

Montreal, March 2, 2006

**PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT BILL OF ELECTION ACT.**

My presentation will deal only with:

- a) Ratio between direct and proportional representation
- b) Number of electoral districts in Quebec

First I shall present MY PROPOSAL.

Then I will compare the advantages of my proposal over the Draft Bill as tabled.

**MY PROPOSAL.**

I am proposing that 80% of deputies are elected by direct electoral system as done presently and 20% of deputies are elected by proportional representation system.

In case of Quebec this system would work as follows:

Instead of having 125 electoral districts, the Province would be divided in 100 electoral districts leaving 25 deputies to be elected proportionally.

This would allow smaller parties to be represented if they received at least 4% of votes, even if the party did not elect any deputies directly.

But it also means that although smaller parties will be represented, the proliferation of totally fringe parties will be eliminated, because, if they did not receive at least 4% of votes, they will not be entitled to any deputies.

**DRAFT BILL**

The Draft Bill proposes 60/40 proportion between direct and proportional representation. It means that for every 2% of votes a party will have one compensatory seat. This will probably lead to proliferation of fringe parties if the votes were counted province wide.

It seems that the legislators preparing the Draft Bill have foreseen this problem and tried to correct it by grouping electoral divisions in electoral districts.

In my opinion this two tier division of Quebec electoral map is confusing, unnecessary and totally ineffective.

I cannot find in Draft Bill any indication how the compensatory seats in each district will be allocated.

I suppose that they will be allocated according to number of votes received by each party in respective district.

In that case, it is mathematically certain, that the parties who managed to elect the division seat candidates will have the majority of votes and therefore obtain the compensatory seats.

I have a sample of figures which illustrate what I have said.

Party	Divisional votes % Total				Div. Seats	Compensatoy Seats	TOTAL Seats
	Div 1	Div 2	Div 3	Average			
A	35	30	38	34	1	1	2
B	30	38	40	36	2	1	3
C	15	17	12	10	0	0	0
D	10	12	8	8	0	0	0
E	10	3	2	5	0	0	0

I also have experimented with various combinations and reached the same conclusion.

This brings the proposed electoral system basically back to direct representation and will change little compared to present system.

Small parties will have no more chance to be represented than they have now.

The Draft Bill also creates confusion as to distribution of seats between divisional and compensatory district seats.

It proposes 77 electoral divisions and 24 to 27 districts with 2 compensatory seats each for a total of 127. If each district has 2 compensatory seats then 24 districts will have 48 seats. This together with 77 divisional seats will have 125 seats for the Province.

However if 27 districts are created then the number of compensatory seats will increase to 54 for a total of 131.

My question is then: why increase the total number of seats to 127. This figure does not fit with any combination.

IN CONCLUSION I am emphasizing again that in my proposal there will be no need to create another confusion by establishing "divisions" and "districts".

80/20 ratio application will:

Allow small parties obtaining 4% votes to be represented  
Eliminate fringe parties who will not reach this threshold  
Leave the total number of deputies the same as at present  
It is simple ~~easy~~ to understand and easy to administer.

Thank you for your attention

Albert Caune  
6565 Collins, Apt. 511  
Cote St. Luc. Que. H4W 3H3  
Tel/Fax: 514 484 0272  
E.Mail: caune@videotron.ca