INFORMATION NOTE

Election debates in selected places

1. Background

1.1 Election debates, or election forums as known in Hong Kong, provide a platform for voters to learn more about the candidates so that they can cast an informed vote. Candidates also make use of election debates as an avenue for campaigning and building support for their electioneering. Many democracies hold live televised debates during the election campaigns, which constitute an integral part of the electoral process.

1.2 The Panel on Constitutional Affairs will hold a meeting on 15 April 2013 to discuss, among other things, the format of election forums for the Legislative Council Election. To facilitate members' deliberation, this information note studies the presidential/prime ministerial election debates in the United States ("US"), the United Kingdom ("UK"), Canada and Australia in terms of:

(a) invitation to participate;

(b) preparation of questions;

(c) format of debates;

(d) the role of moderator; and

(e) the live audience.

The salient features of the election debates in the places studied are highlighted in the Appendix for cross-country comparisons. As there is no specific legislation governing election debates in the selected places, the study is based on the respective rules and practices governing the latest election debates held in these places.
2. The United States

2.1 The US has a long history of election debates. It dates back to 1960 when the country held the first televised presidential debate between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy. At present, presidential debates are produced by the Commission on Presidential Debates ("CPD"), which was established as a non-profit corporation in 1987 and has sponsored each debate since 1988¹.

2.2 During the latest 2012 general election, CPD had hosted four election debates, three for the presidential nominees and one for the vice-presidential nominees. The three presidential debates were held in October 2012 between the Democratic nominee, the incumbent President Barack Obama, and the Republican nominee, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. In addition to the general rules set by CPD, the two campaigns signed a memorandum of understanding governing technical and administrative details of the debates.

Invitation to participate

2.3 There were no rules and practices requiring the invitation of all candidates to participate in the election debates. CPD had a set of criteria to determine whether to include a particular candidate in the debates. The purpose of the criteria was to "identify those candidates who have achieved a level of electoral support such that they realistically are considered to be among the principal rivals for the Presidency". Specifically, candidates should meet all the following three criteria for inclusion:

(a) satisfying the constitutional requirements for presidential eligibility;

¹ Senior staff and board members of CPD are all prominent Democratic and Republican leaders. Such a make-up has been subject to criticism, both domestically and internationally, alleging that CPD is a bipartisan organization acting to insulate the two major parties from challenges and questions.
(b) getting their names appear on enough state ballots to have at least a mathematical chance of securing an Electoral College majority in the 2012 general election\(^2\); and

(c) garnering a level of support of at least 15% of the national electorate as determined by five selected national public opinion polling organizations, using the average of those organizations' most recently publicly-reported opinion pools at the time of determination\(^3,4\).

Preparation of questions

2.4 For the first and third election debates, the moderators selected and announced the discussion topics several weeks before the debates. Citizens could send their questions to the moderators, who would then screen the questions and decide what to ask the candidates during election debates.

2.5 The second debate took the form of a "town hall meeting", in which the live audience asked questions on domestic and foreign policy. Before the debate, the audience members were asked to submit their questions in writing to the moderator. The moderator screened and selected questions to be posed to the candidates. He or she had to ensure that the audience members posed a balance of questions on domestic and foreign policy, as well as eliminating any questions that deemed inappropriate. No third party was permitted to see the questions before the debate.

\(^2\) According to the Constitution, a candidate must receive an absolute majority of votes in the Electoral College, i.e. at least 270 out of the 538 electoral votes, to become President.

\(^3\) In the view that candidates who get 5% votes in the election are qualified for public funding, the threshold of 15% has been criticized as too high.

\(^4\) Four candidates met the first two criteria. They were Democrat Barack Obama, Green Party's Jill Stein, Libertarian Gary Johnson, and Republican Mitt Romney. Only Obama and Romney also satisfied the third criterion to qualify for appearing in the debates. Johnson and Stein have filed lawsuits respectively against CPD, alleging its collusion with the Democratic and Republican parties to exclude third-party candidates and deprive their constitutional rights.
Format of debates

2.6 Candidates stood at podiums in the first debate and they seated at table with the moderator in the third debate. For the second debate, it was conducted as a "town hall meeting". According to the memorandum of understanding between the two campaigns, candidates might not ask each other direct questions during any of the debates. The formats for the three 90-minute debates are as follows:

First and third presidential debates

2.7 The first debate focused on domestic policy and the third on foreign policy. There were no opening statements and the debates were divided into six segments of approximately 15 minutes. Each segment centred on topics selected by the moderator and announced in advance of the debates. The moderator opened each segment with a question, and each candidate had two minutes to respond. This was followed by nine minutes of discussion between the moderator and two candidates for the question, during which the moderators had to ensure that candidates received an equal amount of time to comment. At the conclusion of the debate, each candidate was allowed to make a two-minute closing statement⁵.

Second presidential debate

2.8 The second debate took the form of a "town hall meeting", in which the live audience could pose questions directly to candidates on domestic and foreign policy. There were no opening and closing statements. Each candidate had two minutes to answer each question, followed by a two-minute rebuttal. Then the moderator posed follow-up questions, with each candidate allowed about one minute to respond.

⁵ The order of the closing statements was determined by coin toss.
Role of moderator

2.9 Each presidential debate was hosted by a single moderator. All of them were senior journalists with extensive experience in moderating. The major role of the moderators was to lead the questioning and ask follow-up questions when appropriate. In addition, the moderators were expected to use best efforts to ensure candidates speaking for approximately equal amounts of time during the course of each debate and within each segment of each debate. However, they seldom intervened when the candidates interrupted each other during the debates. In addition, the moderators also reminded the audience, other than those asking the selected questions in the second debate, to refrain from any participation in the debates except silent observation.

Live audience

2.10 A polling company selected 80 uncommitted floating voters from Nassau County of New York to attend the second debate. The company called the voters and only those who convinced the pollster of truly uncommitted were invited to attend the debate.

2.11 For all the three debates, each campaign was entitled to receive one-third of the available tickets, with the remaining one-third going to CPD. CPD allocated tickets in such a manner as to ensure that supporters of the two participating candidates would not sit in a block.

---

6 The second presidential debate was held at Hofstra University located in Nassau County of New York.
7 For the second debate, a total of 80 tickets were reserved for those selected by the polling station to attend the debate. The two campaigns and CPD were each entitled to one-third of the remaining tickets.
8 CPD invited officeholders, such as the US Senate and House Majority and Minority Leaders as well as the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the State hosting the event, to attend the debate. For the second debate, the President of the university hosting the debate was also invited.
2.12 In the first and third debates, there was no audience participation. The audience members were instructed by the moderator not to applaud, speak or participate in the debate by any means other than by silent observation. They were not allowed to make statements, speeches or comments. As to the second debate, some audience members could ask pre-selected questions as originally phrased without making any comments. They were not allowed to ask any follow-up questions or participate in the discussion. Indeed, the audience member's microphone were turned off immediately after he or she had completed asking the question.

3. The United Kingdom

3.1 In the UK, it was not until the 2010 general election that the country successfully held the first election debates. Leaders of the three main political parties, namely the Labour Party, the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats, agreed for the first time to participate in live election debates. Before that, there were several failed attempts to introduce the practice of election debates for reasons such as the lack of agreement between the political parties and broadcasters on the format of debates.

3.2 During the 2010 general election, there were three live televised leaders' debates between Gordon Brown of the Labour Party, David Cameron of the Conservative Party, and Nick Clegg of the Liberal Democrats. The election debates were broadcast over three successive Thursday evenings starting 15 April 2010. No single institution has been established to administer the debates. Each debate was produced by a different broadcaster using the same format. The first debate was produced and broadcast by Independent Television, the second by the British Sky Broadcasting, and the third by the British Broadcasting Corporation. Before the election debates, the three political parties and broadcasters reached agreement in December 2009 with respect to the key principles governing the format of the debates. A set of 76 detailed rules was subsequently announced on 1 March 2010.

9 In addition to the leaders' debates, the financial spokesmen of the three main political parties participated in a debate on 29 March 2010.
Invitation to participate

3.3 From the very beginning, and throughout the negotiations, the broadcasters had assumed that the election debates would involve just the leaders of the three main political parties. As such, no selection criteria were set for inviting candidates from other political parties\(^\text{10}\).

Preparation of questions

3.4 Each broadcaster had an editorial panel to pre-select the debate questions submitted by the live audience, as well as selecting questions from those submitted by the general public from around the UK by email\(^\text{11}\). Their choice had to meet the broadcasters’ legal obligations to provide fair and impartial coverage. That means, each question should be relevant to all three party leaders, with no question focusing on one party or one leader. In addition, all questions should be based on election issues.

3.5 The editorial panels used their editorial judgement to select questions and took into account factors such as the prominence of certain issues in the campaign, voters' interest, the distinctiveness of the different parties' policies on election issues, and issues relevant to the role of the Prime Minister. The selected questions were not shown to anyone outside the editorial team in advance of the debates.

---

\(^{10}\) Such an arrangement had invited criticism from small parties such as the Scottish National Party for their exclusion from the debates. To fulfil their legal obligations, the broadcasters organized election debates between 19 April and 5 May 2010 involving members of the three main political parties and representatives from the Green Party, the Scottish National Party, Plaid Cymru and the UK Independence Party. Such concession did not prevent the Scottish National Party from mounting an unsuccessful high-court challenge to be included in the prime-ministerial debates. See Allen, N. & Bartle, J., eds. (2010).

\(^{11}\) Each editorial panel consisted of five to seven members, including a designated chair who would have a casting vote if necessary. They met in private and made their final decisions on the questions to be selected just before the debates.
Format of debates

3.6 Unlike the US presidential election debates, where up to three different debate formats have been used, the 2010 leaders' debates all followed the same basic format as set out in the 76 rules earlier agreed. The debates ran without a commercial break for 90 minutes. Each leader opened with a one-minute statement, and closed with a one-and-a-half-minute speech, with the questions in between. The first half of the debate was themed on domestic affairs, foreign affairs and the economy respectively\textsuperscript{12,13}, with several sub-themes under each themed topic\textsuperscript{14}. The second half of the debate was on any subject.

3.7 During the debate, questions were asked by the audience members or read by the moderator. All questions were addressed to and answered by all three leaders. The leaders answered in turn for one minute\textsuperscript{15}. They then had an additional minute to respond to the other's answer. Following each question, there was a free debate for a maximum of four minutes.

Role of moderator

3.8 Each debate had a single moderator. They were senior journalists and presenters of current affairs and political programmes. The moderators were responsible for keeping the leaders to agreed time limits and ensuring a free flowing, fair debate conducted within the agreed rules. They might seek factual clarification where necessary, but it was not their role to criticize or comment on the leaders' answers. They seldom intervened even when the leaders questioned, argued and interrupted each other during the debates.

\textsuperscript{12} Independent Television took domestic affairs as the theme, whereas the British Sky Broadcasting focused on international affairs. For the British Broadcasting Corporation, it had economic affairs as the theme of the first half debate.

\textsuperscript{13} The first half of the debate was on the agreed theme but with the agreement of all the parties, in case of a major national or international event not included in the theme of the debate, the moderator would ask the leaders for their reaction to the development at the start of the debate before moving on to the theme.

\textsuperscript{14} For example, international affairs included, but not limited to, international relations, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, the Middle East and the UK defence.

\textsuperscript{15} The order of speaking was determined by drawing lots.
Live audience

3.9 The live audience for each debate was made up of around 200 people selected by polling company ICM, subject to venue capacity. ICM selected people mostly from within a 30-mile radius of the venue and representing a broadly demographic cross section of the country. The audience was chosen such that about 80% of them declared a voting intent, with the final selection to (a) ensure a ratio of 7:7:5 between Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat voters, and (b) include supporters of small parties. The remaining 20% of audience selected by ICM were undecided or floating voters. In addition to those selected by ICM, a small number of seats were reserved for people whose questions had been selected by the broadcaster's editorial panel.

3.10 In the themed half of the debate, the audience members could ask a maximum of three questions on a single sub-theme. In the unthemed half, the audience members could ask a maximum of two questions on a single subject. The number of questions outside the ICM selected audience was limited to a maximum of four questions per debate.

3.11 The audience members were restricted to asking the selected questions. In order to maximise the time available for viewers to hear the leaders discussing election issues with each other, the audience members were asked not to applaud during the debates. In addition, they were not allowed to cheer or boo.

4. Canada

4.1 Canada held its first televised leaders' debate during the federal election in 1968. Leaders of the then four main parties were invited to participate in the debate. Canada did not hold another debate until 1979. In 1984, there were two debates, one in English and one in French. Since then, leaders' debate has been conducted in both English and French over two consecutive nights.

---

16 See Hook (2010).
4.2 The latest leaders’ debate was held in 2011 between Stephen Harper of the Conservative Party, Michael Ignatieff of the Liberal Party, Jack Layton of the New Democratic Party, and Gilles Duceppe of the Bloc Québécois. The English debate was held on 12 April 2011 and the French debate on 13 April 2011. Both debates were produced by the Broadcasting Consortium\(^\text{17}\). The rules of debate were set out by the Broadcasting Consortium subject to the agreement of the participating political parties.

**Invitation to participate**

4.3 There were no rules requiring the invitation of all party leaders to participate in the debates. In the 2011 leaders’ debate, only the leaders of four recognized parties, namely the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party and the Bloc Québécois, were invited to participate.

4.4 According to the criteria for inclusion into the leaders’ debate, the political party represented by a participating candidate should have:

(a) representation in the House of Commons; and

(b) popular support of at least 5% in the most recent public opinion polls.

**Preparation of questions**

4.5 Citizens sent their questions to the Broadcasting Consortium via email, from which six would be selected for the English debate and another six for the French debate\(^\text{18}\). People asking the selected questions were invited to read out the questions before the camera, which would be videotaped and played back to the leaders on the debate nights.

---

\(^{17}\) The Broadcasting Consortium comprised the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation/Radio-Canada, the Canadian Television Network, the Global Television Network and the Télévision Associée.

\(^{18}\) Unlike their counterparts in the UK, the Canadian broadcasters did not announce the selection criteria for the questions to be asked in the leaders’ debate.
Format of debates

4.6 Both the two-hour English and French leaders' debates comprised six segments. There was no opening statement. Each segment began with a pre-selected question. Following the question, there was a six-minute one-on-one debate between two leaders. It would then be followed by a debate on the same topic open to all four leaders. At the conclusion of the election debate, each leader was allowed to present a brief closing statement.

Role of moderator

4.7 The English debate was hosted by a single moderator while the French debate was co-moderated by two moderators. All the three moderators were senior journalists and anchors of current affairs programmes. The moderators were expected to use their best endeavours to ensure equal treatment for all leaders, particularly avoiding any leader getting more air time than another. In addition, they seldom intervened in the leaders' debate.

---

19 The pairing and order of the one-on-one debates were determined by draws. Other arrangements of the debates such as podium positions and order of the leaders' closing arguments were also determined by draws to ensure that no preference was given to any political party. The draws were held about a week before the debates.

20 As commented by Steve Paikin, moderator of the English debate in 2011, "the responsibility of any moderator in any election debate is fairness. The candidates have to leave the studio thinking no one got special treatment. That means equal time at the very least, and the sense that all of them got their chance to make and respond to various points in the debate." See "Four Questions for Steve Paikin", Thought Out Loud, 19 October 2011.

21 According to Steve Paikin, "[i]t's not for me to interrupt every ten seconds. ... Maybe once or twice during a debate, I have interjected because I thought they were all dodging a question. But that's rare. I think people prefer to let the leaders work it out amongst themselves". See "Four Questions for Steve Paikin", Thought Out Loud, 19 October 2011.
Live audience

4.8 It was reported that there was a live audience of about 120 people in attendance that remained largely silent. They were not allowed to boo, shout, heckle or clap. Questions were pre-videotaped and there was no live question from the audience.

5. Australia

5.1 Australia has been broadcasting leaders' debate since 1984. The latest debate was the 2010 leaders' debate held on 25 July 2010 between Prime Minister Julia Gillard and Leader of the Opposition Tony Abbott. The Australian Broadcasting Corporation was the host provider of all the production and direction services to the debate. The National Press Club of Australia made arrangements for broadcasting of the debate. The rules of debate were established by the agreement of both political parties and the board of the National Press Club of Australia.

Invitation to participate

5.2 Leaders' debates in Australia have been a two-candidate debate between the leaders of the two major parties at the time. The 2010 leaders' debate invited the leaders of the two major parties, the Labor Party and the Liberal Party, to participate.

---

23 The leaders' debates have hitherto been organized by the political parties and broadcasters. Such an arrangement is likely to change in the near future. It was reported that the government was closed to establishing a leaders' debate commission entrusted with deciding when and where the debates would take place. See "Gillard hopeful of debates commission agreement", ABC News, 18 January 2013.
Preparation of questions

5.3 According to the rules agreed for the 2010 leaders' debate, the questions to be asked in the debate were prepared by a panel of three senior federal parliamentary journalists24.

Format of debate

5.4 The duration of the debate was one hour. The debate opened with a three-minute opening statement by both participating leaders25. The moderator then conducted a discussion allowing both leaders to pursue the major issues of the election campaign26. Each leader took questions in turn and they had a maximum of three minutes to answer questions and up to one minute for rebuttal. According to the rules agreed, the leaders would not ask questions of each other during the debate. Instead, they were questioned by a panel of three senior federal parliamentary journalists. The debate finished with the moderator asking a general question to both leaders in order to allow them to sum up for a maximum of three minutes. The leader who made the first opening statement was the first to make a closing statement.

Role of moderator

5.5 The debate was moderated by a political editor of Sky News. According to the rules agreed, the moderator should ensure that the two participating leaders were given equal treatment and time. The moderator would immediately intervene to prevent either leader from interrupting the other while speaking. The moderator might direct the executive producer to mute the microphone of the non-speaker to ensure questions were answered without interruption.

24 There is no further information available in the public domain about the preparation of questions for the leaders' debate.
25 A coin was tossed to determine who would make the first opening statement.
26 The issues were economy, foreign relations and security, health, education, environment, small business, regional and rural Australia, job creation, and general issues.
Live audience

5.6 There was a limited live audience made up of representatives of the political parties, the parliamentary press gallery and the National Press Club of Australia. No interaction between the live audience and the participating leaders was allowed. The audience members were expected to be kept silent as no audience microphones were permitted.
## Rules and practices governing the latest election debates held in the places studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitation to participate</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All candidates are invited to participate</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for inclusion</td>
<td>• Participating candidates should meet all of the following three criteria: (a) satisfying the constitutional requirements for presidential eligibility; (b) getting their names appear on enough state ballots to have at least a mathematical chance of securing an Electoral College majority; and (c) garnering a level of support of at least 15% of the national electorate as determined by five selected national public opinion polling organizations.</td>
<td>• No specific criteria. From the very beginning, and throughout the negotiations, the broadcasters had assumed that the debate would involve just the leaders of the three main parties.</td>
<td>• The political party represented by a participating candidate should have: (a) representation in the House of Commons; and (b) popular support of at least 5% in the most recent public opinion polls.</td>
<td>• No specific criteria. Leaders’ debates in Australia have been a two-candidate debate between the leaders of the two main parties at the time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation of questions</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions are selected before the debates</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posing questions</td>
<td>• Questions were posed by the live audience and the general public.</td>
<td>• Questions were posed by the live audience and the general public.</td>
<td>• Questions were posed by the general public.</td>
<td>• Questions were prepared by a panel of three senior federal parliamentary journalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of questions</td>
<td>• Questions were selected by the moderators.</td>
<td>• Questions were selected by each broadcaster's editorial panel.</td>
<td>• Questions were selected by the Broadcasting Consortium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix*
### Appendix (cont'd)

**Rules and practices governing the latest election debates held in the places studied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format of debates</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With specified theme</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Only for the first half of the debate. The second half was on any subject.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening statement</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>One minute for each candidate.</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>Three minutes for each candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Questions were asked by the moderator in the first and third debates, but by the audience members in the second debate.</td>
<td>Questions were asked by the audience members. Email questions were read by the moderator.</td>
<td>Questions were posed by the public using pre-videotaped segments.</td>
<td>Questions were asked by the panellists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering time</td>
<td>The first and third debates were divided into six 15-minute segments. Two candidates each had two minutes to answer the question. This was followed by nine minutes of discussion between the moderator and two candidates for the question.</td>
<td>Each leader had one minute to answer the question and one minute to respond to the other's answers. After that, there was a free debate between the leaders for up to four minutes.</td>
<td>The two-hour debates comprised six segments. Each segment began with a pre-selected question and was followed by six-minute one-on-one debate between two leaders. After that, there would be a debate on the same topic open to all four leaders.</td>
<td>Each leader had a maximum of three minutes to answer questions and up to one minute for rebuttal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal time to speak</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing statement</td>
<td>Two minutes for the first and third debates, and nil for the second debate.</td>
<td>One-and-a-half minute.</td>
<td>No specified time limit, but it should be brief.</td>
<td>A maximum of three minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rules and practices governing the latest election debates held in the places studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of moderator</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major role to play during the debate</strong></td>
<td>• The major role was to lead the questioning and to follow up when appropriate. They had to use best efforts to ensure that the two candidates speak for approximately equal amounts of time.</td>
<td>• The moderator should be fair to all candidates over the course of the debates. They might seek factual clarification, but not criticise or comment on the leaders' answers.</td>
<td>• The moderator should ensure that all participating leaders were given equal treatment.</td>
<td>• The moderator should ensure both leaders were given equal treatment and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handling of interruptions during the debate</strong></td>
<td>• The moderators seldom intervened when the candidates interrupted each other during the debates.</td>
<td>• The moderators seldom intervened when the leaders interrupted each other during the debates.</td>
<td>• The moderators seldom intervened in the debates.</td>
<td>• The moderator would immediately intervene to prevent either leader from interrupting the other while speaking. The moderator might direct the executive producer to mute the microphone of the non-speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rules and practices governing the latest election debates held in the places studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live audience</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>The two campaigns and the Commission on Presidential Debates (&quot;CPD&quot;) were each entitled to one-third of the tickets to the first and third debates.</td>
<td>Roughly 200 people representing a broadly demographic cross section of the country were selected by a polling company to attend the debates.</td>
<td>About 120 people attended the debate, but there is no information on the composition of the live audience.</td>
<td>A limited live audience made up of representatives of the political parties, the parliamentary press gallery and the National Press Club of Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the second debate, a total of 80 tickets were reserved for those audience members selected by a polling company to attend the debate. The two campaigns and CPD were each entitled to one-third of the remaining tickets.</td>
<td>The audience members were restricted to asking the selected questions.</td>
<td>Not allowed.</td>
<td>Not allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with the candidates</td>
<td>Not allowed except for the second debates where audience members could ask selected questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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