

INTERPRETATION BULLETIN #1

ISSUED BY: Gregory D. Morrow
DATE: 12 December 2006

re: Number of Ridings per Region

The purpose of this Interpretation is to expand upon Section 6c) “Number/Size of Regions” of OCA Submission #1122 by Gregory D. Morrow.

The proposed system illustrates an even-number of ridings per region, resulting in a perfect 2-to-1 relationship between local and regional seats. However, it is expected that the regional boundaries will be established at the time that riding re-districting occurs. We suggest that the OCA recommend that this process be open to public input and be responsive to the desires of riding members. During this process, some ridings may shift to adjacent regions, if voters so choose. This may result in an odd-number of ridings in a given region. This is not a problem for the system; the only consequence is that in some regions, this may necessitate one large riding nominating a regional candidate(s) by themselves, and/or 3 smaller ridings jointly nominating a regional candidate(s). If this occurs, the number of regional seats in a given region will be adjusted accordingly.

Example:

The proposal places Timmins-James Bay in Northwest Ontario (which could more properly be called “the Far North”); this is due to the unique regional challenges that this riding shares with Kenora-Rainy River (namely extremely large area and very low population). However, Timmins-James Bay could just as easily be in Northeast Ontario. If voters choose this, then they would join Sudbury and Nickel Belt in jointly nominating a regional candidate(s), while Kenora-Rainy River would nominate a regional candidate by itself. The overall total MPPs for the North, however, would remain the same (15).

INTERPRETATION BULLETIN #2

ISSUED BY: Gregory D. Morrow
DATE: 12 December 2006

re: Number of Regional Candidates

The purpose of this Interpretation is to expand upon Section 6d) “Nomination Process” of OCA Submission #1122 by Gregory D. Morrow.

The proposed system allows paired ridings to nominate a regional candidate to go on the regional ballot. If the paired ridings so choose, they may also put their local candidate on the regional ballot. Therefore, a riding pair may nominate 1, 2, or 3 regional candidates – one distinct regional candidate (in all cases) and, optionally, one or both local candidates, but not more than one distinct candidate. Nominating local candidates on the regional ballot, however, would likely result in local vote-splitting on the regional ballot, and potentially result in candidate from another part of the region winning more votes on the regional ballot, and thus winning the regional seat(s). Thus, it is likely that parties that are particularly strong in a local riding would tend not to place their local candidate on the regional ballot, while parties weak locally would likely place their best local candidates on both ballots.

Example:

Eastern Ontario has 8 local ridings and 4 regional seats. Therefore, the minimum number of regional candidates for a given party is 4 and the maximum is 12 (which only occurs if all local candidates are also on the regional ballot). In practice, some ridings will elect to have dual-candidates and some will not, so it is likely that the number of regional candidates will fall mid-way between the minimum and maximum, in this case around 8. In all cases, there is always at least 4 distinct regional candidates, thus ensuring that a party has sufficient candidates, even if their local candidates are elected (if local candidates are elected, they are removed from the regional ballot and then highest remaining vote-getter wins).

INTERPRETATION BULLETIN #3

ISSUED BY: Gregory D. Morrow
DATE: 12 December 2006

re: Potential for Region-wide Nominations

The purpose of this Interpretation is to expand upon Section 6d) “Nomination Process” of OCA Submission #1122 by Gregory D. Morrow.

Paired ridings for regional nominations ensure that the regional ballot is: a) geographically balanced across a given region, and b) more accountable to local ridings. However, the system is also designed so that if the paired local ridings choose, they may also elect to hold a regional nomination with more than one riding pair, or even a single region-wide nomination if all local associations for a given party elect to do so. In other words, the system is designed to allow for the smallest possible regional nomination (every other riding), but can be scaled to function like a typical region-wide MMP list. A region-wide list allows for a greater number of under-represented minorities and women to be nominated on one, longer list. It is anticipated that ridings in urban regions may elect this option, while ridings in more rural regions may elect a more localized regional nomination to ensure geographic representation. Unlike most list systems, the proposal allows for this flexibility. The principle here is that local riding associations should have the choice how they nominate regional candidates.

Example:

For a given party, the ridings of Scarborough-Rouge River and Scarborough-Agincourt would typically jointly nominate a regional candidate(s). They may choose, however, to join with Scarborough-Southwest and Scarborough-Guildwood (if they concur) to nominate Scarborough-wide regional candidates to go on the Toronto regional ballot. Alternatively, if all 18 Toronto-area ridings agree, a single Toronto regional list could be created at one Toronto-wide regional nomination meeting.