

To: Ron Correll,
From: The Progressive Student Party
Re: Official rebuttal to the Posted Election Complaints

The Progressive Party, (Hence forth to be duly noted in this document as the PP) would like to comment on the nature and validity of some of the complaints lodged against it and it's member-candidates. We request our rebuttal, after being viewed by the CRO, to be posted online to inspire dialogue, if he should find it so convenient.

#2

2-1: We believe this complaint frivolous for several reasons. The first being that the conversation RAF wrote their complaint about was in fact solicited by the students she was speaking with. These students, it seems, had been grossly misinformed about the circumstances surrounding the dismissal of several council members, and as Kristina Kearley had some authority on these matters (having been present for many of the proceedings), she felt responsible for dispelling the myths and misinformation. Secondly, students have the right to know about the students whom they are endorsing and why they should even consider signing a nomination package. It is unreasonable to expect that prospective candidates should go out and get signatures from students without speaking about why they would make a good candidate and their intentions around the election. It is also unreasonable to expect that members of different parties are to be forbidden from speaking to each other (either before, during, or after an election) unless there are real safety concerns. Dialogue between groups with different political perspectives is an essential element of a democracy, allowing for the possibility of compromise and understanding.

2-2: Then there was the issue of Mr. Vincent's MSN name. As anyone who sees the photo can see, Rigel's MSN merely advertised the election. It should also be noted that a MSN screen name is not generally available for viewing to students, making its classification as a form of campaigning tenuous at best.

2-3: The PP denies that any 'election meetings' were held in the KSA Office. A number of incumbents ran with the progressive party, and work together; however, working together does not constitute a party meeting. The complaints made by RAF on this issue are hear-say at best, and at worst random, defamatory allegations.

2-4: Free speech and the rights of the student candidates from the RAF party ensure that they may listen to, or speak to PP candidates without reprimand. The regulations do not speak restrict the ability of slates to speak with students, and probe their interest in running with the party that will win the election. If speaking to PP candidates leads a RAF candidate to switch slates, more power to them.

The Progressive Party would like to note that it believes these 'make-shift offences' were grossly exaggerated by the RAF party for the sole purpose of diluting attention to their own pre-election campaigning violation (of a serious nature) such as enlisting a Fish

bowl café employee to circulate RAF leaflets. An offence that has had a much more detrimental (and material) effect on the election; as well as having far reaching implications in regards to the ethics of the aforementioned party's leadership.

#3

Clearly, from the results of Kristina Kearley's conversations with Mediha Butt, the interaction was asked for and was not, in fact about voting for the PP, but rather to run with the PP. Congratulations to both Kristina and Mediha for getting along famously, and bringing compromise and greater representation to the students of Kwantlen.

#4

As has been stated within the complaint, the CRO has already addressed the issue. A verbal warning was issued.

The PP recommends dismissal of the complaint.

#7

The RAF party was told on Monday that no candidate could run on a campus they did not actively take classes at. The email here is dated Wednesday. The RAF party (specifically the RAF campaign manager) was under obligation to immediately contact the CRO after the all candidates meeting to deal with this promptly. Because of a RAF belated reaction, incorrect ballots were released, students were coopted into voting for a party that they mistakenly though was representative of more of the institution that it is. The PP believes this is another RAF attempt create the appearance of impropriety in the election to push the society into holding a re-run - because they believe they lost.

In actual fact, the impropriety is limited to the RAF party. This violation is of a serious nature, and has been acknowledged/confessed by the RAF party within their letter. An appropriately severe reprimand should be levied against, not only the students that were misled into running on campuses they were not attending (thereby lowering the number of candidates running against RAF in their own "ridings") but also against the RAF party for facilitating and benefiting from such an egregious violation.

#11

No penalty is appropriate as the leaflets were approved before distribution. In compliance with the CRO, the PP ceased distribution of all available fliers immediately after the CRO recalled them. Due to the fact that the progressive party never stated that they would be handing out the free food, and their immediate compliance with the CRO's ruling, we request this complaint be dismissed.

#12

All of the various members of the PP campaigning on the Richmond campus were

notified in the evening of the introduction of this form. All progressive party members campaigning at all campuses ceased proactive campaigning after the form was confirmed as coming from the CRO.

The Progressive party questions the validity of the form because it's origins and relation to the CRO's approval was unknown until late in the evening of its introduction. Due to the nature of the elections committee and it's (at the time) current standing with the society, the progressive party was unsure if it was an elections committee directed attempt to sabotage their campaigning efforts. The timeliness of it's presentation to our campaign manager, in relation to the other campaign managers was a major factor in our confusion in regards to this matter.

We request a further investigation into the origins of this sheet and it's availability to all candidates/campaign-managers.

It should also be noted that once the form was late (ie, for the slates not handing their forms in at the time of the all candidates meeting), the damage has already been done. The form does not affect the number of votes a party receives, therefore this complaint is of an immaterial nature.

The accusations being made in this complaint do not point to a serious violation as laid out in Section X, article 6 of the regulations. Please keep in mind, therefore, that the reprimands available to the elections committee/CRO are very limited.

#13

The PP objects to the consideration of anonymous complaints, as they are, by definition, impossible to confirm.

Listing this complaint only serves to defame the PP's campaign manager and candidate. We request the CRO to respond immediately to the PP if there is evidence to the contrary.

It should also be noted, that Ron Correll's boss, as CRO is the board of directors, which has very limited powers during an election. Outside of an election, Mr. Correll would answer to the General Manager of the KSA.

#17

Complaint **#17** should be brought against the Director of Operations in general Council. It is the understanding of the Progressive slate that this regulation change was submitted to Mrs. Penny Minor, General Manager for the KSA at the time of adoption, as a directive to post online and make available to the membership. While it is the Director of Operations responsibility to supervise the General Manager, it was her duty to follow through with the directive. Any repercussions due to malperformance of duty are confidential HR matters, and as such any remedies that were or were not made in regards to this complaint cannot be public. Unless he is implying that Nelson told her not to follow the directive. Perhaps Mr. Takhar is confused, because in such a case should direct

his complaint through the appropriate channels, like the society's board of directors, or the Executive Board of Directors.

#18

Complaint **#18** shows the extent of absurdity of the RAF party. The leadership of the RAF party is clearly showing that they believe that a level of ownership is achieved of prospective slate members. The PP is of the firm belief that human beings cannot be owned, nor was a contract signed restricting the availability of these students to make decisions of their own. In the event that a contract HAD been signed restricting these students from campaigning with another slate (if that's even legal), the obligations of that contract could not be known to the PP, nor could it obligate the PP in any which way.

#20

Complaint **#20** states that the reason for the dissolving of the elections committee was a disagreement between elections committee members and the CRO. The PP questions the legitimacy of any information that ANY candidates may have received about the operations of the elections committee, save their official, and public rulings. If the reason for the CRO's dissolution of the elections committee was in any way linked to impropriety of members of that committee, clearly that decision was very well justified, as shown by the hearsay of the RAF committee.

So, if the election committee did dissolve because of a disagreement, as the RAF party claims, then the dissolution was justified due to members of that committee leaking confidential information.

The PP recommends dismissal of this complaint.

In the future, a third party investigation into the facts around the dissolution of the elections committee would be appropriate. This third party investigator is allowed for under the elections regulations.

#21

In complaint **#21** the PP marvels at the long windedness of all student politicians and enmass agrees to light a candle for the sanity of the souls forced to deal with the unique personalities attracted to student politics.

It seems odd to the PP that those complaining about the absence of the party member registration from would feel justified in ceasing the PP's campaigning. The regulations do not, anywhere, state that those failing to submit a written and signed party list are prohibited from campaigning. Such a decision would have to be made by the elections committee/CRO. From the PP's correspondence with the CRO, he did not feel it would appropriate to cease campaigning, but requested that the PP expedite the completion of the PP candidate list.

The PP registered its candidates at the next available opportunity after requested by the

CRO.

This complaint should be thrown out solely for its extreme redundancies and excessive verbiage, but in lieu of that, perhaps the fact that Mr. Lee decides to validate gossip in his report, even after naming it thus. The PP politely reminds Mr. Lee to use his common sense as much as his initiative and to quote regulation freely, but leave its interpretation to the persons responsible for interpreting, lest his dotting public perceive him as offensive.

Mr. Lee has also failed to mention that his candidates also have a professional relationship with Mr. Correll as incumbents. It is our understanding that Mr. Correll has the same degree of respect for Mr. Koonja, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Woo, and Mr. Lee as he has for Jeff Nelson, Matt Vu, Kristina Kearley, and Rigel Vincent. Would this not make Correll biased towards him too? But Mr. Lee makes no mention of his own candidates, instead he speaks with a sweeping self-righteousness on behalf of all candidates. It should also be noted that Mr. Lee voted in favour of appointing Correll as the CRO initially.

If nothing else this complaint should be thrown out because it is a rampant self-promoting attack on the CRO for no other reason than Mr. Lee believes he can wield a pen to his benefit with fantastical attacks on groups more successful than his own assembled coteries.

If bias truly was an issue of concern, he could have simply requested the results of the election and all materials used to bring it to conclusion be submitted to a third party. This could have been done without attacking the CRO and the Progressive party. This complaint does little aside from speak to the pettiness of the CSI slate.

The PP apologizes for the excessive length of its response to this particular complaint, but honour demands a reply to the unfettered abuse contained therein.

#23

In complaint **#23** CSI brings the society's director of finance to the chopping block. Mr. McDonald has never attempted to cover his bias against certain parties or persons... namely Mr. Lee, Lisa Coan, and Aaron Takhar. However, he never once has, at any time declared open favour of the progressive party. If Mr. McDonald was to have a conversation with Mr. Correll in regards to the election, much less have materials, all parties involved should be thoroughly outraged. We challenge Steve Lee and CSI to put their investigative noses to the grindstone and procure physical evidence of such interactions and 'influence' or maybe even an outside and unbiased witness or two. Until that is done this complaint should be dismissed and regarded as slander.

#24

In regards to complaint **#24**, the PP has photo evidence of Mr. Lee with his back to the library wall, and in other eccentric positions trying to include progressive members in a

shot of the polling booth and the second floor landing. We request CSI to provide us with evidence in the regulations that being able to see a candidate from the far outer line of the polling booth no-campaign zone is illegal. If that were the case, the entire RAF and PP and CSI slates should be disqualified for campaigning in view of the booth on Surrey, Langley, and Newton.

We would also like to note that the CRO gave us permission to campaign on the second floor landing, and that when he revoked it on Friday afternoon, we respected this request immediately.

This complaint should be dismissed because of the PP's prompt compliance with the CRO's mandates, and obedience to his authority in the running of this election.

#25

In regards to complaint **#25**; All progressive students attending the barbecue stashed all leaflets and covered their shirt logos. All candidates under the PP are also students of kwantlen, and thus reserve the right to attend KSA functions. We can't help it if other students thought we were cool enough to carry our leaflets around all day, only to dispose of them when offered refreshment. We would also like to thank the Richmond campus council for the tasty food. Next time we will bring the potato salad.

Nobody warned any of us to stay away from the event in fact, some PP members distinctly remember Mr. Woo placing a hotdog in Ms. Agausine's Bun. We apologize to the Richmond campus staff who feel they were forced to habitually clean up after our messy constituents and wish them luck promoting their events. We encourage Steve Lee of CSI to bring evidence of our 'campaigning' at the RCC event to the CRO. If none is, we request this complaint disposed of in a manner similar to that of an sauce smeared napkin.

We also would like to note that we find it an odd stretch of the campaign rules that a incumbent members of a slate after spending the morning campaigning spent the afternoon giving out free food to students. We recognize the silliness in requiring candidates to hide their faces, but it is safe to ascertain that members of the society easily connected the candidates to the event.

It is absolutely hypocritical to state that PP candidates should not be seen at KSA events receiving food, when the complainant candidates have no problem hosting those events with KSA funds.

#26

We couldn't help but notice that in complaint **#26** Mr. Lee's perception of himself as a creative writer seems to surface yet again. We are the Progressive Student Party or 'The Great and Noble Collective Student PP'. Not the "progressive" party, not 'The unregistered "Progressive" party,' nor are we 'favored,' except perhaps genetically with

our ability to properly use contextual quoting.

It was our original concern that Steve was using a KSA PC, since he claims to the contrary, We hope he can prove it so. The PP agrees with the CRO's decision to make the lounge space in Richmond and Langley off limits, since it is so tiny and close to the offices. We would prefer that the Surrey and Newton lounges remain open for use, but acknowledge that it is not our place to question the provisions the CRO feels are necessary during an election to ensure its validity.

With Mr. Lee's infallible sense of right and wrong well known throughout the society, The progressive party hoped that he would have the common sense and initiative to realize that working on campaign materials with his well recognized person, so near to his place of work could be misconstrued by his beloved constituents.

We believe that this had a material affect on the election because of the affect it had on students entering the lounge and seeing elected officials crowding around a PC that had CSI propaganda in obvious view. This would lead students to believe the KSA backed CSI, or worse yet, students disenfranchised with the KSA or candidates on CSI, that how they voted had no impact on the election, that CSI would get in no matter what because they incumbants that worked on the election from inside the KSA. (Something that CSI and RAF has wrongfully accused us of on numerous occasions.)

According to his claim of McDonald, Anderson, Vincent, and Kearley all being present when he was working on adds, this is absolute bunk. Kristina Kearley and Rigel Vincent made a thorough check of the lounge that evening for CSI materials. They found empty Chinese food containers and drowsy CSI candidates enjoying the comforts of the RCC lounge. There is nothing wrong with that and no complaint was filed.

We would also like to take the opportunity to respectfully remind Mr. Lee that nothing factual can be considered slanderous.

#27:

In complaint **#27** Mr. Lee neglects the possibility that these leaflets could have been from before the CRO recall. A possibility that is also, in fact, true. It is also of note that Kristina Kearley had solicited space for the leaflets from bookstore staff successfully. There is a possibility of the employee who permitted them to have not consulted with the manager of the Bookstore. Kristina Kearley apologizes for being unaware that the manager's consent was necessary for their placement. In the future she will not assume that because other parties have large yellow leaflets stacked it is ok to stack hers next to them.

#28

In complaint **#28** Mr. Lee considers the incident in question over, but continuously references it and files a complaint. Instead of submitting a complaint he could have

submitted a memo to the committee or a note to the GM, or even presented to council. Instead he backlogs the election with another frivolous complaint. The progressive party politely suggests in a completely non-gruff, absolutely un-abrasive, and generally not frank manner that Mr. Lee stop using the complaint process to harass the CRO and that if he is genuinely interested in a fair and just election he can personally expedite the process by not abusing the right of formal complaint to attack the CRO in any means possible, including his tone of voice.

#38

In regards to complaint **#38**, Due to cellular phone battery problems and communication with campaigners on campuses outside of Surrey, many progressive students did not receive notice of the campaign restriction until late evening when returning to Surrey Campus. This is fortunate, as the CRO never issued a campaign restriction, and for the PP to have followed a disingenuous dictate from the non-existent elections committee would have severely hampered their ability to successfully get elected.

Because of the time line in which the progressive party received the notice to register in comparison to the other slates (the PP was only notified on Thursday that it had violated a regulation in not registering its party properly - with signatures) and the motivations of its issuers, (the potentially corrupt elections committee), we request this complaint to be dismissed. It is also of note that the PP did submit a party member list to the CRO at the time of the all candidates meeting, but that this list was incomplete (lacked member signatures). This omission has been since remedied, and it is clear to see that there was no material affect on the election due to it.

#39

In complaint **#39** Mr. Lee erroneously assumes that the CRO has the ability to be in 4 places at once - clearly demonstrated by his statement that the CRO should have been present for the pickup of all 4 ballot boxes on all 4 boxes.

It is unfortunate if poll-clerks took orders from the Director of Finance during the election. The PP requests that the factuality of this complaint be investigated. If the orders were, in fact, given by... oh, lets say...the chief poll clerk, or under the chief poll clerk's authority, then perhaps responsibility should be placed where it belongs.

While the PP agrees that the Ballot Box theft and potential grievance against McDonald would have a material effect on the election, we are unable to see how this points to the quivering (in a reluctant bemused fear) PP, and see this as yet another of Mr. Lee's attempts to validate slander as reality and sully his self declared 'political enemies.'

#40

The PP withdraws its assertions made in this complaint, pointing to the presence of complaint #32, which was the issue the PP was referring to (but didn't want to leave the aforementioned complaint's submission to chance and happenstance).

We apologize for any inadequacies in complaint #40. It was only our intention to ensure that the issue was addressed, and the sanctity of the election preserved.

#42

In complaint **#42** RAF states that Jeff Nelson used a threatening tone. Jeff Nelson apologizes to Mr. Khan for engaging in a conversation that allowed Jamsheed Khan to perceive he was being threatened. Mr. Nelson would have apologized in person, but was concerned that said conversation would have been deemed threatening, or otherwise inappropriate, and an elections complaint would be submitted.

The PP stands firmly by Jeff Nelson's assertion that he was merely making Jamsheed Khan aware that he could withdraw honourably of his own accord from the election, before his eminent disqualification (Which was not slander against the RAF party, as it pointed to very clear precedence in the 2004 general election). This was merely a gesture assuming the best of the opposing candidate and alerting him to an opportunity to save face.

#43

In complaint **#43** the Progressive party would like to take the opportunity to respectfully remind the RAF party that the reason why certain candidates names were not on the ballots was because their packets were not submitted on time, or their candidates were not able to run in the first place. We understand there was a time allowance made for RAF nomination packets, and would suggest that they reword their complaint accordingly. The PP would also like to note that, rather than rerunning the entire election, it may be appropriate to only rerun it on the Newton campus.

#44

In complaint **#44** the RAF party neglects the fact that the CRO directs and delegates work to the elections committee, this does, by nature make the elections committee subordinate to the CRO. Further to that, the elections committee was never ratified by the board of directors (and if the CRO had tried to ratify Erin Minor, and Pavan Bassi as committee members, council would have rightly rejected the idea). Since the committee was never appointed by council, it must have been acting in an advisory capacity to the CRO. As such, he decided to dismiss his advisors. The progressive party notes that complaints of corruption with physical evidence and witnesses was first brought against the elections committee and that only after this did RAF start leaning their complaints to attack and discredit the CRO.

The PP affirms their faith in the judgement of the CRO, but understands that for the election to be accepted as valid by the student body that a recognition of the potential of bias must be made and suggests that the results of the election be reviewed by an unbiased third party appointed by council, researched by the general manager of the society and appropriate changes be made.

#45

In complaint 45 the declaration of the RAF party that collecting signatures for a nomination to run the election has a large and detrimental affect on the results of the election is ludicrous. Those signatures are a sign of faith from the society membership that a candidate should be able to run in the election. No votes are obtained as a result of them, necessarily. No campaigning is allowed in the office, thus it would make sense that if a candidate was only collecting signatures for a nomination packet, it would not matter where they did it.

If they were referring to line one of article 5.I the PP cordially invites them to finish reading the next two sentences of the regulations that state "This prohibition does not apply to materials and resources available to Society members in general, such as free phones."

So that takes care of the pens they may have used.

And then there is the issue of Mr. Vu and Mr. Nelson not even being candidates at that point in time. Candidacies can only be validated by the CRO after submitting the nomination packets and retaining the CRO's approval or said packet.

Even if the rest of the rebut to this complaint is discounted, there's the simple fact that students were getting signatures for a nomination package (that may or may not have been for them, personally), not campaigning to get votes in the election. Therefore, the violations could not have been serious, according to the definition of a serious violation under section X, article 6 of the regulations.

The PP believes that the RAF party is trying to use any means possible to obtain an opportunity to rerun this election because, and only because, they believe they fairly lost the election. Their inflated allegations and ridiculous demands stand as proof to this, especially in this complaint.

#46

In regards to complaint **#46** neither Rigel Vincent or Tristan Thompson were aware that the bag pipes were considered by the CRO as an ethnic instrument. Bag Pipes while, historically accredited to the Pre-Saxon Pagans of the northern British Isles have been used in state ceremonies in Ireland, Wales, Canada, and Australia, and by the Imperial British Police force in Burma, India, and countries throughout Africa. As soon as the CRO made his ruling both parties ceased use of the Bag Pipes immediately.

The 'slightly exhausted at this point' PP requests this complaint dismissed due to the PP's immediate compliance with the CRO's initial ruling of the complaint, despite our opinion of its nonsensical nature.

#47

The PP requests an immediate inquiry into the validity of the allegations made against McDonald in complaint #47. While the Progressive party stands by the belief that the complaint against McDonald connecting McDonald and his alleged infractions with the The G&NCS PP is little more than slander geared towards serving the ends of the RAF party, they recognize the responsibility of the CRO in the manner of ensuring the Chief Poll Clerk does her job. The PP would also like to recognize the potential of the elections committee working with the chief poll clerk to subvert the election for reasons of personal vendetta. From what the PP has heard of Mr McDonald's actions, he was acting under the strict supervision and direction of the chief poll clerk. Why she would use a currently elected official to contact her poll clerks is beyond the limply befuddled PP.

The Great and Noble Collective Student PP would like to voice our concern over the direction of the complaints in this election. It would seem that both the RAF and the CSI slates have redundantly and persistently angled for a re-election ever since the polls have closed on the first day of voting. The Progressive Student Party challenges any person to time line the complaints from both slates. CSI and RAF believe that they have lost the election. To use an old adage, "(They) are slinging shit in every direction to see what sticks."

The Progressive party does not deny that some of their complaints have validity. To be fair, The Progressive Party strongly believes that after the CRO brings forward their results the General Manager of the Society, (who is legally obliged to have no bias except towards the best interests of the society) shall research several outside institutions and present them alongside what he believes is the best option, to council. The general council should then appoint one of the options presented. That party will review the results of the elections and should make their recommendations for change, and council will act accordingly to make said changes and then ratify the results.

This is the only way to act fairly. To make a decision now would be to bend to the scheming ends of specific people and their personal objectives. To do nothing would be to undermine the rights of those with an actual grievance. We must put a show of faith in the Board of Director's ability to choose a CRO that is not corrupt, and only when he gives us results that show the possibility of corruption can we safely bring forward a third party to investigate the allegations. Through the whole process, it is of paramount importance that the CRO follow his conscience and his mandate. The KSA's bylaws account for problems and allow different options to proceed from them.

It is of course understandable that there will be certain irregularities during an election, but it would not improve matters if an election was run and rerun until the results that certain members were hoping for were achieved. This would only serve to exacerbate the problem, and possibly lead to much higher levels of corruption and conflict.

