voter can vote for one candidate.

Candidate	Party	Votes
1	A	300
2	A	90
3	B	200
4	B	180
5	C	120
6	D	110

Party	Votes	Vote %	Seats
A	390	39.0	1
B	380	38.0	2
C	120	12.0	1
D	110	11.0	0

---

# SNTV, advantages

Direct connection between voters in an electoral district and elected members

Likelihood that multiple parties will be elected from an electoral district

Simple to understand.  
Candidates with most votes elected

---

---

# SNTV, disadvantages

Requires parties to be highly strategic in nominating candidates

One candidate receiving many votes can disadvantage a party

Can be disproportionality in vote to seat count for parties, although candidates with most votes win

Intraparty competition is heightened

---



---

# SNTV, consideration s

SNTV is premised on multi-member districts. Is there compelling case for multi-member districts in Yukon?

Presents more opportunities for minor parties. Are they currently overly disadvantaged?

Encourages parties to be highly tactical. Is this a good thing?

No guarantee that seat distribution is less distorted than under FPTP. What advantages does this system bring to the Yukon?

---

---

# Assessment of Proportional Representation systems

The List PR system is the most proportional among these three systems. With a small legislature such as the Yukon's, it would likely be implemented with only one or two electoral districts. It also gives a high measure of authority to political parties

If STV is adopted, it would likely be with a small number of electoral districts (3 or 4), with 3 to 5 members per district.

In both List PR and STV, some smaller parties would likely gain legislative seats (although thresholds could limit this). Majority governments would be unlikely.

The Single Non-Transferable Vote option has little benefit in the Yukon, and likely can be removed as an option.

---

---

# Mixed Electoral Systems

Parallel Systems

Mixed Member  
Proportional  
Systems

---

---

# Parallel Systems

Two separate electoral systems operate alongside and independent of one another

Often combine a plurality/majority system, like FPTP, with proportional, like list PR

Some legislative seats assigned from each method, again assigning them independently

Used in 21 countries, including large (Russia) and small (Monaco, Andorra)

---

## Parallel systems

Applying a parallel system to the 2021 Yukon election. This example uses first past the post for 19 constituency seats (that is, the current constituency seats). And a second set of 11 List PR seats are allocated based on voting results in the Yukon territory as a whole.

Party	Votes	Vote %	Constituency seats	Constituency seat %	List seats	Total seats	Seat %
NDP	5356	28.2%	3	15.8%	3	6	20%
Liberal	6155	32.4%	8	42.1%	4	12	40%
Yukon	7477	39.3%	8	42.1%	4	12	40%
Indep.	26	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0	0%

The parallel voting system has a very modest impact on overall proportionality of election results, and comes at a cost of an additional 11 MLAs. (For list seats,  $11 \cdot .282 = 3.1$ ;  $11 \cdot .324 = 3.6$ ;  $11 \cdot .393 = 4.3$ )

---

# Parallel, advantages

Reduces distortion that can be caused by plurality/majority system

Provides opportunities for minor parties to be represented

Can maintain constituency connection with at least some legislative members

---

---

# Parallel, disadvantages

To the extent that there is distortion via plurality system, it may be insufficiently compensated

Two types of members – those elected from constituencies, and those elected from party lists

Can members switch parties, or become independent? If so, is this possible for constituency members and party list members?

---

---

# Parallel, consideration s

Introduces two kinds of MLAs. One represents district, one represents party

Do different kinds of MLAs have different roles or different status?

Is Yukon legislative assembly large enough to elect member using two separate systems?

Would list PR seats simply reinforce constituency seats, particularly if there is small district magnitude?

---



---

# Mixed Member Proportional (MMP)

Also uses two separate electoral systems.

The two systems run independently during the voting process, but are combined in the seat assignment process

The list seats are used to “compensate” parties based on the way in which they have been allocated constituency seats

List PR vote is the compensatory tool

---



	Divisor	NDP Votes	NDP seat #	Liberal votes	Liberal seat #	Yukon votes	Yukon seat #	Indep votes	Indep seat #
<b>Mixed Member Proportional</b>									
Applying MMP to Yukon election results, 2021 election. Determining each party's seat entitlement. Divide vote total by odd numbers. Assign a party a seat sequentially when it has the next highest number.	1	5356	3	6155	2	7477	1	26	
	3	1785	6	2052	5	2492	4		
	5	1071	9	1231	8	1495	7		
	7	765	13	879	11	1068	10		
	9	595	16	684	14	831	12		
	11	487	20	560	18	680	15		
	13	412	23	473	21	575	17		
	15	357	27	410	24	498	19		
	17	315		362	26	440	22		
	19	282		324	30	394	25		
	21	255		293		356	28		
	23	232		268		325	29		
	25	214		246		299			
	Total seats		8		10		12		

## Mixed Member Proportional

Assigning constituency and list seats, based on 2021 Yukon election result.

Party	Constituency seats	Total seats	List PR seats	% votes	% seats
NDP	3	8	5	28.2%	26.7%
Liberal	8	10	2	32.4%	33.3%
Yukon	8	12	4	39.3%	40.0%
Other	0	0	0	0.1%	0.0%

Using both the first past the post and the MMP systems, the 2021 Yukon election produces a minority government scenario. However, the seat allocation under MMP is more closely aligned to the vote percentages.

# MMP

## Allocating seats, 2020 NZ election

Party	Party Votes	% of Votes	Electorate Seats	List Seats	Total Seats
Labour Party	1,443,545	50.0	46	19	65
National Party	738,275	25.6	23	10	33
Green Party	226,757	7.9	1	9	10
ACT NZ	219,031	7.6	1	9	10
Maori Party	33,630	1.2	1	1	2
NZ First Party	75,020	2.6	--	--	--
The Opp. Party	--	43,449	1.5	--	--
New Cons.	42,613	1.5	--	--	--
...					
Total	2,886,420		72	48	120

---

# MMP, advantages

System is more proportional  
since list seats are  
compensatory

Improved proportionality while  
maintaining constituency-  
based representation

Shares other advantages of  
PR systems

---

---

# MMP, disadvantages

Would appear to require legislative assembly with fairly large number of seats (perhaps 30 seats in the case of Yukon)

With few list PR seats to allocate, likely that party list seats would be allocated through one Yukon-wide district

Majority government is possible, but quite unlikely, and is very unlikely to be the "typical" election outcome.

---

---

# MMP, consideration s

Like the Parallel electoral system, elects some MLAs from one method and some from another

Is Yukon legislative assembly large enough for this model?

Under MMP, what would be the proportion of constituency and list MLAs?

Would list seats come from Yukon as a whole, or from different constituencies?

---

# Assessment of Mixed electoral systems

With a relatively small legislative assembly, the PR list seats may not compensate much for a distortion based on first past the post seats

This is especially the case with a parallel system. Therefore, this system should be eliminated from further consideration

MMP requires a larger legislature, but it can help balance the legislative seats to closely approximate votes

There would be two types of MLAs, some of whom have constituency connections and others that do not. Majority governments are much less likely.



---

# Key issues in PR systems

District magnitude

Thresholds

Open and closed  
lists

---

---

# District magnitude

Refers to the number of members elected from a district or constituency

PR systems require multi-member districts

The larger the number of members elected in a district, the greater the impact of measures used to provide proportionality

In New Zealand, list seats are based on a single country-wide electoral district of 120 members

---

---

# Thresholds

Although PR generally is viewed as making it easier for smaller parties to gain a seat, thresholds do the opposite

They establish barriers to getting seats

When the West German electoral system was introduced in post WWII, thresholds intended to keep extreme parties out

Thresholds often relate to number of constituency seats won to be eligible for list PR seats

Also often based on achieving some minimum % of votes (5%)

---

---

# Open and closed lists

Closed list determined by party

Open list determined by voter

Use of closed lists provides considerable power to party

In a closed list system, is a member's allegiance to the electorate or to the party?

---

# Special consideration s

Representation of Women

Representation of  
Indigenous people

Community representation  
(rural and urban)

Population size and size of  
the legislative assembly

---

---

# Previous attempts at electoral reform in Canada

Federal (2015-2017)

British Columbia (2003-2009, 2018)

Ontario (2004-2007)

Quebec (2018-2021)

New Brunswick (2003-2006, 2016-2017)

Prince Edward Island (2005-2019)

---

---

# Lessons from Canadian experience with electoral reform

There are common complaints about FPTP

But complaints don't mean a consensus for change

Changing electoral system is hard

Some form of public consultation is important

Common to use double super-majority

Similar questions can produce different results

Should be process for narrowing options

Public education on electoral reform is important

---

---

# Key issues when considering electoral system reform

Effectiveness of the current system

What are the representational values one is seeking to achieve?

What about the representation of women and minorities?

Size of the population and of the legislative assembly

Public engagement is important

Public should be involved in selecting among alternatives

Can one revert to FPTP?

---