

Steven H. Lee, Candidate for Richmond Campus Council Director, 2005 KSA General Election

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

E-mail: [steveleenow@yahoo.com](mailto:steveleenow@yahoo.com)

April 28, 2005

Paul Browning, Ombudsperson  
Kwantlen University College Student Association  
12666 – 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
Surrey, BC V3W 2M8

Dear Mr. Browning,

This complaint is an appeal of the CRO's rulings in regards to slate expenses as applied to parties running in the 2005 KSA General Election.

We submit that as per Regulation X.5.7.(vi.) which clearly states:

“Where candidates incur expenses jointly as members of a slate, the expenses shall be divided equally amongst them. No other distribution of jointly incurred expenses shall be permitted.”

The only possible way that expenses can be shared equally as part of a slate (when using materials that benefit the entire slate) is to ensure that every member of the slate does not spend more than the maximum spending limit allowed for campus specific positions, which for this election was \$30. For this election, the spending limit for candidates running for multi-campus positions was \$75.

We submit that the only way people in a slate that are running for multi-campus positions can spend over the campus specific allotment is if they spend on materials that directly benefit only themselves, and not the slate as a whole. This was in fact, noted by the CRO in his decisions.

As such if campus council candidates who are members of a slate overspend, you cannot simply separate them from those candidates running from multi-campus positions and only disqualify one group. If a slate overspends the campus council limit on materials that benefit the entire slate, then the entire slate has gained a clear material advantage as they have access to a larger set of resources to use in pursuing the electorate to vote for them as opposed to other candidates.

To allow otherwise clearly sets up and allows for a situation that lets those running for multi-campus positions to use campus specific positions as a jumping board into office, using them as a scapegoat to collect votes and then see disqualified at the end of the day – which is what has happened in this election.

The ability of the Executive candidates to use campus specific candidates as a means to spend more money should not be allowed and the decision of the CRO not to boot executive candidates should be overturned. Both Mr. Nelson and Mr. Takhar, who were both representatives for their respective slates had a duty to meticulously keep track of all campaign expenses and to ensure that all expenses incurred were shared equally among all candidates and they clearly did not. In

