# PRESENTATION SUMMARY

# POWELL RIVER PUBLIC HEARING DATED 15 MAY 2004 AT THE CEDAR ROOM, POWELL RIVER RECREATION CENTRE

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PRESENTATION TO THE CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY ON ELECTORAL REFORM. IT ATTEMPTS TO CAPTURE THE KEY ISSUES AND ARGUMENTS THAT WERE PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING. IN SOME INSTANCES, THE PRESENTER HAS ALSO MADE A SUBMISSION TO THE ASSEMBLY AND THIS IS ACCESSIBLE VIA THE WEBSITE AT <a href="https://www.citizensassembly.bc.ca">www.citizensassembly.bc.ca</a> By CLICKING ON "GET INVOLVED". IF SUCH A SUBMISSION IS AVAILABLE, IT WILL BE NOTED AT THE END OF THIS REPORT.

# Helen Evans

### DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTATION

An alternative form of MMP where top-up MLAs are also constituency candidates rather than coming from party lists.

#### **KEY THEMES**

Helen Evans spoke briefly and suggested a form of mixed electoral system where top-up MLAs would not be elected from party lists. Voters would have two votes, one for their preferred constituency candidate and one for their preferred party as in MMP, but they would also be able to indicate a second preference for the constituency candidate. Top-up seats would be allocated to parties according to their share of the party vote, but rather than these MLAs coming from party lists, as is the case under MMP, the MLAs would come from seats where the party had gained most support but failed to win the seat. The party candidate who had competed in the constituency would be elected to the legislature. This system would have the benefits of MMP, but without the unpopular component of a party list.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Helen Evans recommended an alternative form of mixed electoral system, where top-up MLAs are also constituency candidates rather than being elected from party lists.

### QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PANEL

There were no questions or comments from the panel.

# QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Following this presentation quite a few members of the audience had questions.

Q	How will final decision making process work?
A	(Panel member) At our Prince George meeting, we will make a decision on how we decide. We came up with our own shared values and we'll also decide on our own
Q	Our First Nations are nations rather than one indigenous people. Have you given any thought to how that would work? Also the geographical boundaries, do you have any say on who goes where?
A	(Facilitator) Electoral boundaries and the idea of reserved seats for First Nations are both technically outside the mandate, but both

	could be put forward as recommendations.
Q	Could you put forward mandatory voting?
A	(Panel member) We've certainly considered that and thought about what people in BC would think about that. We've also discussed that a closed list could be a way to get more representation but that certainly is at the discretion of the party.

## Comment:

"Change to MMP has affected the media in New Zealand. When I visited New Zealand I spoke to members of the Press Gallery who said that it was more work because they had to report on all the parties' points of view, not just at elections but between elections. Also, everyday people seem to know more. Government was more interesting and the increased variety of people in parliament interested people. They also liked having two votes and being able to vote differently between the two."

SUBMISSION: TO FOLLOW