PRP* (Paired Riding Proportional*) description and example

PRP* overview

- Seeks national proportionality while maximizing local votes and ensuring local representation.
- Simple: no lists, maintains local representation, utilizes existing electoral boundaries, same number of seats, builds on First Past the Post (FPTP).

Advantages disadvantages and options of PRP*

Dis.   In paired ridings the number of candidates will roughly double which may be a bit confusing / challenging for some voters?

Dis.   The sequential nature of seat selection means that determining the proportional paired riding seats will take longer; however, it will be clear what the outcome of the election and the makeup of Parliament will be right away.

Ad.   Only local candidates elected. National proportionality, while maximizing local votes.

Ad.   Simple system to use, understand and implement. More votes count.

Opt.   Rather than FPTP, it is possible to use a preferential ballot for either / both of the seat votes and / or the party proportional votes.

Opt.   After the first PRP* election, the Government of Canada could check in with Canadians to decide which system they believe is better, i.e. hold a referendum after a PRP* election to test whether Canadians want PRP* or FPTP.

   * PRP* indicates this PRP proposal is a variation of Mr. Dave Brekke's system (Yukon witness to the select committee), without regional clusters and keeping preferential ballot as an option rather then a requirement

Step by step PRP* electoral system

Step 1   Use existing electoral boundaries to logically pair ridings across the country. Examples could be:
   Red Deer–Lacombe and Red Deer–Mountain View,
   Barrie–Innisfail and Barrie–Springwater–Oro-Medonte,
   Cape Breton–Canso and Sydney–Victoria, etc.
   Meanwhile, the handful of ridings which are distinct and don't have a logical relationship with neighbouring ridings, can be left as is: e.g. Yukon, Labrador, etc.

Step 2   For each paired riding, allow up to two candidates per party to run. Each paired riding will elect 2 seats - the first directly from the vote, and a second based on national proportionality.

Step 3   Voters cast two votes in paired ridings, and one vote in stand-alone ridings, for candidates. In every riding, voters also get to vote for a party (used to determine proportionality).

Step 4   Use FPTP to determine the direct seat in every paired riding, and also in the stand-alone ridings.

Step 5   Use the proportional party vote to select the 2nd seat in each riding from the local candidates so as to maximize the voter % (described below).

Step by step proportionality for PRP* system

Step 6   Determine party seats in the Parliament based on the proportional vote. Subtract the already elected direct seats. The difference is the set of proportional seats to be selected from local candidates (one per paired riding).

Step 7   Set the sequence of seat selection so as to distribute the selection of the proportional seats evenly.

Step 8   Step through the proportional seat selection order: the next party on the list chooses their candidate with the highest percentage of the vote from the remaining paired riding proportional seats. That candidate is elected as the proportional seat from that paired riding, and then that riding is removed from the list of paired ridings still seeking a proportional seat.

Submitted by: John Streicker

Example: Yukon 2011 election
FPTP (First Past the Post)

Ridings	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn/FNP
Vuntut Gwitchin	36%		64%	
Mayo-Tatchun	32%	42%	27%	
Klondike	37%	14%	49%	
Kluane	38%	29%	29%	4%
Lake Laberge	52%	32%	16%	
Porter Creek North	50%	31%	10%	9%
Porter Creek Centre	39%	30%	32%	
Porter Creek South	43%	17%	41%	
Takhini-Kopper King	32%	46%	22%	
Copperbelt North	48%	15%	38%	
Whitehorse West	58%	13%	29%	
Mountainview	45%	35%	20%	
Whitehorse Centre	24%	63%	13%	
Riverdale North	37%	30%	29%	4%
Riverdale South	32%	39%	28%	
Copperbelt South	40%	41%	19%	
ML-Southern Lakes	38%	47%	11%	5%
Pelly-Nisutlin	52%	34%	14%	
Watson Lake	40%	35%	24%	

Stats	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn / FNP
Candidates run	19	18	19	2 / 2
Candidates elected	11	6	2	0 / 0
Vote %	41%	33%	25%	0.7 / 0.5%

Example: Yukon 2011 election
PRP* (Paired Riding Proportional)

Stage 1: pair ridings and elect direct seats

Ridings / Pairings	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn/FNP
Vuntut Gwitchin	36%		64%	
Mayo-Tatchun	32%	42%	27%	
Klondike	37%	14%	49%	
Kluane	38%	29%	29%	4%
Lake Laberge	52%	32%	16%	
Porter Creek North	50%	31%	10%	9%
Porter Creek Centre	39%	30%	32%	
Porter Creek South	43%	17%	41%	
Takhini-Kopper King	32%	46%	22%	
Copperbelt North	48%	15%	38%	
Whitehorse West	58%	13%	29%	
Mountainview	45%	35%	20%	
Whitehorse Centre	24%	63%	13%	
Riverdale North	37%	30%	29%	4%
Riverdale South	32%	39%	28%	
Copperbelt South	40%	41%	19%	
ML-Southern Lakes	38%	47%	11%	5%
Pelly-Nisutlin	52%	34%	14%	
Watson Lake	40%	35%	24%	

Stats	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn / FNP
Candidates run	19	18	19	2 / 2
Direct elected seats	4	4	2	0 / 0
Proportional vote %	41%	33%	25%	0.7 / 0.5%

Stage 2: set selection order and elect proportional seats

Ridings / Pairings	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn/FNP
Vuntut Gwitchin	36%		64%	
Mayo-Tatchun	32%	42%	27%	
Klondike	37%	14%	49%	
Kluane	38%	29%	29%	4%
Lake Laberge	52%	32%	16%	
Porter Creek North	50%	31%	10%	9%
Porter Creek Centre	39%	30%	32%	
Porter Creek South	43%	17%	41%	
Takhini-Kopper King	32%	46%	22%	
Copperbelt North	48%	15%	38%	
Whitehorse West	58%	13%	29%	
Mountainview	45%	35%	20%	
Whitehorse Centre	24%	63%	13%	
Riverdale North	37%	30%	29%	4%
Riverdale South	32%	39%	28%	
Copperbelt South	40%	41%	19%	
ML-Southern Lakes	38%	47%	11%	5%
Pelly-Nisutlin	52%	34%	14%	
Watson Lake	40%	35%	24%	

Stats	YP	NDP	Lib	Grn / FNP
Total seat count	8	6	5	0 / 0
Proportional elected seats	4	2	3	0 / 0
Seat selection order	YP, Lib, NDP, YP, Lib, YP, NDP, Lib, YP			

Legend: **YP** Yukon Party **NDP** Yukon NDP **Lib** Yukon Liberals **Grn** Yukon Greens **FNP** Yukon First Nations Party — 52% FPTP/direct elected seat — 35% Proportional elected seat

Submitted by: John Streicker