*In 1994 Anton Buhagiar wrote a report to the Gonzi Commission in which he suggested a method for assuring a more proportionate distribution of parliamentary seats among the competing political parties. The present article is a follow-up to that report and demonstrates a way to assure a more equitable assignment, among the electoral districts, of the parliamentary seats that political parties have won.*

# THE PRIORITY QUEUE:

# A FAIR METHOD FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

# OF SEATS TO DISTRICTS.

by

Anton Buhagiar

Statistics Unit,

The University of Malta.

8th June 1995.

In the report submitted in November 1994 to the Commission on Electoral Reform, diverse electoral methods were suggested, which are guaranteed to secure the highly desirable feature of nationwide proportional representation. This means that the total number of seats gained nationally by a party should reflect the total number of votes earned by it in the various constituencies, and this irrespective of the actual configuration of the constituency boundaries.

Of these methods, the easiest to use was the partywise distribution method. This method consists of first determining the total number of nationwide seats which should be assigned to a given party on a nationwide basis. This is achieved in the following way:

i) Count the first count votes for each party in each district;

ii) Add the votes obtained by a given party in each district, thus obtaining the nationwide total of first count votes for that party;

iii) Use the d'Hondt Divisor method on the nationwide first count total found in ii) to determine the total number of seats which a given party should be assigned on a nationwide basis.

The second step of the partywise distribution method is to assign the nationwide seats of a given party to the different districts. This necessitates further steps as follows:

iv) Sort the parties in descending order of nationwide first count vote (using the information in ii),

v) Calculate using i) the percentage of votes polled by a party in each district;

vi) Starting with the largest party, use the d'Hondt divisor on the district percentages for that party. The party's seats are then assigned to the districts with the highest quotients. The seats that have already been taken are then subtracted from the total of seats allowed for that district.

vii) Repeat the procedure in vi) with the next largest party as determined by the order in iv) above. Eventually, the seats of all the parties, from the largest down to the smallest, are assigned to the various districts.

When the number of seats of a given party have been determined for each district, the first count votes can then be inspected for the candidates' names, and the STV process can proceed exactly as in previous elections. In a given district, the predetermined number of candidates of a given party are elected. The number of seats a party can win in a district has to be equal to this preassigned number, and cannot exceed it. Counting of votes for a party or transfer of votes to that party's candidates can then be stopped in that district, once the predetermined number of candidates for that party is elected.

Details of the partywise calculations on Maltese General Elections from 1962 to 1992, are given in the above mentioned report. For the convenience of the reader, we also give details of the partywise method for the election of 1992. Steps i) to vii) above are given in detail for this election in Appendix I of this report. No threshold is assumed in this case.

**SEAT DISTRIBUTION BY DISTRICT IN THE PARTYWISE METHOD.**

There are numerous advantages of the partywise distribution, and these were referred to in the previous report. However, the final distribution of the parties' seats by district is in some cases not wholly satisfactory. In the election of 1992, for instance, the partywise distribution assigns the only seat of the AD to the II District, rather than the XI District where they obtained most votes. (Please refer to Appendix I for details of this election). A similar instance occurs in the election of 1971, where the partywise method 'misplaces' an MLP seat from District IX to District I, and misplaces a PN seat the other way round.

It is therefore the aim of this study to find whether the partywise distribution can be modified to obtain an improved distribution of the contesting parties' seats in the districts. In particular, how can one amend steps iv) to vii) above to secure a fairer distribution of a party's seats in the different districts?

The proposed order for the party scans in the partywise distribution was that determined by the size of the nationwide first count vote, as mentioned in iv) above. The largest party has all its seats assigned first to the districts, then the next largest, and so on, until finally one assigns the seats of the smallest party. By the time one reaches the scan for the smallest party, most of the district seats will have been already filled, with the result, say, that such a party will be awarded its seat in a district where it does not the have highest number or the highest district percentage of votes.

The problem is that in the partywise distribution, where seats are distributed by party, all the seats of a given party will have a higher priority over the choice of district than any seat of a smaller party. It could therefore happen that a seat which was marginal for the larger party could be assigned to a district, which should have been assigned to a less marginal seat of a smaller party.

Conceivably one can alter the order, specified in iv) and vi) above, in which the parties are scanned for the partywise distribution of seats. If for example one were to start with the smallest party first, and end up with the largest, the partywise seat distribution in the districts might turn out to be unfair on some candidates of the larger parties. The problem is that whatever the order of the party scans, priority in the partywise distribution is determined by party size only, without any other consideration whatsoever.

**THE PRIORITY QUEUE.**

A possible remedy to this problem is to avoid using the concept of party priority implicit in the partywise distribution. A more sophisticated criterion to use is individual seat priority, or equivalently nationwide

priority, whereby one has to decide which party gets the first seat, which party gets the second seat, and so on, up to the 65'th seat. This sequence of individual party seats determines the order in which each individual seat is assigned to the districts.

Once again the elegant method of d'Hondt can be easily utilised to determine which party has priority on each individual seat. As an illustration, we take the Maltese General Election of 1992, and assume that there is no threshold. In Table I, we give the calculation to determine the number of seats won by each party on a nationwide basis. The highest 65 quotients are chosen from the three columns, giving 34 seats to the PN, 30 seats to the MLP, and 1 seat to the AD.

To find the priority of the parties on these 65 seats, one again sorts these 65 numbers in descending order of magnitude. The largest quotient written in the columns of Table I is 127932, and corresponds to the first divisor of the PN. The PN has therefore priority over the first seat to be assigned to some district. The second largest quotient is 114861, which is the highest quotient for the MLP. The MLP therefore has priority over the second seat. The third largest quotient is 63966 in the PN column, which therefore has priority over the third seat. This can be repeated for each single seat.

The priority list for parties for each individual seat is given in Table II. As can be seen, the sequence is given by PN, MLP, PN, MLP, PN, ..... , PN. The AD, for example, has priority over the 58'th seat, whilst the PN has priority over the 65'th seat, which is the last one to be awarded.

The 65 party seats can therefore be considered as a queue of length 65. The party sequence in this queue determines the order in which each individual party seat is assigned to the districts. For this reason, this procedure can be termed the priority queue method. This is in clear contrast to the partywise distribution where all the seats of a larger party have a higher priority than any seat of a smaller party.

To see how seats are assigned to districts in the priority queue, the d'Hondt divisor is again used, this time on the percentage of votes each party polls in each district. Please refer to Table III.

For each separate party, a matrix is first set up having thirteen columns. In the first row there are the 13 district names, I, II, up to XIII, and in the second row there is the percentage of votes obtained by that party in each of the districts. Thus, in the matrix for the PN, it can be seen that this party got 54.80% of the first count votes in the first district, 31.93% of the first count votes in the second district, and so on. In the thirteenth district it obtained 58.94%. (In this case the percentages are multiplied by a factor of 100 for convenience). Since there is a total of five seats available in each district, these district percentages are divided by the d'Hondt divisors, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and the quotients are written in the appropriate column. The matrices for the other parties are constructed in an analogous manner.

Seats are then assigned to the districts according to the nationwide priority established in Table II. Here it was shown that the PN has priority over the first seat. The PN matrix in Table III is therefore scanned first for the largest quotient (7129) which turns out to be in the 10'th district. The PN is therefore awarded a seat in this district. The nationwide priority of the seat (1 in this case) is then written in boldface just beneath this quotient, which is also marked with an asterisk.

Similarly, from the priority list in Table II, it can be seen that the MLP has priority over the second seat. The MLP matrix in Table III is therefore scanned for the largest quotient. This turns out to be 6637 in the second district. The MLP is then awarded a seat in the second district. The priority of this seat (2 in this instance) is then written beneath this quotient, which is also marked with an asterisk.

Proceeding down the list, we assign the 3rd seat to the PN in the seventh district (with quotient 6162), and the fourth seat to the MLP in the third District (quotient 6105). At every step one chooses from the matrix of the relevant party, the highest quotient which has not yet been chosen. The priority is then written beneath it, and that quotient is then marked with an asterisk.

One must also be careful whilst following the priority list, that seats are not assigned to districts that already have their full complement of seats. Taking for instance the 58'th seat pertaining to the AD, it can be seen that the highest quotient for this party is 218 in the ninth district. However the seat cannot be assigned there because that district already has its full complement of five seats. The next available quotient is then taken, which is 210 in the eleventh district. This is in fact the district where AD obtained most votes.

Following this procedure, it is not difficult to assign every single seat in the priority queue individually to the districts. As can be deduced from Table III, the matrix for each party will then determine the number of seats awarded to that party in each district, along with the individual seat priorities.

Alternatively for convenience, each party's matrix of district quotients can be written as a list of quotient and district. This is then sorted for each party separately in descending order of quotient. (These lists are given next in Table III). One then follows the nationwide priority party sequence to choose the appropriate party list, and hence to assign the next available district to that party seat. The nationwide priority for each assigned seat is then written in the left hand column of the relevant list. Each of these lists can be considered as a queue, where districts are waiting to be assigned to the seats of a given party.

The final distribution of party seats in the districts as predicted by the priority queue method for the Maltese General Election of 1992 with no threshold assumed, is summarised in the last part of Table III. As pointed out before, this distribution is practically identical to the actual election result, except that the AD is awarded a seat in the eleventh district, where it polled the highest number of votes.

This assignment of the nationwide seats gained by a party to the various districts can also be appreciated by drawing up a detailed schedule of how the seats are allocated to the districts. This schedule is displayed in Table IV. Each district quotient shown in Table III is listed in a matrix, along with the corresponding information including party, district, and d'Hondt divisor. Each quotient and its relevant information occupies one row in this matrix. For the sake of clarity, these rows are then sorted in descending order of quotient magnitude, and are shown in this order in Table IV below. The order defined by the district quotients in this table can be referred to as districtwise priority, to distinguish it from the nationwide priority referred to earlier.

According to the nationwide priority list shown in Table II, one awards the first seat to the PN. Looking up the list in Table IV, the highest PN seat is the first seat of the tenth district, which is the first one to be awarded to the PN. The nationwide priority of this seat is then written in the left hand side under the PN column. Similarly the second nationwide seat is to be awarded to the MLP. In Table IV, the highest MLP seat is the first seat in the second district. The nationwide priority (namely 2) of this seat is then written in the left hand side under the MLP column. Continuing in this way, alternately scanning the nationwide and the districtwise priority lists (Tables II and IV respectively), one can determine how the party seats are assigned to the districts.

Thus for example, as can be easily seen from the comments in the right hand side of Table IV, the ninth district is awarded the seats with nationwide priority 11, 16, 36, 46, and 56. The numbers 11, 36, and 56 represent the seats of the PN, whereas the numbers 16 and 46 represent the priorities of the MLP seats. This ninth district gains its full complement of 5 seats when the PN is awarded the 56'th nationwide seat in this district.

Assuming one has already distributed the first 56 seats, the 57'th seat is then awarded to the MLP in District 4. On assigning the AD the 58th nationwide seat, one then searches for the highest quotient of the AD, which is 218 in District 9. This seat, however, cannot be awarded since District 9 was already filled with the 56'th seat. Therefore the next highest AD quotient is searched, which is 210 in the 11'th District. This seat is then awarded to the AD in the 11'th District, which now has its full complement of seats. Similarly, the 60'th seat is not awarded to the MLP in the 11'th District (with the highest available quotient of 1832), because that District is already full. The seat is then awarded to the District with the next highest MLP quotient (1819), namely the Seventh District. This District has now gained all its five seats, and henceforth cannot take any more seats.

Proceeding in this way, one finally arrives at the last seat, the 65th seat, which the PN gains in the Tenth District. The distribution of party seats over the districts can then be seen to be identical to that given in the last part of Table III.

## SEAT DISTRIBUTION USING THE PRIORITY METHOD WITH THE D'HONDT SET OF DIVISORS FOR BOTH THE NATIONWIDE AND THE DISTRICT CALCULATIONS.

The predictions of the priority method for General Elections held in Malta in and after 1962, are shown in Table V. Here the d'Hondt set of divisors was used on both the nationwide first count votes and on the district percentages to obtain the nationwide priority and the seat distribution in the districts respectively.

For each election, the calculations are first done assuming that there is no threshold. A national threshold is then imposed to eliminate the smallest party with seats, and the distribution is recalculated using the priority method. This is repeated until only the two largest parties are left to compete for the available seats. In this and similar analysis, where a national threshold is imposed, parties which polled less than this threshold are not awarded any seats, but the district percentages of the other parties still in contention are not altered by the exclusion of the smaller parties.

The final distribution of party seats in the districts afforded by the priority queue seems to be fair in general, and agrees quite well with the actual election result. This is especially true in those elections, namely those of 1971 and 1976, where the nationwide number of party seats tallies exactly with the actual election result.

It can be seen from Table V, that for the elections of 1971 and that of 1976, the priority queue method predicts the exact election result. The partywise method by contrast fails to do so for the 1971 election. Relative to the actual election result, the partywise method displaced one MLP seat from the ninth to the first district, whereas one PN seat was displaced the other way. It should also be recalled that in this (1971) election, the number of seats available to each district was not constant, but was either five or six, depending on the district. In spite of this, the priority queue method predicts the election result exactly.

It was also shown above that in the election of 1992 with no threshold, the priority queue method awards a seat to the AD in the eleventh district, where it got most votes. By contrast, the partywise method awards this AD seat to the second district. The priority method yields a result which is fairer to the affected candidates of both parties concerned, the AD and the MLP in this case. It is also interesting to note that if a nationwide threshold of 5% is imposed in this election, the AD loses its seat in favour of the MLP, and the partywise and priority methods both agree exactly with the final election result.

Again, in the election of 1966 with no threshold, the priority queue method awards three seats to the CWP in the sixth, seventh and eighth districts, where this party is strongest. By contrast, the partywise distribution removes a CWP seat from the sixth district, and places it in the second district, where it polled only a relatively small number of votes. In general, the priority distribution seems to be fairer not only to the smaller parties, but also, indirectly, to the candidates of the larger parties affected by this change in district.

The priority method also gives a fair result for the election of 1966, assuming a national threshold of 6%. The CWP is eliminated with this threshold. (Please refer to Table V). The priority method predicts a marginal distribution of 26 seats for the PN, and 24 seats for the MLP, just like the partywise distribution. The seat assignment to the districts by the two methods, however, differs in the second and the seventh districts. The priority method predicts 1 seat for the PN and 4 seats to the MLP in the second district, and 3 seats to the PN and 2 seats to the MLP in the seventh district.

On the other hand, the partywise method predicts 2 seats for the PN and 3 seats for the MLP in the both the second and the seventh districts. This is not so fair on the PN candidates in the 7th district, since the PN got about 2000 more votes than the MLP in this district. An event such as this, where a party gets more votes than another in a district but gets less seats (or vice-versa) will henceforth be referred to as an inversion. It is

clear that for a given nationwide distribution of seats, a districtwise distribution with a fewer number of inversions is fairer than a distribution with a larger number of inversions. The voting pattern in the districts will be respected more when there are fewer inversions, or better still, when there are none at all.

It is also interesting to note that in the eighth district both the priority and the partywise methods assign 3 seats to the MLP and 2 seats to the PN, even though the latter party polled 57 more votes than its rival in this district; (ie. both methods produce an inversion in the 8th district). However, such inversions have actually occurred also in past elections because a good number of votes can be wasted on unelected candidates. Besides such a paradoxical result can be interpreted as a 'seat swap', as in the districtwise a priori method, to restore an abnormal election result to nationwide proportionality.

More detailed comparisons of the priority and the partywise methods will be discussed in the following sections in this study.

## THE EFFECT OF DIVISOR ON THE NATIONWIDE CALCULATION IN THE PARTYWISE AND PRIORITY METHODS.

The partywise and priority methods are two similar procedures based on the divisor method to translate a given number of party votes into parliamentary seats. So far only the d'Hondt set of divisors has been considered in our calculations, but there are other sets of divisors which are commonly used in such contexts. The most popular sets of divisors are the following:

a) the D'Hondt set of divisors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ....;
b) the modified Sainte Lague : 1.4, 3, 5, 7, 9, ....;
c) the Sainte Lague : 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, ....;
d) equal proportions : (root 2)/3, root 2, root 6, root 12, ..;
e) the Danish system : 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, .... .

Different sets of divisors make it more or less difficult for the smaller parties to obtain representation in Parliament. The sets of divisors a) to e) listed above are given in the sequence of increasing ease with which a small party stands to gain seats. Thus for a given voting pattern, the d'Hondt set offers the greatest difficulty for a small party to gain seats. The Danish system conversely tends to give seats to smaller parties with very little votes! (In the case of the method of equal proportions, the first divisor is not usually defined, but for the purpose of this study, it was taken to be 0.4714, to retain the same ratio between the first and second seat as for the Sainte Lague system).

In the priority method, as for the partywise procedure, divisors are used on two separate occasions: firstly to determine the number of seats earned nationwide by a given party; and secondly to distribute each seat in the various districts. These two steps are mainly independent of each other, and, tentatively, one can use a different set of divisors for these two distinct purposes. At this point it is natural to ask the following question: how does the choice of divisor affect the performance and the fairness of the partywise and priority methods?

The numerous advantages of these methods were referred to in the previous report. One of the most notable was that, when the total number of seats available is odd, a party which polls more votes than all the others together on a nationwide basis will then get an absolute majority of seats. This very important majority rule only holds true provided one uses the d'Hondt divisor, rather than any of the other divisors. It is therefore clear that one cannot replace the d'Hondt divisor in the nationwide calculation without sacrificing this important majority rule.

This is readily illustrated using the Monte Carlo method. In Appendix II, examples are given of elections between three parties A, B, and C. In these elections, party A gets more nationwide votes than parties B and C together, yet A fails to gain an absolute majority of seats when divisors other than the d'Hondt are used.

By contrast, the d'Hondt set of divisors unfailingly gaurantees a majority of seats for party A in such a situation. A majority of votes and/or seats for party A is distinguished by a + sign in Appendix II.

In view of the foregoing arguments therefore, it is not advisable to use the modified Sainte Lague, the Sainte Lague, the equal proportion, or the Danish sets of divisors for the initial calculation of the number of nationwide seats due to a given party. In fact, the main reason for these divisors is to enable the smaller parties to gain a seat, even when they have obtained a small fraction of the quota obtained by the larger parties. This is illustrated by some elections in Appendix II. For example, in election number v), the Danish system awards one seat to party C with only 342 votes, when the average quota for the larger parties is about one thousand. The reason is that these divisors tend to equalise the percentage of votes wasted for each party, rather than the absolute number of votes. Thus a party with ten times as many votes as a smaller party will have ten times as many votes wasted! These divisor systems therefore have an effect opposite to that of the threshold. Whereas a threshold tends to exclude the smaller parties from the electoral contest, these divisor systems are inclined to assign seats to parties with a very small nationwide vote. For this reason, it is not advisable to employ these divisors for the preliminary calculation of the number of seats to be awarded to a party on a nationwide basis.

**THE SAINTE LAGUE PRIORITY METHOD.**

Having calculated the number of nationwide seats for each party, both the partywise and priority methods proceed to assign the seats to the various districts. In both cases this is done using a suitable set of divisors on the district percentages for each party. So far we have only used the d'Hondt set of divisors for this purpose. However once the total number of seats due to each party has been determined, it is only reasonable to examine how the final seat distribution in the districts is affected when one employs an alternative set of divisors on the district percentages. In this instance, it is the relative strength of the parties in the districts which is affected rather than their overall nationwide strength.

As an example of this we give detailed calculations for the priority method for the election of 1962, assuming there is no threshold. The nationwide number of seats and their priority is first computed using the d'Hondt set of divisors. The seats are then assigned to the districts, employing the Sainte Lague system of divisors (1, 3, 5, 7 ...) on the district percentages of first count votes.

For convenience, this method will be referred to as the Sainte Lague priority method. The computational details of this method are shown in Appendix III for the election of 1962 without a threshold. It can be seen that the calculation is very similar to the method shown above in Tables I, II and III for 1992. We now give a formal description of this method.

The Sainte Lague priority method achieves nationwide proportional representation by a priori adjustments to the STV, and can be described as follows:

i) Count the first count votes for each party in each district;

ii) Add the votes obtained by a given party in each district, thus obtaining the nationwide total of first count votes for that party;

iii) Use the d'Hondt Divisor method on the nationwide first count total found in ii) to determine the total number of seats which a given party should be assigned on a nationwide basis (see Table I), and also to determine the priority of each individual seat. Set up the nationwide priority list (as in Table II).

iv) Calculate using i) the percentage of votes polled by a party in each district;

v) For each party, set up its matrix of district percentages and the corresponding quotients calculated with the Sainte Lague system of divisors as in Appendix III. (One can also set up for each party, the

corresponding district queue for convenience. This is obtained by sorting a party's matrix in descending order of quotient and noting the corresponding district, as explained previously).

vi) Starting with the seat of highest priority, identify the party to which it belongs from iii) above, and then search in the matrix of quotients of that party (or the corresponding district queue) for the highest available quotient. The seat will then be assigned to the district associated with that quotient.

vii) Take the next seat on the nationwide priority list, and repeat the procedure just described in vi). In this step, care must be taken not to assign seats to districts which are already full. Repeat until all seats on the nationwide priority list have been assigned to the districts.

viii) The STV can then proceed as described above for the partywise method.

Priority methods with other options for district divisors can be easily described in a similar fashion.

## THE EFFECT OF DIVISOR ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS IN THE DISTRICTS.

To examine the effect of divisor further, and for the sake of completeness, we also give calculations for all possible combinations of divisor systems for both partywise and priority methods. This is done for all elections in or after 1962, with or without a threshold. The d'Hondt, modified Sainte Lague, Sainte Lague, equal proportions, and Danish systems are first used, in that order, to obtain the nationwide number of seats for each party, (and the priorities of these seats also in the case of the priority method). For each of these methods, the distribution of the seats in the districts is then obtained by using each of these divisors, in turn, on the district percentages. For any particular election with a given threshold, therefore, there are a total of twenty five divisor combinations, (although many of these often turn out to give identical results). The sequence of divisors, d'Hondt through to Danish, represents a greater facility for smaller parties to gain seats in the nationwide calculation, and an increasing tendency to even out a party's seats in the districts in the subsequent computation.

The partywise calculations are shown in Appendix IV, whereas the results for the priority method are given in Appendix V. The distributions for these two methods are given for all different divisor combinations. In Appendix VI, we compare these two methods for different divisor options in the districts. (For the sake of simplicity, however, we comment only on the case when the d'Hondt set of divisors is used to obtain the nationwide distribution).

On inspection of the various distributions arising from these two methods, it appears that the priority method with d'Hondt divisors for the nationwide calculation, and Sainte Lague divisors for the districts gives a seat distribution which is generally fair to all the contesting parties whether large or small, and whether there is a threshold or not. With this choice of divisors, the partywise method sometimes gives identical results, but is generally speaking less accurate in the assignment of the smaller parties' seats in the districts. The advantages of the Sainte Lague priority method are listed below.

## ADVANTAGES OF THE PRIORITY SAINTE-LAGUE METHOD.

In this method, the seats of the smaller parties are generally awarded in the districts where they are strongest. Indirectly, this is also fair on candidates, of whatever party, who would have lost their seat had the small party been awarded its seat in a district where its following is weak. The 'correct' assignment of a smaller party's seats to the right districts leads to a more equitable distribution for all the contesting parties and for their candidates.

There also seems to be a smaller number of inversions for this method than for the other methods. It is clear that an electoral system with constituencies should as far as possible respect the voting pattern in each constituency. A party which polled significantly more votes in a district than another party should gain more, rather than less, seats in that district than the other party. Given a marginal (nationwide) distribution of seats, therefore, one should strive to achieve that distribution in the districts with the smallest number of inversions. The number of inversions when one uses the Sainte Lague priority method is generally smaller than for the other methods.

Another feature of this method is that it does not concentrate the seats of a smaller party in just one district. It can well happen that a small party that is awarded two seats on a nationwide basis gets both those seats in one district, even though its vote was rather evenly spread out over more than one district. (This happens for instance in the election of 1962 under various thresholds, when the PCP and DNP parties are each awarded two seats in one district by the other methods.) Such a distribution is clearly unfair to the other parties in that district, and could easily lead to inversions in that same district, and possibly also in other districts. This priority method does not have this drawback and seems to distribute a small party's seats reasonably well in the districts.

In a similar fashion, the Sainte Lague priority method will make it slightly more difficult (though certainly not impossible) for a large party to get a fourth seat in a given district. In a district with two major contending parties, it is slightly more probable to get a 3 seats to 2 result than a 4 to 1 result. (Please refer to comments on 1992 election in Appendix VI). Whereas this might seem strange in the light of results of recent elections, this method spreads the parties' seats more evenly in the districts, thus leading to a less polarised distribution of party seats.

The two proportional elections of 1971 and 1976 are also predicted perfectly by this method. It is interesting to remember that in 1971, the number of seats available to the districts was not constant, but was five or six depending on the district.

The main characteristic of the Sainte Lague priority method is that it is fair, and is seen to be fair by all parties, whether large or small, and by their candidates. It leaves less to chance than the partywise method: each seat is individually assigned to a party and hence to a district. The smaller parties are awarded seats where they are stronger rather than in districts where the larger parties did not happen to gain seats! The method generally also respects the voters' wishes in the individual districts, in that it keeps the number of inversions to an absolute minimum. Besides, the parties' seats are distributed quite evenly in the districts, thus keeping regional polarisation in check.

**CALCULATIONS.**

Since hundreds of distributions had to be computed for this study, resort had to be made to the digital computer. The seat distribution predicted by the partywise and priority methods for the different divisor systems was calculated by two computer programs in the GWBASIC language. These were written expressly for this purpose by the present author. Some of the calculations were also performed manually to corroborate the distributions predicted by these programs.

**REFERENCES.**

Buhagiar Anton, November 1994. Can one achieve nationwide proportional representation in Malta without major changes to the present method of election? Report submitted to the Commission on Electoral Reform, The Palace, Valletta, Malta.

Carstairs Andrew McLaren, 1980. A Short History of Electoral Systems in Western Europe. Allen and Unwin, London.

Lane John C., 1993. Maltese Elections: District Data and Candidate Checklist; Preliminary Version. Amherst, New York.

---

Table I: Use of the d'Hondt divisor to calculate the number of seats due to a party on the basis of its first count nationwide vote. This is done for the election of 1992, and no threshold is assumed for this particular example. To elect 65 seats, the largest 65 numbers are chosen from the three columns. These are marked with an asterisk. The smallest of these 65 numbers is essentially a quota for the divisor method, and is denoted by *-. In this case, it is equal to 3763, corresponding to the 34'th seat of the PN. Numbers smaller than this quota are unmarked corresponding to unelected candidates. The number of candidates assigned will then be 34 seats for the PN, 30 seats for the MLP, and 1 seat for the AD. Sorting these 65 numbers in descending order will then determine which party has priority over a given seat. This is done in Table II.

TABLE I:

ELECTION OF 1992; NO THRESHOLD ASSUMED:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | AD | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nationwide 1st count votes: | 114861 | 127932 | 4186 | | 246979 |
| % votes : | 46.51 | 51.80 | 1.69% | | 100% |

| DIVIDE BY: DIVISOR | | | | | NO OF SEATS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 114861* | 127932* | 4186* | AD | 1 |
| 2 | 57431* | 63966* | 2093 | | 2 |
| 3 | 38287* | 42644* | 1395 | | 3 |
| 4 | 28715* | 31983* | 1047 | | 4 |
| 5 | 22972* | 25586* | 837 | | 5 |
| 6 | 19144* | 21322* | 698 | | 6 |
| 7 | 16409* | 18276* | 598 | | 7 |
| 8 | 14358* | 15992* | 523 | | 8 |
| 9 | 12762* | 14215* | 465 | | 9 |
| 10 | 11486* | 12793* | 419 | | 10 |
| 11 | 10442* | 11630* | 381 | | 11 |
| 12 | 9572* | 10661* | 349 | | 12 |
| 13 | 8835* | 9841* | 322 | | 13 |
| 14 | 8204* | 9138* | 299 | | 14 |
| 15 | 7657* | 8529* | 279 | | 15 |
| 16 | 7179* | 7996* | 262 | | 16 |
| 17 | 6757* | 7525* | 246 | | 17 |
| 18 | 6381* | 7107* | 233 | | 18 |
| 19 | 6045* | 6733* | 220 | | 19 |
| 20 | 5743* | 6397* | 209 | | 20 |
| 21 | 5470* | 6092* | 199 | | 21 |
| 22 | 5221* | 5815* | 190 | | 22 |
| 23 | 4994* | 5562* | 182 | | 23 |
| 24 | 4786* | 5331* | 174 | | 24 |
| 25 | 4594* | 5117* | 167 | | 25 |
| 26 | 4418* | 4920* | 161 | | 26 |
| 27 | 4254* | 4738* | 155 | | 27 |
| 28 | 4102* | 4569* | 150 | | 28 |
| 29 | 3961* | 4411* | 144 | | 29 |
| 30 | 3829* | 4264* | 140 | MLP | 30 |
| 31 | 3705 | 4127* | 135 | | 31 |
| 32 | 3589 | 3998* | 131 | | 32 |
| 33 | 3481 | 3877* | 127 | | 33 |
| 34 | 3378 | 3763* | 123 | PN | 34 |
| 35 | 3282 | 3655 | 120 | | 35 |
| 36 | 3191 | 3554 | 116 | | 36 |
| 37 | 3104 | 3458 | 113 | | 37 |
| 38 | 3023 | 3367 | 110 | | 38 |

TABLE II. The nationwide priority list for parties for each individual seat. The d'Hondt divisor illustrated in Table I can be used to determine the priority in which the individual seats of the various parties are allocated to the districts. The largest quotient written in the columns of Table I is 127932, and corresponds to the first divisor of the PN. The PN has therefore priority over the first seat to be assigned to some district. The second largest quotient is 114861, which is the highest quotient for the MLP. The third largest quotient is 63966 in the PN column, which therefore has priority over the third seat. This can be repeated for each single seat. The AD, for example, has priority over the 58'th seat, whilst the PN has priority over the 65'th seat, which is the last one to be awarded.

The 65 party seats can therefore be considered as a queue of length 65.

The party sequence in this queue determines the order in which each individual party seat is assigned to the districts. This is in clear contrast to the partywise distribution where all the seats of a larger party have a higher priority than any seat of a smaller party.

| d'Hondt quotients from Table I. | Party Priority List. | Seat Number. |
|---|---|---|
| 127932 | PN | 1 |
| 114861 | MLP | 2 |
| 63966 | PN | 3 |
| 57431 | MLP | 4 |
| 42644 | PN | 5 |
| 38287 | MLP | 6 |
| 31983 | PN | 7 |
| 28715 | MLP | 8 |
| 25586 | PN | 9 |
| 22972 | MLP | 10 |
| 21322 | PN | 11 |
| 19144 | MLP | 12 |
| 18276 | PN | 13 |
| 16409 | MLP | 14 |
| 15992 | PN | 15 |
| 14358 | MLP | 16 |
| 14215 | PN | 17 |
| 12793 | PN | 18 |
| 12762 | MLP | 19 |
| 11630 | PN | 20 |
| 11486 | MLP | 21 |
| 10661 | PN | 22 |
| 10442 | MLP | 23 |
| 9841 | PN | 24 |
| 9572 | MLP | 25 |
| 9138 | PN | 26 |
| 8835 | MLP | 27 |
| 8529 | PN | 28 |
| 8204 | MLP | 29 |
| 7996 | PN | 30 |
| 7657 | MLP | 31 |
| 7525 | PN | 32 |
| 7179 | MLP | 33 |
| 7107 | PN | 34 |
| 6757 | MLP | 35 |
| 6733 | PN | 36 |
| 6397 | PN | 37 |
| 6381 | MLP | 38 |
| 6092 | PN | 39 |
| 6045 | MLP | 40 |
| 5815 | PN | 41 |
| 5743 | MLP | 42 |
| 5562 | PN | 43 |
| 5470 | MLP | 44 |
| 5331 | PN | 45 |
| 5221 | MLP | 46 |
| 5117 | PN | 47 |
| 4994 | MLP | 48 |
| 4920 | PN | 49 |
| 4786 | MLP | 50 |
| 4738 | PN | 51 |
| 4594 | MLP | 52 |
| 4569 | PN | 53 |
| 4418 | MLP | 54 |
| 4411 | PN | 55 |
| 4264 | PN | 56 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4254 | MLP | 57 |
| 4186 | AD | 58 |
| 4127 | PN | 59 |
| 4102 | MLP | 60 |
| 3998 | PN | 61 |
| 3961 | MLP | 62 |
| 3877 | PN | 63 |
| 3829 | MLP | 64 |
| 3763 | PN | 65 |
| ..... | | |
| 3705 | MLP | not elected |
| 3655 | PN | not elected |
| 3589 | MLP | .. |
| 3554 | PN | .. |
| 3481 | MLP | .. |
| 3458 | PN | .. |

Table III. The d'Hondt divisor method is used on the district percentages of first count votes (as in the partywise distribution) to assign the individual seats of the various parties to the different districts. In the priority queue method, however, the order is not determined by descending order of party size, as in the partywise method, but according to the nationwide priority list described in Table II.

| PN SEATS: | DISTRICT PERCENTAGES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DISTRICT | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII |
| %*100 | 5480 | 3193 | 3718 | 4188 | 3848 | 4417 | 6162 | 6033 | 5712 | 7129 | 6127 | 5472 | 5894 |
| 1 | 5480 | 3193 | 3718 | 4188 | 3848 | 4417 | 6162 | 6033 | 5712 | 7129 | 6127 | 5472 | 5894 |
| | *13 | *26 | *22 | *18 | *20 | *17 | *3 | *7 | *11 | *1 | *5 | *15 | *9 |
| 2 | 2740 | 1597 | 1859 | 2094 | 1924 | 2209 | 3081 | 3017 | 2856 | 3565 | 3064 | 2736 | 2947 |
| | *37 | | *59 | *45 | *55 | *43 | *28 | *32 | *36 | *24 | *30 | *39 | *34 |
| 3 | 1827 | 1064 | 1239 | 1396 | 1283 | 1472 | 2054 | 2011 | 1904 | 2376 | 2042 | 1824 | 1965 |
| | *61 | | | | | | *47 | *51 | *56 | *41 | *49 | *63 | *53 |
| 4 | 1370 | 798 | 930 | 1047 | 962 | 1104 | 1541 | 1508 | 1428 | 1782 | 1532 | 1368 | 1474 |
| | | | | | | | | | | *65 | | | |
| 5 | 1096 | 639 | 744 | 838 | 770 | 883 | 1232 | 1207 | 1142 | 1426 | 1225 | 1094 | 1179 |

MLP SEATS: DISTRICT PERCENTAGES.

| DISTRICT | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| %*100 | 4390 | 6637 | 6105 | 5623 | 5988 | 5455 | 3637 | 3771 | 4071 | 2668 | 3663 | 4380 | 4042 |
| 1 | 4390 *12 | 6637 *2 | 6105 *4 | 5623 *8 | 5988 *6 | 5455 *10 | 3637 *25 | 3771 *21 | 4071 *16 | 2668 *38 | 3663 *23 | 4380 *14 | 4042 *19 |
| 2 | 2195 *42 | 3319 *27 | 3053 *29 | 2812 *33 | 2994 *31 | 2728 *35 | 1819 *60 | 1886 *54 | 2036 *46 | 1334 | 1832 | 2190 *44 | 2021 *50 |
| 3 | 1463 | 2212 *40 | 2035 *48 | 1874 *57 | 1996 *52 | 1818 *62 | 1212 | 1257 | 1357 | 889 | 1221 | 1460 | 1347 |
| 4 | 1098 | 1659 *64 | 1526 | 1406 | 1497 | 1364 | 909 | 943 | 1018 | 667 | 916 | 1095 | 1011 |
| 5 | 878 | 1327 | 1221 | 1125 | 1198 | 1091 | 727 | 754 | 814 | 534 | 733 | 876 | 808 |

AD SEATS: DISTRICT PERCENTAGES.

| DISTRICT | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| %*100 | 130 | 170 | 177 | 188 | 164 | 128 | 201 | 196 | 218 | 203 | 210 | 148 | 64 |
| 1 | 130 | 170 | 177 | 188 | 164 | 128 | 201 | 196 | 218 | 203 | 210 *58 | 140 | 64 |
| 2 | 65 | 85 | 89 | 94 | 82 | 64 | 101 | 98 | 109 | 102 | 105 | 74 | 32 |
| 3 | 43 | 57 | 59 | 63 | 55 | 43 | 67 | 65 | 73 | 68 | 70 | 49 | 21 |
| 4 | 33 | 43 | 44 | 47 | 41 | 32 | 50 | 49 | 55 | 51 | 53 | 37 | 16 |
| 5 | 26 | 34 | 35 | 38 | 33 | 26 | 40 | 39 | 44 | 41 | 42 | 30 | 13 |

Alternatively, each party's matrix of district quotients can be written as a list of quotient and district. This is then sorted for each party separately in descending order of quotient. One then follows the nationwide priority party sequence to choose the appropriate party list, and hence to assign the next available district to that party seat. The nationwide priority for each assigned seat is then written in the left hand column of the relevant list. Each of these lists can be considered as a queue, where districts are waiting to be assigned to the seats of a given party. These lists are given on the following page.

| PN | | | MLP | | | AD | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEAT PRIO | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS | QUOTIENT |
| 1 | 10 | 7129 | 2 | 2 | 6637 | *58 | 9 | 218 |
| 3 | 7 | 6162 | 4 | 3 | 6105 | 58 | 11 | 210 |
| 5 | 11 | 6127 | 6 | 5 | 5988 | | 10 | 203 |
| 7 | 8 | 6033 | 8 | 4 | 5623 | | 7 | 201 |
| 9 | 13 | 5894 | 10 | 6 | 5455 | | 8 | 196 |
| 11 | 9 | 5712 | 12 | 1 | 4389 | | 4 | 188 |
| 13 | 1 | 5480 | 14 | 12 | 4380 | | 3 | 177 |
| 15 | 12 | 5472 | 16 | 9 | 4070 | | 2 | 170 |
| 17 | 6 | 4417 | 19 | 13 | 4042 | | 5 | 164 |
| 18 | 4 | 4188 | 21 | 8 | 3771 | | 12 | 148 |
| 20 | 5 | 3848 | 23 | 11 | 3662 | | 1 | 130 |
| 22 | 3 | 3718 | 25 | 7 | 3637 | | 6 | 128 |
| 24 | 10 | 3564 | 27 | 2 | 3319 | | 9 | 109 |
| 26 | 2 | 3193 | 29 | 3 | 3052 | | 11 | 105 |
| 28 | 7 | 3081 | 31 | 5 | 2994 | | 10 | 102 |
| 30 | 11 | 3064 | 33 | 4 | 2812 | | 7 | 101 |
| 32 | 8 | 3017 | 35 | 6 | 2727 | | 8 | 98 |
| 34 | 13 | 2947 | 38 | 10 | 2668 | | 4 | 94 |
| 36 | 9 | 2856 | 40 | 2 | 2212 | | 3 | 88 |
| 37 | 1 | 2740 | 42 | 1 | 2195 | | 2 | 85 |
| 39 | 12 | 2736 | 44 | 12 | 2190 | | 5 | 82 |
| 41 | 10 | 2376 | 46 | 9 | 2035 | | 12 | 74 |
| 43 | 6 | 2209 | 48 | 3 | 2035 | | 9 | 73 |
| 45 | 4 | 2094 | 50 | 13 | 2021 | | 11 | 70 |
| 47 | 7 | 2054 | 52 | 5 | 1996 | | 10 | 68 |
| 49 | 11 | 2042 | 54 | 8 | 1886 | | 7 | 67 |
| 51 | 8 | 2011 | 57 | 4 | 1874 | | 8 | 65 |
| 53 | 13 | 1965 | *60 | 11 | 1831 | | 1 | 65 |
| 55 | 5 | 1924 | 60 | 7 | 1818 | | 13 | 64 |
| 56 | 9 | 1904 | 62 | 6 | 1818 | | 6 | 64 |
| 59 | 3 | 1859 | 64 | 2 | 1659 | | 4 | 63 |
| 61 | 1 | 1827 | | 3 | 1526 | | 3 | 59 |
| 63 | 12 | 1824 | | 5 | 1497 | | 2 | 57 |
| 65 | 10 | 1782 | | 1 | 1463 | | 5 | 55 |
| | 2 | 1596 | | 12 | 1460 | | 9 | 54 |
| | 7 | 1540 | | 4 | 1406 | | 11 | 53 |
| | 11 | 1532 | | 6 | 1364 | | 10 | 51 |
| | 8 | 1508 | | 9 | 1357 | | 7 | 50 |
| | 13 | 1473 | | 13 | 1347 | | 12 | 49 |
| | 6 | 1472 | | 10 | 1334 | | 8 | 49 |
| | 9 | 1428 | | 2 | 1327 | | 4 | 47 |
| | 10 | 1426 | | 8 | 1257 | | 3 | 44 |

* signifies that the seat is not awarded since the relevant district already has its full complement of seats.

| PN | | | MLP | | | AD | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEAT PRIO | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS | QUOTIENT |
| | 4 | 1396 | | 3 | 1221 | | 9 | 44 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1370 | 11 | 1221 | 1 | 43 |
| 12 | 1368 | 7 | 1212 | 6 | 43 |
| 5 | 1283 | 5 | 1198 | 2 | 43 |
| 3 | 1239 | 4 | 1125 | 11 | 42 |
| 7 | 1232 | 1 | 1097 | 5 | 41 |
| 11 | 1225 | 12 | 1095 | 10 | 41 |
| 8 | 1207 | 6 | 1091 | 7 | 40 |
| 13 | 1179 | 9 | 1018 | 8 | 39 |
| 9 | 1142 | 13 | 1010 | 4 | 38 |
| 6 | 1104 | 8 | 943 | 12 | 37 |
| 1 | 1096 | 11 | 916 | 3 | 35 |
| 12 | 1094 | 7 | 909 | 2 | 34 |
| 2 | 1064 | 10 | 889 | 5 | 33 |
| 4 | 1047 | 1 | 878 | 1 | 33 |
| 5 | 962 | 12 | 876 | 13 | 32 |
| 3 | 930 | 9 | 814 | 6 | 32 |
| 6 | 883 | 13 | 808 | 12 | 30 |
| 4 | 838 | 8 | 754 | 1 | 26 |
| 2 | 798 | 11 | 732 | 6 | 26 |
| 5 | 770 | 7 | 727 | 13 | 21 |
| 3 | 744 | 10 | 667 | 13 | 16 |
| 2 | 639 | 10 | 534 | 13 | 13 |

FINAL SEAT DISTRIBUTION BY DISTRICT (1992, NO THRESHOLD ASSUMED):

| | DISTRICT. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARTY | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII | TOTAL |
| PN: | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP: | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

As pointed out before, this distribution is practically identical to the actual election result, except that the AD is awarded a seat in the eleventh district, where it polled the highest number of votes. By contrast, the partywise method assigns the AD seat to the second district, where the AD did not get most votes. This improvement in the allocation of party seats to districts by the priority queue method is confirmed in many other elections.

TABLE IV: Detailed schedule for the assignment of party seats to the districts. The d'Hondt quotients for the district percentages in Table III are sorted in descending order of quotient, and written in the following matrix along with the corresponding party and divisor. The nationwide priority of each seat is given on the left. The final seat distribution is identical to that given in Table III.

| NATIONWIDE SEAT PRIORITY MLP | PN | AD | PARTY | DISTRICT | DISTRICT -WISE PRIORITY 100* DISTRICT% | PARTY SEAT NO. IN DIST. | COMMENTS. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | PN | 10 | 7129 | 1 | |
| 2 | | | MLP | 2 | 6637 | 1 | |
| | 3 | | PN | 7 | 6162 | 1 | |
| | 5 | | PN | 11 | 6127 | 1 | |
| 4 | | | MLP | 3 | 6105 | 1 | |
| | 7 | | PN | 8 | 6033 | 1 | |
| 6 | | | MLP | 5 | 5988 | 1 | |
| | 9 | | PN | 13 | 5894 | 1 | |
| | 11 | | PN | 9 | 5712 | 1 | 1st seat in District 9. |
| 8 | | | MLP | 4 | 5623 | 1 | |
| | 13 | | PN | 1 | 5480 | 1 | |
| | 15 | | PN | 12 | 5472 | 1 | |
| 10 | | | MLP | 6 | 5455 | 1 | |
| | 17 | | PN | 6 | 4417 | 1 | |
| 12 | | | MLP | 1 | 4390 | 1 | |
| 14 | | | MLP | 12 | 4380 | 1 | |
| | 18 | | PN | 4 | 4188 | 1 | |
| 16 | | | MLP | 9 | 4071 | 1 | 2nd seat in District 9. |
| 19 | | | MLP | 13 | 4042 | 1 | |
| | 20 | | PN | 5 | 3848 | 1 | |
| 21 | | | MLP | 8 | 3771 | 1 | |
| | 22 | | PN | 3 | 3718 | 1 | |
| 23 | | | MLP | 11 | 3663 | 1 | |
| 25 | | | MLP | 7 | 3637 | 1 | |
| | 24 | | PN | 10 | 3565 | 2 | |
| 27 | | | MLP | 2 | 3319 | 2 | |
| | 26 | | PN | 2 | 3193 | 1 | |
| | 28 | | PN | 7 | 3081 | 2 | |
| | 30 | | PN | 11 | 3064 | 2 | |
| 29 | | | MLP | 3 | 3053 | 2 | |
| | 32 | | PN | 8 | 3017 | 2 | |
| 31 | | | MLP | 5 | 2994 | 2 | |
| | 34 | | PN | 13 | 2947 | 2 | |
| | 36 | | PN | 9 | 2856 | 2 | 3rd seat in District 9. |
| 33 | | | MLP | 4 | 2812 | 2 | |
| | 37 | | PN | 1 | 2740 | 2 | |
| | 39 | | PN | 12 | 2736 | 2 | |
| 35 | | | MLP | 6 | 2728 | 2 | |
| 38 | | | MLP | 10 | 2668 | 1 | |
| | 41 | | PN | 10 | 2376 | 3 | |
| 40 | | | MLP | 2 | 2212 | 3 | |
| | 43 | | PN | 6 | 2209 | 2 | |
| 42 | | | MLP | 1 | 2195 | 2 | |
| 44 | | | MLP | 12 | 2190 | 2 | |
| | 45 | | PN | 4 | 2094 | 2 | |
| | 47 | | PN | 7 | 2054 | 3 | |
| | 49 | | PN | 11 | 2042 | 3 | |
| 46 | | | MLP | 9 | 2036 | 2 | 4th seat in District 9. |
| 48 | | | MLP | 3 | 2035 | 3 | |
| 50 | | | MLP | 13 | 2021 | 2 | |
| | 51 | | PN | 8 | 2011 | 3 | |

```
 52           MLP      5      1996      3
     53        PN      13      1965      3     District 13 is now full.
     55        PN       5      1924      2     District  5 is now full.
     56        PN       9      1904      3     5th seat in District 9.
                                               District  9 is now full.
 54           MLP      8      1886      2     District  8 is now full.
 57           MLP      4      1874      3     District  4 is now full.
     59        PN       3      1859      2     District  3 is now full.
*60           MLP     11       1832        *    District 11 already filled in step 58.
See below.
     61        PN       1      1827      3     District  1 is now full.
     63        PN      12      1824      3     District 12 is now full.
 60           MLP      7      1819      2     District  7 is now full.
 62           MLP      6      1818      3     District  6 is now full.
     65        PN      10      1782      4     District 10 is now full.
 64           MLP      2      1659      4     District  2 is now full.
               PN      2      1597
               PN      7      1541
               PN     11      1532
              MLP      3      1526
               PN      8      1508
              MLP      5      1497
               PN     13      1474
               ..      .       ..
               ..      .       ..
               PN      2       639
              MLP     10       534
    *58        AD      9       218      *      District 9 already filled in step 56.
See above.
     58        AD     11       210      1     District 11 is now full.
               AD     10       203
               AD      7       201
               ..      .       ..
               ..      .       ..
```

An * in a given row signifies that the seat is not awarded in that district because the district has already gained its full complement of five seats.

TABLE V: Distribution of seats using the priority queue method for Elections on and after 1962. The d'Hondt divisor is used throughout, both nationwide and in the districts.

ELECTION OF 1962.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

5% Threshold. PCP eliminated.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

9.3% Threshold. DNP eliminated.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

10% Threshold. CWP eliminated.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1966.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

6% Threshold. CWP eliminated.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 26 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 24 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1971.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 28 |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 27 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 55 |

ELECTION OF 1976.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MLP | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 34 |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 31 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1981.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1987.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1992.

No Threshold.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

5% Threshold. AD eliminated.

| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

APPENDIX I.

ELECTION OF 1992. SEAT DISTRIBUTION BY THE PARTYWISE METHOD.

First count votes for parties in each district, district percentages,
and partywise calculations for the 1992 election. No threshold is assumed.

Number of parties is 3. Number of seats is 65.
Number of districts is 13. Number of seats/ district is 5.

| FIRST COUNT VOTES | PARTIES. | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| DISTRICTS | MLP | PN | AD |
| I | 8153 | 10179 | 242 |
| II | 12680 | 6100 | 325 |
| III | 11936 | 7270 | 346 |
| IV | 10061 | 7494 | 337 |
| V | 11852 | 7616 | 325 |
| VI | 10241 | 8293 | 241 |
| VII | 6960 | 11792 | 385 |
| VIII | 7030 | 11247 | 365 |
| IX | 7808 | 10956 | 418 |
| X | 5025 | 13426 | 383 |
| XI | 7337 | 12275 | 421 |
| XII | 8249 | 10305 | 278 |
| XIII | 7529 | 10979 | 120 |
| TOTAL: | 114861 | 127932 | 4186 |
| NATIONWIDE SEATS: | 30 | 34 | 1 |

% vote of each party by district:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I | 43.895 | 54.802 | 1.303 |
| II | 66.370 | 31.929 | 1.701 |
| III | 61.047 | 37.183 | 1.770 |
| IV | 56.232 | 41.885 | 1.884 |
| V | 59.880 | 38.478 | 1.642 |
| VI | 54.546 | 44.170 | 1.284 |
| VII | 36.369 | 61.619 | 2.012 |
| VIII | 37.711 | 60.332 | 1.958 |
| IX | 40.705 | 57.116 | 2.179 |
| X | 26.680 | 71.286 | 2.034 |
| XI | 36.625 | 61.274 | 2.102 |
| XII | 43.803 | 54.721 | 1.476 |
| XIII | 40.418 | 58.938 | 0.644 |

Parties in descending order of first count vote: PN, MLP, AD.

Direct assignment of seats to districts (1992):

PN scan:
---

| Dist. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seats still available: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |
| %*102: | 548 | 319 | 372 | 419 | 385 | 442 | 616 | 603 | 571 | 713 | 613 | 547 | 589 | |
| 1 | 548* | 319* | 372* | 419* | 385* | 442* | 616* | 603* | 571* | 713* | 613* | 547* | 589* | |
| 2 | 274* | 160 | 186* | 210* | 193* | 221* | 308* | 302* | 286* | 357* | 307* | 274* | 295* | |
| 3 | 183* | 106 | 124 | 140 | 128 | 147 | 205* | 201* | 190* | 238* | 204* | 182* | 196* | |
| 4 | 137 | 80 | 93 | 105 | 96 | 111 | 154 | 151 | 143 | 178* | 153 | 137 | 147 | |
| 5 | 110 | 64 | 74 | 84 | 77 | 88 | 123 | 121 | 114 | 143 | 123 | 109 | 118 | |

Choose largest 34 numbers. Smallest is 178 in District X, Seat 4.

| PN: | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seats still available: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |

MLP scan:
---

| Dist. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seats still available: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| %*10 | 439 | 664 | 610 | 562 | 599 | 545 | 364 | 377 | 407 | 267 | 366 | 438 | 404 | |
| 1 | 439* | 664* | 610* | 562* | 599* | 545* | 364* | 377* | 407* | 267* | 366* | 438* | 404* | |
| 2 | 220* | 332* | 305* | 281* | 300* | 273* | 182* | 189* | 204* | | 183* | 219* | 202* | |
| 3 | | 221* | 203* | 187* | 200* | 182* | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | 166 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Choose largest 30. Smallest is 182 in District VI, Seat 3.

| MLP: | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seats still available: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

AD scan:
---

| Dist. | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seats still available: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| %*100 | 130 | 170 | 177 | 188 | 164 | 128 | 201 | 196 | 218 | 203 | 210 | 148 | 64 | |
| 1 | | 170 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Choose largest 1 number. Smallest is 170 in District II, Seat 1.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AD: | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Seats still available:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

ALL SEATS ARE NOW ASSIGNED.

FINAL SEAT DISTRIBUTION BY DISTRICT (1992):

| | DISTRICT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARTY | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIII | TOTAL |
| PN: | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP: | 2 | 3+ | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD: | 0 | 1- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

In the actual election, the MLP got one seat more, and the AD one seat less in the II district.

## APPENDIX II.

## EFFECT OF DIVISOR ON MAJORITY RULE.

Comparison of different divisors on fictitious elections between three parties, A, B and C, where A has the largest following, B is slightly smaller than A, and C is a small party. In each case Party A gains more votes than parties B and C put together, ie. A has an absolute majority of votes. A total of 65 seats is then distributed amongst the three parties. The quota per seat is about 1000 votes for the larger parties A and B. Different divisor methods are then used to calculate the number of nationwide seats to each party, The elections and the divisor systems with a majority of votes and seats respectively are marked with a +. Of all the divisor methods, it is only the d'Hondt set of divisors which is mathematically gauranteed to give an absolute majority of seats to party A. The Danish system in particular is extremely generous to small parties. As can be deduced from election v), it awards one seat to party C with only 342 votes, when the quota for the larger parties is about 1000. This is because divisors other than the d'Hondt do not equalise the number of wasted votes to each party; rather they equalise the proportion of votes wasted by each party.

| | PARTY | A | B | C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| i) | Votes | 33010 : | 32000 : | 712 | + |
| SEATS: | | | | | |
| | d'Hondt | 33 | 32 | 0 | + |
| | Modified St. Lague | 32 | 32 | 1 | |
| | St. Lague | 32 | 32 | 1 | |
| | Equal Proportions | 32 | 32 | 1 | |
| | Danish | 32 | 32 | 1 | |
| ii) | | 34020 : | 32000 : | 1572 | + |
| SEATS: | | | | | |
| | d'Hondt | 33 | 31 | 1 | + |
| | Modified St. Lague | 32 | 31 | 2 | |
| | St. Lague | 32 | 31 | 2 | |
| | Equal Proportions | 32 | 31 | 2 | |
| | Danish | 32 | 31 | 2 | |
| iii) | | 35210 : | 32000 : | 2710 | + |
| SEATS: | | | | | |
| | d'Hondt | 33 | 30 | 2 | + |
| | Modified St. Lague | 32 | 30 | 3 | |
| | St. Lague | 32 | 30 | 3 | |
| | Equal Proportions | 32 | 30 | 3 | |
| | Danish | 32 | 30 | 3 | |
| iv) | | 36450 : | 32000 : | 3927 | + |

SEATS:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d'Hondt | 33 | 29 | 3 | + |
| Modified St. Lague | 32 | 29 | 4 | |
| St. Lague | 32 | 29 | 4 | |
| Equal Proportions | 32 | 29 | 4 | |
| Danish | 32 | 29 | 4 | |

| | PARTY | A | B | C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| v) | Votes | 33018 : | 32000 : | 342 | + |

SEATS:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d'Hondt | 33 | 32 | 0 | + |
| Modified St. Lague | 33 | 32 | 0 | + |
| St. Lague | 33 | 32 | 0 | + |
| Equal Proportions | 33 | 32 | 0 | + |
| Danish | 32 | 32 | 1 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| vi) | 33000 : | 31000 : | 1361 | + |

SEATS:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d'Hondt | 33 | 31 | 1 | + |
| Modified St. Lague | 33 | 31 | 1 | + |
| St. Lague | 33 | 31 | 1 | + |
| Equal Proportions | 33 | 31 | 1 | + |
| Danish | 32 | 31 | 2 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| vii) | 34150 : | 31000 : | 2470 | + |

SEATS:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d'Hondt | 33 | 30 | 2 | + |
| Modified St. Lague | 33 | 30 | 2 | + |
| St. Lague | 33 | 30 | 2 | + |
| Equal Proportions | 33 | 30 | 2 | + |
| Danish | 32 | 30 | 3 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| viii) | 34230 : | 30000 : | 3530 | + |

SEATS:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d'Hondt | 33 | 29 | 3 | + |
| Modified St. Lague | 33 | 29 | 3 | + |
| St. Lague | 33 | 29 | 3 | + |
| Equal Proportions | 33 | 29 | 3 | + |
| Danish | 32 | 29 | 4 | |

APPENDIX III. The Sainte Lague priority method for the election of 1962. No threshold is assumed. The d'Hondt divisor is first used to determine the number of seats for each party, and their priority. The seats are then distributed in the districts, using the Sainte Lague system of divisors.

The D'Hondt set of divisors is used on the nationwide total of first count votes obtained by each party. In this election, the PN polled 63262 votes, the MLP 50974, the CWP 14285, the DNP 13968, the PCP 7290. The nationwide totals for each party are divided by the divisors 1, 2, 3, 4, etc, and sorted in descending order of this quotient. The sequence of this sorted list determines the number of seats due to each party, and also the nationwide priority of each seat.

| NATIONWIDE PRIORITY | PARTY | D'HONDT QUOTIENT |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | PN | 63262 |
| 2 | MLP | 50974 |
| 3 | PN | 31631 |
| 4 | MLP | 25487 |
| 5 | PN | 21087 |
| 6 | MLP | 16991 |
| 7 | PN | 15816 |
| 8 | CWP | 14285 |
| 9 | DNP | 13968 |
| 10 | MLP | 12744 |
| 11 | PN | 12652 |
| 12 | PN | 10544 |
| 13 | MLP | 10195 |
| 14 | PN | 9037 |
| 15 | MLP | 8496 |
| 16 | PN | 7908 |
| 17 | PCP | 7290 |
| 18 | MLP | 7282 |
| 19 | CWP | 7143 |
| 20 | PN | 7029 |
| 21 | DNP | 6984 |
| 22 | MLP | 6372 |
| 23 | PN | 6326 |
| 24 | PN | 5751 |
| 25 | MLP | 5664 |
| 26 | PN | 5272 |
| 27 | MLP | 5097 |
| 28 | PN | 4866 |
| 29 | CWP | 4762 |
| 30 | DNP | 4656 |
| 31 | MLP | 4634 |
| 32 | PN | 4519 |
| 33 | MLP | 4248 |
| 34 | PN | 4217 |
| 35 | PN | 3954 |
| 36 | MLP | 3921 |
| 37 | PN | 3721 |
| 38 | PCP | 3645 |
| 39 | MLP | 3641 |
| 40 | CWP | 3571 |
| 41 | PN | 3515 |
| 42 | DNP | 3492 |
| 43 | MLP | 3398 |
| 44 | PN | 3330 |
| 45 | MLP | 3186 |
| 46 | PN | 3163 |
| 47 | PN | 3012 |
| 48 | MLP | 2998 |
| 49 | PN | 2876 |
| 50 | CWP | 2857 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| not elected | ... | MLP | 2832 |
| not elected | ... | DNP | 2794 |
| .. | | PN | 2751 |
| .. | | MLP | 2683 |
| .. | | PN | 2636 |
| .. | | MLP | 2549 |
| | | PN | 2530 |
| | | PN | 2433 |
| | | PCP | 2430 |
| | | MLP | 2427 |
| | | CWP | 2381 |
| | | PN | 2343 |
| | | DNP | 2328 |
| | | MLP | 2317 |
| | | PN | 2259 |
| | | MLP | 2216 |
| | | PN | 2181 |
| | | MLP | 2124 |
| | | PN | 2109 |
| | | CWP | 2041 |
| | | PN | 2041 |
| | | MLP | 2039 |
| | | DNP | 1995 |
| | | PN | 1977 |
| | | MLP | 1961 |
| | | PN | 1917 |
| | | MLP | 1888 |

The Sainte Lague Priority Method;

Sainte Lague's set of divisors is used on the districtwise proportions to determine the order in which districts are assigned to the seats of a given party. The nationwide priority of each seat is written under the relevant quotient. The distribution of the contesting parties' seats in the districts arising from using this set of divisors is usually fairer to the parties and the individual candidates than when the d'Hondt's divisors are used in this step.

PARTY DISTRICT.

DIVISOR

| PN | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| %*100 | | 4518 | 2672 | 3494 | 4272 | 4977 | 4913 | 3626 | 3739 | 4910 | 5188 |
| | 1 | 4518 | 2672 | 3494 | 4272 | 4977 | 4913 | 3626 | 3739 | 4910 | 5188 |
| | | *11 | *23 | *20 | *12 | *3 | *5 | *16 | *14 | *7 | *1 |
| | 3 | 1506 | 891 | 1165 | 1424 | 1659 | 1638 | 1209 | 1246 | 1637 | 1729 |
| | | *34 | | *44 | *35 | *26 | *28 | *41 | *37 | *32 | *24 |
| | 5 | 904 | 534 | 699 | 854 | 995 | 983 | 725 | 748 | 982 | 1038 |
| | | | | | | *47 | | | | *49 | *46 |
| | 7 | 645 | 382 | 499 | 610 | 711 | 702 | 518 | 534 | 701 | 741 |
| | 9 | 502 | 297 | 388 | 475 | 553 | 546 | 403 | 415 | 546 | 576 |

| MLP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| %*100 | | 3308 | 5620 | 4635 | 4747 | 3430 | 2402 | 2648 | 3541 | 2597 | 626 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 3308 | 5620 | 4635 | 4747 | 3430 | 2402 | 2648 | 3541 | 2597 | 626 |
| | | *15 | *2 | *6 | *4 | *13 | *25 | *18 | *10 | *22 | |
| | 3 | 1103 | 1873 | 1545 | 1582 | 1143 | 801 | 883 | 1180 | 866 | 209 |
| | | *45 | *27 | *33 | *31 | *39 | | | *36 | | |
| | 5 | 662 | 1124 | 927 | 949 | 686 | 480 | 530 | 708 | 519 | 125 |
| | | | *43 | | *48 | | | | | | |
| | 7 | 473 | 803 | 662 | 678 | 490 | 343 | 378 | 506 | 371 | 89 |
| | 9 | 368 | 624 | 515 | 527 | 381 | 267 | 294 | 393 | 289 | 70 |

| CWP | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 585 | 1025 | 1213 | 467 | 755 | 1097 | 878 | 1240 | 910 | 1407 |
| | 1 | 585 | 1025 | 1213 | 467 | 755 | 1097 | 878 | 1240 | 910 | 1407 |
| | | | *50 | *29 | | | *40 | | *19 | | *8 |
| | 3 | 195 | 342 | 404 | 156 | 252 | 366 | 293 | 413 | 303 | 469 |
| | 5 | 117 | 205 | 243 | 93 | 151 | 219 | 176 | 248 | 182 | 281 |
| | 7 | 84 | 146 | 173 | 67 | 108 | 157 | 125 | 177 | 130 | 201 |
| | 9 | 65 | 114 | 135 | 52 | 84 | 122 | 98 | 138 | 101 | 156 |

| DNP | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1028 | 574 | 467 | 347 | 553 | 986 | 1347 | 936 | 902 | 2162 |
| | 1 | 1028 | 574 | 467 | 347 | 553 | 986 | 1347 | 936 | 902 | 2162 |
| | | *30 | | | | | *42 | *21 | | | *9 |
| | 3 | 343 | 191 | 156 | 116 | 184 | 329 | 449 | 312 | 301 | 721 |
| | 5 | 206 | 115 | 93 | 69 | 111 | 197 | 269 | 187 | 180 | 432 |
| | 7 | 147 | 82 | 67 | 50 | 79 | 141 | 192 | 134 | 129 | 309 |
| | 9 | 114 | 64 | 52 | 39 | 61 | 110 | 150 | 104 | 100 | 240 |

| PCP | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 475 | 109 | 192 | 168 | 285 | 431 | 1413 | 466 | 654 | 522 |
| | 1 | 475 | 109 | 192 | 168 | 285 | 431 | 1413 | 466 | 654 | 522 |
| | | | | | | | | *17 | | *38 | |
| | 3 | 158 | 36 | 64 | 56 | 95 | 144 | 471 | 155 | 218 | 174 |
| | 5 | 95 | 22 | 38 | 34 | 57 | 86 | 283 | 93 | 131 | 104 |
| | 7 | 68 | 16 | 27 | 24 | 41 | 62 | 202 | 67 | 93 | 75 |
| | 9 | 53 | 12 | 21 | 19 | 32 | 48 | 157 | 52 | 73 | 58 |

Alternatively, each party's district quotients can be sorted in descending order for each party, and listed as district queues.

Alternatively, each party's matrix of district quotients can be written as a list of quotient and district. This is then sorted for each party separately in descending order of quotient. One then follows the nationwide priority party sequence to choose the appropriate party list, and hence to

assign the next available district to that party seat. The nationwide priority for each assigned seat is then written in the left hand column of the relevant list. Each of these lists can be considered as a queue, where districts are waiting to be assigned to the seats of a given party.

| PN | | | MLP | | | CWP | | | DNP | | | PCP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEAT PRIO | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS. | QUOTIENT | SEAT PRI | DIS | QUOTIENT | SEAT PR | DIS | QUOTIENT | SEAT PR | DIS | QUOTIENT |
| 1 | 10 | 5188 | 2 | 2 | 5620 | 8 | 10 | 1407 | 9 | 10 | 2162 | 17 | 7 | 1413 |
| 3 | 5 | 4977 | 4 | 4 | 4747 | 19 | 8 | 1240 | 21 | 7 | 1347 | 38 | 9 | 654 |
| 5 | 6 | 4913 | 6 | 3 | 4635 | 29 | 3 | 1213 | 30 | 1 | 1028 | | 10 | 522 |
| 7 | 9 | 4910 | 10 | 8 | 3541 | 40 | 6 | 1097 | 42 | 6 | 986 | | 1 | 475 |
| 11 | 1 | 4518 | 13 | 5 | 3430 | 50 | 2 | 1025 | | 8 | 936 | | 7 | 471 |
| 12 | 4 | 4272 | 15 | 1 | 3308 | | 9 | 910 | | 9 | 902 | | 8 | 466 |
| 14 | 8 | 3739 | 18 | 7 | 2648 | | 7 | 878 | | 10 | 721 | | 6 | 431 |
| 16 | 7 | 3626 | 22 | 9 | 2597 | | 5 | 755 | | 2 | 574 | | 5 | 285 |
| 20 | 3 | 3494 | 25 | 6 | 2402 | | 1 | 585 | | 5 | 553 | | 7 | 283 |
| 23 | 2 | 2672 | 27 | 2 | 1873 | | 10 | 469 | | 3 | 467 | | 9 | 218 |
| 24 | 10 | 1729 | 31 | 4 | 1582 | | 4 | 467 | | 7 | 449 | | 7 | 202 |
| 26 | 5 | 1659 | 33 | 3 | 1545 | | 8 | 413 | | 10 | 432 | | 3 | 192 |
| 28 | 6 | 1638 | 36 | 8 | 1180 | | 3 | 404 | | 4 | 347 | | 10 | 174 |
| 32 | 9 | 1637 | 39 | 5 | 1143 | | 6 | 366 | | 1 | 343 | | 4 | 168 |
| 34 | 1 | 1506 | 43 | 2 | 1124 | | 2 | 342 | | 6 | 329 | | 1 | 158 |
| 35 | 4 | 1424 | 45 | 1 | 1103 | | 9 | 303 | | 8 | 312 | | 7 | 157 |
| 37 | 8 | 1246 | 48 | 4 | 949 | | 7 | 293 | | 10 | 309 | | 8 | 155 |
| 41 | 7 | 1209 | | 3 | 927 | | 10 | 281 | | 9 | 301 | | 6 | 144 |
| 44 | 3 | 1165 | | 7 | 883 | | 5 | 252 | | 7 | 269 | | 9 | 131 |
| 46 | 10 | 1038 | | 9 | 866 | | 8 | 248 | | 10 | 240 | | 2 | 109 |
| 47 | 5 | 995 | | 2 | 803 | | 3 | 243 | | 1 | 206 | | 10 | 104 |
| 49* | 6 | 983 | | 6 | 801 | | 6 | 219 | | 6 | 197 | | 1 | 95 |
| 49 | 9 | 982 | | 8 | 708 | | 2 | 205 | | 7 | 192 | | 5 | 95 |
| | 1 | 904 | | 5 | 686 | | 10 | 201 | | 2 | 191 | | 9 | 93 |
| | 2 | 891 | | 4 | 678 | | 1 | 195 | | 8 | 187 | | 8 | 93 |
| | 4 | 854 | | 3 | 662 | | 9 | 182 | | 5 | 184 | | 6 | 86 |
| | 8 | 748 | | 1 | 662 | | 8 | 177 | | 9 | 180 | | 10 | 75 |
| | 10 | 741 | | 10 | 626 | | 7 | 176 | | 3 | 156 | | 9 | 73 |

* signifies that the seat with priority 49 is not awarded to the PN in district 6, since this is already full (with seats 5, 25, 28, 40 and 42). Instead, the PN is awarded the seat in the next district available on its list, namely the ninth district.

| PN | | MLP | | CWP | | DNP | | PCP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DISTRICT | QUOTIENT | DISTRICT | QUOTIENT | DISTRICT | QUOTIENT | DISTRICT | QUOTIENT | DISTRICT | QUOTIENT |
| 7 | 725 | 2 | 624 | 3 | 173 | 7 | 150 | 1 | 68 |
| 5 | 711 | 7 | 530 | 6 | 157 | 1 | 147 | 8 | 67 |
| 6 | 702 | 4 | 527 | 10 | 156 | 6 | 141 | 3 | 64 |
| 9 | 701 | 9 | 519 | 4 | 156 | 8 | 134 | 6 | 62 |
| 3 | 699 | 3 | 515 | 5 | 151 | 9 | 129 | 10 | 58 |
| 1 | 645 | 8 | 506 | 2 | 146 | 4 | 116 | 5 | 57 |
| 4 | 610 | 5 | 490 | 8 | 138 | 2 | 115 | 4 | 56 |
| 10 | 576 | 6 | 480 | 3 | 135 | 1 | 114 | 1 | 53 |
| 5 | 553 | 1 | 473 | 9 | 130 | 5 | 111 | 8 | 52 |
| 6 | 546 | 8 | 393 | 7 | 125 | 6 | 110 | 6 | 48 |
| 9 | 546 | 5 | 381 | 6 | 122 | 8 | 104 | 5 | 41 |
| 2 | 534 | 7 | 378 | 1 | 117 | 9 | 100 | 3 | 38 |
| 8 | 534 | 9 | 371 | 2 | 114 | 3 | 93 | 2 | 36 |
| 7 | 518 | 1 | 368 | 5 | 108 | 2 | 82 | 4 | 34 |
| 1 | 502 | 6 | 343 | 9 | 101 | 5 | 79 | 5 | 32 |
| 3 | 499 | 7 | 294 | 7 | 98 | 4 | 69 | 3 | 27 |
| 4 | 475 | 9 | 289 | 4 | 93 | 3 | 67 | 4 | 24 |
| 8 | 415 | 6 | 267 | 5 | 84 | 2 | 64 | 2 | 22 |
| 7 | 403 | 10 | 209 | 1 | 84 | 5 | 61 | 3 | 21 |
| 3 | 388 | 10 | 125 | 4 | 67 | 3 | 52 | 4 | 19 |
| 2 | 382 | 10 | 90 | 1 | 65 | 4 | 50 | 2 | 16 |
| 2 | 297 | 10 | 70 | 4 | 52 | 4 | 39 | 2 | 12 |

Final seat distribution for the Sainte Lague priority method:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

APPENDIX IV.

PARTYWISE CALCULATIONS WITH DIFFERENT DIVISORS

FOR THE ELECTIONS 1962-1992.

ELECTION OF 1962. PARTYWISE CALCULATIONS.
No threshold assumed.

Number of parties is 7
Total number of seats is 50
Total number of districts is 10
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | CWP | DNP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5532 | 7556 | 795 | 979 | 1720 | 143 | 0 |
| 2 | 9170 | 4359 | 178 | 1672 | 937 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 6512 | 4908 | 269 | 1704 | 656 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 6919 | 6226 | 245 | 681 | 505 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 4860 | 7051 | 404 | 1069 | 784 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 3457 | 7072 | 621 | 1579 | 1419 | 247 | 0 |
| 7 | 4493 | 6152 | 2397 | 1489 | 2285 | 152 | 0 |
| 8 | 5292 | 5588 | 697 | 1853 | 1399 | 116 | 0 |
| 9 | 3896 | 7368 | 981 | 1366 | 1353 | 41 | 0 |
| 10 | 843 | 6982 | 703 | 1893 | 2910 | 0 | 128 |
| TOTAL: | 50974 | 63262 | 7290 | 14285 | 13968 | 699 | 128 |

Nationwide Divisor: D'HONDT:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 22 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

Nationwide Divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED, SAINTE LAGUE, EQUAL PROPORTIONS:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 21 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

Nationwide Divisor: DANISH:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 20 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1962. THRESHOLD 5%.
PCP eliminated.

Nationwide Divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 22 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1962. THRESHOLD = 9.3 % of national vote.
DNP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 25 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 20 | 6 | | | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED, SAINTE LAGUE: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| District divisors: EQUAL PROPORTIONS, DANISH: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

Election of 1962; THRESHOLD = 10 % of national vote.
CWP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 22 | 0 | | | | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| TOTAL | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1966. PARTYWISE CALCULATIONS.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 6.
Total number of seats is 50.
Total number of districts is 10.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT.

| 2DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | CWP | DNP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6151 | 7623 | 191 | 747 | 351 | 0 |
| 2 | 9517 | 4771 | 0 | 598 | 0 | 20 |
| 3 | 7756 | 5356 | 0 | 954 | 99 | 0 |
| 4 | 7812 | 5761 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 29 |
| 5 | 6176 | 7231 | 0 | 495 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 4561 | 7725 | 180 | 1033 | 199 | 0 |
| 7 | 5622 | 7737 | 915 | 1554 | 476 | 0 |
| 8 | 6402 | 6459 | 163 | 1134 | 523 | 9 |
| 9 | 5010 | 7805 | 257 | 853 | 197 | 67 |
| 10 | 2767 | 8188 | 380 | 879 | 0 | 267 |
| TOTAL: | 61774 | 68656 | 2086 | 8594 | 1845 | 392 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 25 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| PCP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| DNP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| PCP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DNP | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1966; 6% THRESHOLD.
CWP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 26 | 24 | 0 | | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 26 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 24 |
| Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 24 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1971. PARTYWISE CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 4.
Total number of seats is 55.
Total number of districts is 10.

Seats available in each district:

| District: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of seats: | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 55. |

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7728 | 8266 | 204 | 0 |
| 2 | 11827 | 5293 | 43 | 8 |
| 3 | 11354 | 6888 | 55 | 22 |
| 4 | 10288 | 6324 | 36 | 0 |
| 5 | 8151 | 8130 | 23 | 0 |
| 6 | 6664 | 9332 | 349 | 0 |
| 7 | 7617 | 11032 | 682 | 26 |
| 8 | 8480 | 8631 | 171 | 0 |
| 9 | 7232 | 9392 | 165 | 27 |
| 10 | 6107 | 7465 | 28 | 19 |
| TOTAL: | 85448 | 80753 | 1756 | 102 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT and SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 27 | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MLP | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 28 |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 27 |
| Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MLP | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 28 |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| TOTAL | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 55 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 26 | 1 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 55 |

ELECTION OF 1976. PARTYWISE CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7537 | 7408 | 0 |
| 2 | 11282 | 4346 | 0 |
| 3 | 10400 | 5497 | 0 |
| 4 | 9639 | 6051 | 0 |
| 5 | 9193 | 6420 | 0 |
| 6 | 9300 | 7455 | 0 |
| 7 | 8446 | 7492 | 11 |
| 8 | 6442 | 8969 | 0 |
| 9 | 7554 | 8898 | 0 |
| 10 | 5647 | 9875 | 24 |
| 11 | 7388 | 8564 | 0 |
| 12 | 6134 | 9501 | 0 |
| 13 | 6892 | 9075 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 105854 | 99551 | 35 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 31 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MLP | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 34 |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 31 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 33 |
| MLP | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 32 |

ELECTION OF 1981. PARTYWISE CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8240 | 7786 | 9 |
| 2 | 11871 | 5207 | 0 |
| 3 | 10355 | 6375 | 0 |
| 4 | 9972 | 6848 | 0 |
| 5 | 9949 | 7569 | 0 |
| 6 | 9316 | 8333 | 0 |
| 7 | 9267 | 8210 | 13 |
| 8 | 6923 | 10945 | 0 |
| 9 | 6673 | 10856 | 0 |
| 10 | 6282 | 10793 | 0 |
| 11 | 7604 | 10048 | 0 |
| 12 | 6550 | 10999 | 0 |
| 13 | 6988 | 10165 | 7 |
| TOTAL: | 109990 | 114134 | 29 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |

Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1987. PARTYWISE CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8800 | 8396 | 30 |
| 2 | 12486 | 5808 | 23 |
| 3 | 11417 | 6486 | 14 |
| 4 | 10223 | 7412 | 21 |
| 5 | 10139 | 8284 | 14 |
| 6 | 10080 | 8746 | 27 |
| 7 | 9154 | 8366 | 42 |
| 8 | 7016 | 11227 | 74 |
| 9 | 6962 | 11884 | 71 |
| 10 | 6135 | 11259 | 78 |
| 11 | 7156 | 11438 | 57 |
| 12 | 7393 | 10986 | 60 |
| 13 | 7975 | 9429 | 0 |
| TOTAL: | 114936 | 119721 | 511 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |

Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1992. PARTYWISE CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8153 | 10179 | 242 |
| 2 | 12680 | 6100 | 325 |
| 3 | 11936 | 7270 | 346 |
| 4 | 10061 | 7494 | 337 |
| 5 | 11852 | 7616 | 325 |
| 6 | 10241 | 8293 | 241 |
| 7 | 6960 | 11792 | 385 |
| 8 | 7030 | 11247 | 365 |
| 9 | 7808 | 10956 | 418 |
| 10 | 5025 | 13426 | 383 |
| 11 | 7337 | 12275 | 421 |
| 12 | 8249 | 10305 | 278 |
| 13 | 7529 | 10979 | 120 |
| TOTAL: | 114861 | 127932 | 4186 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 30 | 1 |

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1992. THRESHOLD OF 5%.
AD eliminated.

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 31 | 0 |

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

Fictitious election. No threshold.

Number of parties is 6.
Total number of seats is 50.
Total number of districts is 10.
Seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3200 | 2100 | 100 | 921 | 930 | 925 |
| 2 | 2200 | 3100 | 110 | 980 | 990 | 985 |
| 3 | 4100 | 1200 | 989 | 930 | 910 | 950 |
| 4 | 2100 | 3221 | 980 | 970 | 982 | 994 |
| 5 | 1100 | 4050 | 970 | 981 | 902 | 911 |
| 6 | 1120 | 1050 | 3050 | 910 | 940 | 980 |
| 7 | 2500 | 3010 | 950 | 960 | 970 | 975 |
| 8 | 3020 | 2400 | 960 | 943 | 921 | 910 |
| 9 | 2500 | 3500 | 950 | 960 | 965 | 948 |
| 10 | 2500 | 980 | 3022 | 981 | 982 | 978 |
| TOTAL: | 24340 | 24611 | 12081 | 9536 | 9492 | 9556 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTIES: | B | A | C | F | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 14 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

continued ...

Fictitious election continued ...

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Districtwise divisor: EQUAL PROPORTIONS only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Districtwise divisor: DANISH only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| A | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

Fictitious election continued.
National threshold of 12%.
Parties D, E, F eliminated.

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTIES: | B | A | C | F | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 20 | 20 | 10 | | | |

Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

Districtwise divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

## APPENDIX V.

## PRIORITY CALCULATIONS WITH DIFFERENT DIVISORS

## FOR THE ELECTIONS 1962-1992.

ELECTION OF 1962. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold assumed.

Number of parties is 7
Total number of seats is 50
Total number of districts is 10
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | CWP | DNP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5532 | 7556 | 795 | 979 | 1720 | 143 | 0 |
| 2 | 9170 | 4359 | 178 | 1672 | 937 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 6512 | 4908 | 269 | 1704 | 656 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 6919 | 6226 | 245 | 681 | 505 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 4860 | 7051 | 404 | 1069 | 784 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 3457 | 7072 | 621 | 1579 | 1419 | 247 | 0 |
| 7 | 4493 | 6152 | 2397 | 1489 | 2285 | 152 | 0 |
| 8 | 5292 | 5588 | 697 | 1853 | 1399 | 116 | 0 |
| 9 | 3896 | 7368 | 981 | 1366 | 1353 | 41 | 0 |
| 10 | 843 | 6982 | 703 | 1893 | 2910 | 0 | 128 |
| TOTAL: | 50974 | 63262 | 7290 | 14285 | 13968 | 699 | 128 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 22 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to EQUAL PROPORTION; all same:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 21 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 21 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: DANISH only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 20 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 3 | | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1962. Threshold 5%.
PCP eliminated.
NATIONWIDE Divisor: D'HONDT:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 22 | 18 | 5 | 5 | | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 22 | 18 | 5 | 5 | | | |

District divisors: D'HONDT:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |

District divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |

District divisor: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 22 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1962. National threshold of 9.3%.
DNP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE Divisor: D'HONDT:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 25 | 20 | 5 | | | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to EQUAL PROPORTIONS; all same:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 20 | 6 | | | | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: DANISH only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 20 | 6 | | | | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| CWP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1962. National threshold of 10%.
CWP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE Divisor: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | DNP | PCP | DCP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 22 | 0 | | | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

District divisors: D'HONDT only:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED only:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 28 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |

| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

ELECTION OF 1966. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No Threshold.

Number of parties is 6
Total number of seats is 50
Total number of districts is 10
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | CWP | DNP | IND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6151 | 7623 | 191 | 747 | 351 | 0 |
| 2 | 9517 | 4771 | 0 | 598 | 0 | 20 |
| 3 | 7756 | 5356 | 0 | 954 | 99 | 0 |
| 4 | 7812 | 5761 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 29 |
| 5 | 6176 | 7231 | 0 | 495 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 4561 | 7725 | 180 | 1033 | 199 | 0 |
| 7 | 5622 | 7737 | 915 | 1554 | 476 | 0 |
| 8 | 6402 | 6459 | 163 | 1134 | 523 | 9 |
| 9 | 5010 | 7805 | 257 | 853 | 197 | 67 |
| 10 | 2767 | 8188 | 380 | 879 | 0 | 267 |
| 2TOTAL: | 61774 | 68656 | 2086 | 8594 | 1845 | 392 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | PCP | DNP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 25 | 22 | 3 | | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | PCP | DNP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 22 | 3 | 1 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 24 |
| MLP | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to EQUAL PROPORTIONS:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | PCP | DNP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DNP | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: DANISH only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | PCP | DNP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 24 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DNP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| MLP | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 21 |
| CWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DNP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1966. National threshold of 6%.
CWP eliminated.

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | CWP | PCP | DNP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 26 | 24 | | | |

DISTRICTS: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 TOTAL

District divisors: D'HONDT only:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 26 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 24 |

District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 24 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

ELECTION OF 1971. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 4
Total number of seats is 55
Total number of districts is 10
Seats available in each district:

| District: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number: | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5. |

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7728 | 8266 | 204 | 0 |
| 2 | 11827 | 5293 | 43 | 8 |
| 3 | 11354 | 6888 | 55 | 22 |
| 4 | 10288 | 6324 | 36 | 0 |
| 5 | 8151 | 8130 | 23 | 0 |
| 6 | 6664 | 9332 | 349 | 0 |
| 7 | 7617 | 11032 | 682 | 26 |
| 8 | 8480 | 8631 | 171 | 0 |
| 9 | 7232 | 9392 | 165 | 27 |
| 10 | 6107 | 7465 | 28 | 19 |
| TOTAL: | 85448 | 80753 | 1756 | 102 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT to SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED; all same:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 27 | | |

DISTRICTS: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 TOTAL

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 28 |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 27 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | PCP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 28 | 26 | 1 | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 28 |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| PCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 55 |

ELECTION OF 1976. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3
Total number of seats is 65
Total number of districts is 13
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7537 | 7408 | 0 |
| 2 | 11282 | 4346 | 0 |
| 3 | 10400 | 5497 | 0 |
| 4 | 9639 | 6051 | 0 |
| 5 | 9193 | 6420 | 0 |
| 6 | 9300 | 7455 | 0 |
| 7 | 8446 | 7492 | 11 |
| 8 | 6442 | 8969 | 0 |
| 9 | 7554 | 8898 | 0 |
| 10 | 5647 | 9875 | 24 |
| 11 | 7388 | 8564 | 0 |
| 12 | 6134 | 9501 | 0 |
| 13 | 6892 | 9075 | 0 |
| TOTAL: | 105854 | 99551 | 35 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 31 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MLP | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 34 |
| PN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 31 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| PARTY: | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

District divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; all same:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 33 |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 32 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1981. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8240 | 7786 | 9 |
| 2 | 11871 | 5207 | 0 |
| 3 | 10355 | 6375 | 0 |
| 4 | 9972 | 6848 | 0 |
| 5 | 9949 | 7569 | 0 |
| 6 | 9316 | 8333 | 0 |
| 7 | 9267 | 8210 | 13 |
| 8 | 6923 | 10945 | 0 |
| 9 | 6673 | 10856 | 0 |
| 10 | 6282 | 10793 | 0 |
| 11 | 7604 | 10048 | 0 |
| 12 | 6550 | 10999 | 0 |
| 13 | 6988 | 10165 | 7 |
| TOTAL: | 109990 | 114134 | 29 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | OTH |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| District Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1987. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8800 | 8396 | 30 |
| 2 | 12486 | 5808 | 23 |
| 3 | 11417 | 6486 | 14 |
| 4 | 10223 | 7412 | 21 |
| 5 | 10139 | 8284 | 14 |
| 6 | 10080 | 8746 | 27 |
| 7 | 9154 | 8366 | 42 |
| 8 | 7016 | 11227 | 74 |
| 9 | 6962 | 11884 | 71 |
| 10 | 6135 | 11259 | 78 |
| 11 | 7156 | 11438 | 57 |
| 12 | 7393 | 10986 | 60 |
| 13 | 7975 | 9429 | 0 |
| TOTAL: | 114936 | 119721 | 511 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 33 | 32 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| District Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 32 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

ELECTION OF 1992. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 3.
Total number of seats is 65.
Total number of districts is 13.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | MLP | PN | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8153 | 10179 | 242 |
| 2 | 12680 | 6100 | 325 |
| 3 | 11936 | 7270 | 346 |
| 4 | 10061 | 7494 | 337 |
| 5 | 11852 | 7616 | 325 |
| 6 | 10241 | 8293 | 241 |
| 7 | 6960 | 11792 | 385 |
| 8 | 7030 | 11247 | 365 |
| 9 | 7808 | 10956 | 418 |
| 10 | 5025 | 13426 | 383 |
| 11 | 7337 | 12275 | 421 |
| 12 | 8249 | 10305 | 278 |
| 13 | 7529 | 10979 | 120 |
| TOTAL: | 114861 | 127932 | 4186 |

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT only:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 30 | 1 |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 30 |
| AD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

This last array is also the distribution obtained by all the remaining divisor combinations, namely, Sainte Lague modified to Danish nationwide, combined with any divisor for the districts.

ELECTION OF 1992. National threshold of 5%.
AD eliminated.

NATIONWIDE Divisors: D'HONDT to DANISH; ALL SAME:

| PARTY: | PN | MLP | AD |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 34 | 31 | |

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| District divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PN | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 |
| MLP | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 |

FICTITIOUS ELECTION. PRIORITY CALCULATION.
No threshold.

Number of parties is 6.
Total number of seats is 50.
Total number of districts is 10.
Number of seats available in each district is 5.

VOTES OF EACH PARTY BY DISTRICT:

| DISTRICT | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3200 | 2100 | 100 | 921 | 930 | 925 |
| 2 | 2200 | 3100 | 110 | 980 | 990 | 985 |
| 3 | 4100 | 1200 | 989 | 930 | 910 | 950 |
| 4 | 2100 | 3221 | 980 | 970 | 982 | 994 |
| 5 | 1100 | 4050 | 970 | 981 | 902 | 911 |
| 6 | 1120 | 1050 | 3050 | 910 | 940 | 980 |
| 7 | 2500 | 3010 | 950 | 960 | 970 | 975 |
| 8 | 3020 | 2400 | 960 | 943 | 921 | 910 |
| 9 | 2500 | 3500 | 950 | 960 | 965 | 948 |
| 10 | 2500 | 980 | 3022 | 981 | 982 | 978 |
| TOTAL: | 24340 | 24611 | 12081 | 9536 | 9492 | 9556 |

ALL NATIONWIDE DIVISORS give:

| PARTIES: | B | A | C | F | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 14 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5. |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: D'HONDT only:

Districtwise Divisor D'HONDT:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor SAINTE LAGUE:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor EQUAL PROPORTIONS:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor DANISH:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to EQUAL PROPORTIONS:

Districtwise Divisor D'HONDT:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor SAINTE LAGUE:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor EQUAL PROPORTION:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

Districtwise Divisor DANISH:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| A | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| F | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: DANISH only:

The seat distribution is identical to the above, except when the district divisor is Sainte Lague modified, when the distribution is similar to the first one given on this page.

FICTITIOUS ELECTION. National threshold of 12%.

Parties D, E, F eliminated.

ALL NATIONWIDE DIVISORS ALL give:

| PARTY: | B | A | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEATS: | 20 | 20 | 10 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISOR: D'HONDT only:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District divisors: D'HONDT only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| District Divisors: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to EQUAL PROPORTIONS: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| District Divisor: DANISH only: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 |

NATIONWIDE DIVISORS: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED to DANISH; all same:

| DISTRICTS: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Districtwise divisor: D'HONDT: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE MODIFIED: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Districtwise divisor: SAINTE LAGUE: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| Districtwise divisors: EQUAL PROPORTIONS to DANISH: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| A | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| DIST. TOTALS: | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |

APPENDIX VI.

COMPARISON OF PARTYWISE AND PRIORITY METHODS

WITH NATIONWIDE D'HONDT DIVISORS

FOR DIFFERENT DIVISORS IN THE DISTRICTS.

ELECTIONS 1962-1992.

NB: ALL THE FOLLOWING COMPARISONS ARE BETWEEN METHODS WITH THE D'HONDT DIVISOR FOR THE NATIONWIDE CALCULATIONS. THESE METHODS ARE COMPARED WHEN DIFFERENT DIVISORS ARE CHOSEN FOR THE DISTRICTS.

ELECTION OF 1962. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt to Danish.
NOT =
Priority : d'Hondt, Modified St Lague; Sainte Lague to Danish.

All three groups of distributions are different.

D'Hondt priority concentrates 2 seats of the PCP in District 7, and 2 seats of the DNP in District 10. This is not done in the Sainte Lague priority method. This method also gives a better distribution for the DNP and the PN than does the partywise method for any choice of divisor. It gives a seat to the DNP in the 6th rather than the 9th district, and gives 3 seats to the PN in the 9th rather than the in the 6th district, making it fairer than its counterparts.

ELECTION OF 1962. 5% Threshold.
PCP eliminated.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt to Danish.
NOT =
Priority : d'Hondt, Modified St Lague; Sainte Lague to Danish.

All three groups of distributions are different.

The partywise method (with any district divisor) concentrates 2 seats of the PCP in district 7, whilst the priority method with the d'Hondt divisor awards 2 seats to the DNP in the tenth district. The Sainte Lague priority method does not do this. This method also gives a better distribution for the CWP, the DNP and the PN. It gives a seat to the CWP in the 3rd rather than the 9th district, it transfers one DNP seat from the 7th to the 6th district, and awards 3 seats to the PN in the 9th rather than the 6th district.

ELECTION OF 1962. 9.3% Threshold.
DNP eliminated.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT =
Priority : d'Hondt, Modified St Lague; Sainte Lague to Danish.

There are four groups of methods, all different from each other.

All the partywise methods concentrate 2 CWP seats in the 10th district, and award a seat to this party in the 7th District, where it is not so strong. Conversely, the priority methods move one Gozo seat and the seat in the seventh district to the 2nd and 3rd districts, where the CWP is strong.

The d'Hondt partywise method gives an inversion in the 4th District, whilst the d'Hondt priority method gives an inversion in the 7th District. The Sainte Lague priority method does not yield any inversion. It is also interesting to note that this method awards one seat to the MLP in the tenth District.

ELECTION OF 1962. 10% Threshold.
CWP eliminated.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt to Danish.
NOT =
Priority : d'Hondt, Modified St Lague; Sainte Lague to Danish.

There three groups of distributions all different from one another.

The partywise methods yield an inversion in the 4th and 7th Districts. The priority d'Hondt produces an inversion in the 7th District.

By contrast, the Sainte Lague priority method does not give rise to any inversion, and seems to be the best option.

ELECTION OF 1966. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT = =
Priority : d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.

There are three groups of distributions all different from one another.

Partywise d'Hondt : CWP awarded seats in districts 2, 7 and 8;
Partywise Priority: CWP awarded seats in districts 6, 7 and 8;
Mod St Lague to Danish: CWP awarded seats in districts 7, 8, 10.
(Partywise or priority)

The relevant districts in descending order of CWP strength are: 7, 8 and 6, all closely followed by district 10. The CWP has only a moderate following in the second district. There are no inversions in this district for any of the three groups of methods.

ELECTION OF 1966. 6% Threshold.
CWP eliminated.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT = =
Priority : d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.

There are three groups of distributions all different from one another.
The difference between these methods lies in Districts 2, 7 and 10
as follows.

| Method | Party | District 2 | 7 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Partywise d'Hondt | PN | 2 | 2* | 4 |
| | MLP | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Priority d'Hondt | PN | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| | MLP | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Mod Sainte Lague-Danish (Partywise or Priority) | PN | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | MLP | 3 | 2 | 2 |

* signifies an inversion.

All methods give an inversion in the 8'th district for this election.

ELECTION OF 1971. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT =
Priority : d'Hondt to Danish.

All three groups of methods are different from one another.

Partywise d'Hondt gives an inversion in the 1st district.

Partywise Sainte Lague modified to Danish give an inversion in 1st and
10th districts.

Priority d'Hondt to Danish does not yield any inversion. Also the
distribution is identical to the actual election.

ELECTION OF 1976. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt to Danish.
=
Priority : d'Hondt to Danish.

All methods are identical and equal to the actual election.

ELECTION OF 1981. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT = =
Priority : d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.

There are three groups of distributions all different from one another.
The difference between these methods lies in Districts 2, 6 and 10 as follows.

| Method | Party | District 2 | 6 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Partywise d'Hondt | PN | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| | MLP | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Priority d'Hondt | PN | 1 | 3* | 3 |
| | MLP | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Sainte Lague Mod-Danish (Partywise or Priority) | PN | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | MLP | 3 | 3 | 2 |

* signifies an inversion.

It is interesting to note that all methods give an inversion in the first district for this election. This is equivalent to a seat swap to restore a districtwise result to nationwide proportionality.

ELECTION OF 1987. No Threshold.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.
NOT = =
Priority : d'Hondt ; Modified Sainte Lague to Danish.

There are three groups of distributions all different from one another.

The difference between these methods lies in Districts 2, 7 and 10 as follows.

| Method | Party | District 2 | 7 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Partywise d'Hondt | PN | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| | MLP | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Priority d'Hondt | PN | 1 | 3* | 3 |
| | MLP | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Sainte Lague Mod-Danish (Partywise or Priority) | PN | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | MLP | 3 | 3 | 2 |

* signifies an inversion.

All methods give an inversion in the first district for this election.

ELECTION OF 1992. No Threshold.

District divisor:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Partywise: | d'Hondt ; | Modified Sainte Lague to Danish. | |
| | NOT = | | NOT = |
| Priority : | d'Hondt ; | Modified Sainte Lague to Danish. | |

There are four groups of distributions all different from one another.

In this election the MLP cedes one seat to the AD in a district depending on the method and divisor used. The d'Hondt partywise awards the seat in the second district - this is the least satisfactory of all. The other methods award this seat in the 9th, 10th or 11th districts, where the AD is strongest with 2% of the relevant district's total vote. It is clear that when the district percentages are very near each other as in this case, it is mainly a matter of chance which of the three districts will get the AD seat!

ELECTION OF 1992. 5% Threshold.
AD eliminated.

District divisor:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Partywise: | d'Hondt ; | Modified Sainte Lague to Danish. | |
| | = | | = |
| Priority : | d'Hondt ; | Modified Sainte Lague to Danish. | |

There are two groups of distributions which are different from each other.

D'Hondt for both methods gives MLP: PN = 4 : 1 in second district,
and MLP: PN = 1 : 4 in tenth district;

Modified Sainte Lague to Danish for both partywise and priority methods give the corresponding ratios in these two districts as 3 : 2 and 2 : 3 respectively.

FICTITIOUS ELECTION. No Threshold.

District divisor:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Partywise: | d'Hondt to Danish: all different. | |
| | NOT = | |
| Priority : | d'Hondt to Danish: all different. | |

All ten methods are different from one another.

The partywise methods all give two seats to party E in the 9th District, where it is of only average strength.

The priority Sainte Lague method gives a better distribution for parties D and E. Party C has one seat transferred from District 4 to District 8, where it is of comparable strength. Distributions of

parties A and B are reasonable for both partywise and priority methods.

FICTITIOUS ELECTION. 12% Threshold.
Parties D, E, F eliminated.

District divisor:

Partywise: d'Hondt ; Modified St Lague to Danish.
NOT = = NOT=
Priority : d'Hondt ; Mod St Lague to Eq prop; Danish.

There are four groups of methods, all different from one another.

The partywise and priority methods with Sainte Lague divisors give identical distributions in this case.