

Re: Complaint #35

I would like to express my disappointment with the use of this venue as a vehicle for rumour and innuendo. The allegations made against me were based on hearsay and gossip. At no point have I ever made slanderous comments to, nor do I hold any animosity toward Rigel Vincent and Kristina Kearly. Any personal matter that Rigel and I discussed was addressed in June 2004. Since then, any disagreements we may have had were within the normal functioning of the student association.

After several failed attempts to discuss KSA related matters with Rigel Vincent, I was forced to bring my concerns to Council. My reports were simply factual and any perceived unfounded bias should be easily dismissed by someone who has nothing to hide.

The 2/3 required signature motion was passed with the intent of promoting more democratic reports.

I would further like to note that at no point in time did I neglect any of my responsibilities as Campus Director. Please refer to the October 2004 reports in which I stated that due to medical reasons, I had to reduce my office hours. I also consulted with the General Manager, Penny Minor, to inform her of my current medical condition.

The only factual statement is that I resigned in November 2004. What this complaint failed to disclose is that I resigned for medical reasons.

I was forced to contact Rigel Vincent in response to a phone call my mother received from him on the evening of March 11, 2005. During this conversation with my mother, he implied that I am responsible for harassing phone calls that both Rigel Vincent and Kristina Kearly have been receiving. When I contacted Rigel Vincent to address this, he was surprised to hear from me and the conversation was both allusive and defensive.

Apart from this, I have made no contact with either, nor do I foresee any need to do so.

I regret even having to respond, but I refuse to endure such a groundless complaint and I challenge the writer (s) to come forth and provide proof of these accusations. Also, whom I decide to have lunch with is of no bearing on my hiring as Chief Poll Clerk. I find the mention of this indicative of the ridiculous use of gossip in this complaint to try to further discredit me.

In my closing remarks, I am still unclear as to why the Progressive Student Party objects to my hiring as Chief Poll Clerk. I was hired on Monday and within three days I ensured that there would be sufficient staff at each of the four polling stations. I organized the supply and collection of each ballot box and the necessary supplies required. As I foresee no conflict between my previous position and current temporary posting, I perceive this complaint as more vindictive than subjective.

I hope that any Progressive members are not being besmirched by someone's inappropriate use of this party's name on this complaint.

Ron Correll, CRO, KSA
12666 – 72nd Avenue
Surrey, BC, V3W 2M8

Tuesday, March 08, 2005

Dear Mr. Correll and members of the Elections Committee,

I wish to provide a formal response to the progressive complaint against myself and Ashveen Koonja in regards to leaflets being left within the polling area. I cannot speak for Mr. Takhar, as I did not campaign with him.

I can only say, with the utmost honesty, that this is not true. I am shocked and dismayed at this baseless complaint. Whenever I saw leaflets left lying around on campus, I would recover them, so that I could reuse them. Even at the end of the day, I would go around collecting leaflets, so I could reuse them. On Friday, I collected the leaflets, so that security & facilities would not be upset with the leafleting of classes, the cafeteria, etc. I also did this to ensure that none of my leaflets would come back to haunt me, as all material must be removed one week following the close of an election.

I stayed far away from the polling booth, I didn't even approach it to ask how many people had voted and the one time I did ask - I asked from afar, when there was no one voting.

The polling regulations clearly state that it is the poll clerk's duty to ensure that the polling stations are clear and free of debris. It is not a candidate's responsibility. If there were leaflets left by voters at the polling station, it is through no fault of my own. Again, this would come down to an irregularity as caused by the poll clerks, and their failure to abide by the duties as laid out for them in the regulations. It is my understanding that a similar occurrence happened in Surrey, which Lisa COAN complained about, but again, we did not specifically blame members of the RAF for this infraction, rather noted that it was an irregularity due to the failure of the poll clerks to follow the regulations.

I would further question how a Progressive member would observe this, as they shouldn't have had any reason to be near a polling station other than to vote. We observed the Surrey infraction at the time that Ms. COAN voted. The regulations clearly state that no loitering at a polling station is permitted by anyone. The only way I can think they would have observed this is if they had been looking down at candidates from their "perch" on the 2nd floor, directly above the polling station.

Sincerely,

Steven H. Lee

Ron Correll, CRO, KSA
12666 – 72nd Avenue
Surrey, BC, V3W 2M8

Tuesday, March 08, 2005

Dear Mr. Correll and members of the Elections Committee,

This is in response to the allegations made by the Progressive Party in regards to campaigning on the 2nd floor, directly above the polling booth.

On the first day of campaigning, Stella asked me where the tape should be placed to mark the boundaries of the ten meter boundary. As per past precedence, the tape was placed in all instances more than 10 meters away from the polling booth. I thought about doing the 2nd floor, but decided not to as I thought this would not become an issue.

Early Friday morning, Pavan Bassi asked us to clearly mark off the 10 meter boundary on the 2nd floor, as the regulations clearly state the buffer zone shall be 10 meters (or more, at the discretion of the committee) **IN ALL DIRECTIONS** from the polling station.

This was before I learned that the elections committee had been dissolved by the CRO. I nevertheless go by my original argument, made in a complaint regarding this issue – **RICHMOND CAMPUS IS A VERY LARGE CAMPUS**. There are many, many areas that are very far away from the polling station, areas that make campaigning fair. As I stated to Kristina, when she started complaining to me about the issue late on the last day of the elections, Rigel has been a candidate in many elections when this area has been a no-access zone, and he should have known better.

Sincerely,

Steven H. Lee

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 6? (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

This is a formal response to the election complaint filed by the Progressive Party, found on web link #2 of complaints (page 7 of 38) at yourksa.ca. It is incorrectly labeled as complaint # 6.

The RAF Party sincerely apologizes to members of Progressive who were campaigning within the “no-campaign” zone on February 24th, 2005 at the Richmond campus. Progressive members were apparently blinded because of a combination of camera flashes and “excessive natural light”. We apologize for photographing and videotaping Progressive members blatant disregard for election rules. This type of thing never should have happened, both the breaking of rules and camera flashes. We should have turned the flash off first.

What is most troubling are the injuries sustained by Progressive Party members from the combination of “excessive natural light” and camera flashes. The RAF Party would like to ensure all Progressive candidates who’s eyes sustained injury that all optometry costs will be covered by RAF. We apologize once again for traumatizing Progressive members while they broke electoral rules with scary camera flashes. We do hope that every victim makes a full recovery and that they can put this traumatic event behind them.

Thank You,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 10 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

The RAF Party would like to see some hard evidence regarding the allegations made by the Progressive Party. If “various” students have approached Progressive members stating that RAF candidates that they nominated are, in fact, not running for the positions they originally solicited, then it should be easy for those same students to come forward to the elections committee as they did when they approached Progressive members and clearly state what the name and position of the RAF candidate “originally” was. These students are either very concerned members of the society or liars.

Thank You,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 13 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

This complaint sums up the election pretty nicely. How should one response to such common sense? It almost seems comical, doesn't it? Great appreciation to the student who submitted such common sense, we all needed it...

Thank You,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT #29 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

The Progressive party clearly stated that members of the on-again off-again elections committee should never have been members of the committee from the beginning. Progressive singled out two members (Pavan Bassi & Erin Minor) and suggested that they would, or have already negatively influenced the outcome of the election because of their “affiliations” with CUPE, among other parties. Progressive, clearly pointed out that Sec.10, Article 1,5 states that;

“Prospective members of the Elections Committee holding positions in the Society other than positions on Council or the Executive Board shall become eligible to serve on the Elections Committee as soon as they resign from their other Society positions.”

It is clear the Progressive singled out these two individuals, who indeed hold other positions within the society, but failed to mention the fact the CRO also holds another position within the society. If Bassi and Minor should be removed, then what about Correll? Thanks to the Progressive Party for failing to mention only part of this slightly gigantic electoral violation.

Sincerely,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 31 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

The pictures attached to this complaint are absurd. The person is not visible nor is their clothing. The location cannot be determined and neither can the actions of the person ever be known. Was this person putting something up on the wall? Were they just looking? Were they even in the area alleged by Progressive? Were they wearing a RAF t-shirt?

No members of RAF were ever told that they were captured on camera and that they had committed a campaign violation? This would be a reasonable response for the Progressive Party to take because of the seriousness of the allegation.

After viewing the footage, one can only come to only a few safe conclusions: The photos are either of the lockness monster or big foot or perhaps the KSA election ghost who only comes out during this time just to confuse the elections committee even more than it already is. One last thought: the picture could be from the game show, "The Price is Right.", who is to say its not?

Take any guess, it may even be a picture from a 1930's pornography shoot...no one will ever know, so stop wasting time... The Progressive party never ceases to amaze though...

Thanks,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 33 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

Allegations made by Progressive and Ken McIntyre of CSI are serious and misleading. All RAF candidates are eligible for the positions they have solicited. The RAF Party has not broken any regulations or bylaws and would request the elections committee conduct a full investigation by interviewing the RAF Campaign manager that allegedly made such misleading remarks to his party members (as stated in complaint #33). If proof of eligibility is required, all RAF candidates are willing to cooperate. Aaron Takhar can be contacted @ [REDACTED] in order to speak with any RAF member. This response relates to all complaints pertaining to the eligibility of RAF candidates in this election.

Thank You,

RAF Party

RAF RESPONSE TO ELECTION COMPLAINT # 40 (as stated online at yourksa.ca)

This complaint submitted by Progressive is complete hearsay. RAF does not appreciate being associated with unnamed people that have allegedly committed campaign violations. What seems stupid is that certain incumbent members of Progressive work closely with the Policy Analyst and current CRO, so why would they hire someone who is still unnamed and has ties to RAF, as a poll clerk? This all seems a little strange... and oh, by the way, some proof of this allegation will indeed be helpful...

Thank You,

RAF Party