

System

ISSN: 1402-6759
ISBN: 91-89098-00-5

The International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design is an easy-to-use guide describing what factors to consider when modifying or designing an electoral system. Created for policy-makers, politicians and election administrators it is also an excellent tool for students. The Handbook gives practical information explaining why certain countries choose different systems, and how other countries have modified inherited systems. It describes which electoral systems have proven advantageous for specific cultural, social and economic conditions, and how electoral systems can increase participation, reach-out to minorities, and help instil faith in a skeptical electorate.

The Handbook includes:

- A precise and simple to understand explanation of the electoral systems in use in more than 200 independent states and related territories.
- An explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of using different electoral systems.
- Case studies, written by regional experts, explaining how and why electoral systems were adopted and modified in Bolivia, Chile, Finland, Germany, India, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Russia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.
- An analysis of which electoral systems have facilitated the representation of women and minorities.
- A colour-coded map showing which systems are being used where in the world.

Electoral

INTERNATIONAL
IDEA
INSTITUTE FOR
DEMOCRACY AND
ELECTORAL
ASSISTANCE

Strömsborg
S-103 34 Stockholm
Sweden
Phone: +46 8 698 3700
Fax: +46 8 20 24 22
E-mail: info@int-idea.se
Website: http://www.int-idea.se

International IDEA

The International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design

Handbook Series

1/97

System

The
International IDEA
Handbook
of
Electoral
System Design

Andrew Reynolds
and Ben Reilly
with Kader Asmal
Sarah Birch
John Carey
Mona Makram Ebeid
Jorgen Elklit
Michael Gallagher
Yash Ghai
Michael Krennerich
Arend Lijphart
René Antonio Mayorga
Ned McMahon
Shaheen Mozaffar
Vijay Patidar
Mahesh Rangarajan
Nigel Roberts
Wilma Rude
Nadezhda Shvedova
Sir Anthony Siaguru
and Jan Sundberg

Handbook Series

INTERNATIONAL
IDEA
INSTITUTE FOR
DEMOCRACY AND
ELECTORAL
ASSISTANCE

gration, effective representation of constituents, effective voter participation, effective government, effective parliament, effective parties, and legitimacy. At the same time, however, the Royal Commission stressed that "no voting system can fully meet the ideal standards set by the criteria", and pointed out that the criteria were not all of equal weight.

The Royal Commission proposed that New Zealand adopt a system of proportional representation similar to that used in Germany; the Mixed Member Proportional system, or MMP. Electors have two votes, one for a political party, and one for a local candidate elected by FPTP in single-member districts. As in Germany, but contrary to the situation in Japan and Russia, the party vote is paramount in the New Zealand system, because the party vote determines the overall number of seats parties are entitled to in Parliament. For example, if a political party wins 25% of the party votes in an election, it will qualify for 30 (25%) of the 120 seats in Parliament. If the party has already won 23 local district (or constituency) seats, then its complement of seats in the House of Representatives is topped up by giving it seven additional seats, and those seven seats will be allocated to the first seven eligible people on the party's rank-ordered list of nominated candidates. Likewise, a party with 25% of the party votes but only two district MPs will be awarded an additional 28 seats from its party-list to bring its total number of seats in Parliament up to 30 as well.

In view of the fact that New Zealand had used an FPTP voting system for more than 100 years, the Royal Commission on the Electoral System rejected the Single Transferable Vote (STV) system of proportional representation, both because MMP "retains single-member constituencies" and because the results of an MMP election were "likely to be more closely proportional" than those under STV. The Commission also recommended that a referendum should be held on the adoption of the MMP system, and despite the fact that a select committee of the New Zealand Parliament disagreed with the Royal Commission's recommendations, political pressure eventually led to two referendums on electoral reform.

The first referendum, held in September 1992, was not binding, but an indicative plebiscite. However, voters so overwhelmingly favoured both changing the electoral system and MMP that a second – and binding – poll was held 14 months later. The second referendum was a straight choice between the FPTP and the MMP electoral systems, and MMP won 53.9% of the referendum votes.

To ensure that the official publicity campaigns for the electoral reform referendums were conducted with "political impartiality, ... balance and neutrality", the Minister of Justice went so far as to appoint an independent Electoral Referendum Panel, at arm's length from politicians and public servants, in both 1992 and 1993. On each occasion, the panel was headed by the country's Chief Ombudsman and had a substantial budget for the task of informing voters about the mechanics – and, in

effect, the advantages and the disadvantages – of the different options under consideration in each of the referendums.

New Zealand's last FPTP election was held on 6 November 1993, on the same day as the referendum in which voters adopted MMP as the country's new electoral system. Just under three years later, New Zealand held its first MMP election, on 12 October 1996. The results of the 1996 election demonstrate that MMP has lived up to many of the expectations of the Royal Commission which recommended it.

Six parties are represented in the new Parliament, each in close accord with the share of the votes it won throughout the country as a whole; the system is highly proportional. There are now 15 Maori in the House of Representatives, and Maori are represented in the New Zealand Parliament in rough proportion to their numbers in the population as a whole. The same is true of Pacific Islanders, and the country's first PR election also saw the election of the country's first Asian MP. In addition, the overall proportion of women in Parliament rose from 21% in 1993 to 29% in 1996.

There is also clear evidence that voters grasped how to use the new voting system in their own best interests. A pre-election survey found that 38% of electors intended to differentiate between their party and their local constituency or district votes; by way of comparison, only about 15% of German voters split their tickets. Furthermore, voter turnout in New Zealand was even higher in 1996 than it had been in either 1990 or 1993.

In 1986, the Report of the Royal Commission on the Electoral System had stressed that an "electoral system should allow Governments ... to meet their responsibilities. Governments should have the ability to act decisively when that is appropriate, and there should be reasonable continuity and stability both within and between Governments". Time alone will tell whether New Zealand's new electoral system fulfils the demands of this criterion. There was some criticism that it took two months after the 1996 general election for a new government to be sworn in. The new government is a coalition of two parties – National and New Zealand First – that control a bare majority (61 seats) in the 120-member House of Representatives. Nevertheless, New Zealand voters would not have been too surprised by this. For example, the 1992 Electoral Referendum Panel pointed out that under MMP "minor parties are likely to be represented in Parliament", and that as a result "coalitions or agreements between parties may be needed to form governments". The following year the Electoral Referendum Panel reiterated that "coalition governments are more likely under MMP. This is because the MMP system results in a Parliament that reflects each party's share of the nationwide party vote. Having several parties in Parliament makes it more likely that there will be no one party with a majority of seats in Parliament." This is precisely what happened in New Zealand in 1996.