

RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT 2A

Date: April 17, 2005

To Whom It May Concern:

As stated in the complaint submitted by Laura Anderson, it is to “her knowledge” that the following events are true:

- 1) The complaint was submitted past the 72-hour time frame as required by the KSA. The CRO has, in his past rulings, stated that complaints submitted after this time would not be considered. This complaint should follow the same rules and regulations that the CRO has upheld in regards to the previous 50 complaints. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid.* It would not be fair to any of the candidates if this complaint is not struck down, however, Anderson claims that:
- 2) Mat Huff produced the material on the “night of March 23”, she later goes on to say that it remained posted until “February 25”. How can this be? The law of common sense states that February, in a normal calendar year, not a Laura Anderson calendar year, comes before the month of March, henceforth, how can the material be created in March and be mysteriously present in February? How can this material be created on March 23 and be present at the Langley campus on Feb 24? The story seems misleading. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*
- 3) “Distributing campaign material” is alleged by Anderson. However, there was never *any* campaign material of the kind be alleged, ever *distributed*. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*
- 4) It is also said that Huff told Anderson that he had the material in question approved by the CRO. Is this correct? Huff denies saying this, so some sort of proof would be necessary, which would be slightly impossible to obtain without investigating the matter extensively. *The entire complaint is based on the fact that false information was given by Huff, says who?* This needs to be proven and the RAF Party essentially requests the CRO to investigate this matter. We also challenge Anderson to come forward. The RAF will be fully cooperative because the basis of the complaint is most definitely false. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*
- 5) The apparent campaign material was approved by Enrin Minor as well as Pavan Bassi, who were asked by the CRO to help with the election. Minor and Bassi also approved *and* disallowed campaign material for, among others, the RAF Party, Progressive Party and, what do you know, **LAURA ANDERSON**. The fact that Anderson had her campaign material approved by Minor in the Fishbowl, and then turns around and submits such a baseless complaint is absurd and inappropriate, especially for someone in her senior elected position. She knows the rules inside out, and her misuse and intentional misinterpretation of these rules is uncalled for. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*

- 6) The CRO clearly stated in the “all candidates meeting” that Bassi, Minor and Coreen Mason would be his committee/ advisors/ helpers or whatever you want to refer to them at this point in time, by helping him with election related issues. How were candidates of the RAF Party, Progressive Party *and Laura Anderson* to know that Bassi and Minor did not have the authority to approve and disapprove campaign material without the CRO clearly stating that they were no longer helping with the election? Aaron Takhar received a telephone call from the CRO explaining that the services of Bassi and Minor were no longer required, this was on the morning of February 23 (approx 11am), long after the campaign material in question was approved. Other parties and candidates were also misled by the electoral officials and subsequently had their campaign material looked over by Bassi and Minor in addition to RAF. Every candidates and slate trusted that Bassi and Minor had this responsibility at one point in time. It is not the fault of any single party or individual that this mix-up occurred. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*
- 7) It is not the fault of RAF or Progressive or Anderson or any independents that this miscommunication may have occurred, it is the fault of the electoral staff. RAF, Progressive, Anderson as well as independents **all** had campaign material approved by Bassi and Minor. Unless the CRO wishes to run another election, which may very well be appropriate given Anderson’s findings that the electoral staff faulted, the complaint cannot be sustained. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*

Much gratitude to Laura Anderson to point out the fault of the electoral staff during the 2005 General election. Candidates, however, cannot be blamed for such a thing. The RAF Party requests that neither the Progressive party or Anderson or any other candidate for that matter be held accountable for the miscommunications of the electoral/ administrative/ support staff at any time during the election. It is the fault of senior management, not candidates. *On this point alone the complaint is not valid*

If the CRO wishes to persue this complaint, RAF campaign manager Aaron Takhar can be contacted via telephone @ 604-537-1503 to start his investigation into the *many* subsections of this complaint.

Thank You,

Sincerely,

RAF Party

