



STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

Amendments to the Election Legislation Governing the City of Toronto

Date:	October 4, 2007
To:	Executive Committee
From:	City Clerk
Wards:	All
Reference Number:	

SUMMARY

Since 1999, the City Clerk has prepared for Council's consideration five reports on desired amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* (the *MEA*). In considering these reports, Council has requested that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing consider a number of amendments to the *MEA*. A list of the 34 outstanding amendments requested by Council is attached as Appendix 1. Those requested amendments that have been enacted by the Legislative Assembly are listed in Appendix 2.

This report builds on the previous work and includes recommendations on those areas of concern that were identified during the conduct of the 2006 election; most notably the lack of an enforcement mechanism, the manner of preparation of the voters' list and the issues identified relating to election finance reform.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The City Clerk recommends:

1. given that the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* specifies that it is "in the best interests of the Province and the City to engage in ongoing consultations with each other about matters of mutual interest" and that the Legislative Assembly recognizes that "the City is a government that is capable of exercising its powers in a responsible and accountable fashion", Council request that the Province enact Toronto-specific election legislation that meets the unique needs of Toronto's electors and candidates.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

This report has no financial implications.

However, should the Province enact amending legislation, there is the possibility of a financial impact. Should the Province enact amending legislation, then the City Clerk will produce a subsequent report outlining any specific financial implications that may arise from the legislative changes.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

DECISION HISTORY

City Council has considered reports from the City Clerk for legislative amendments at its meetings of:

- (a) April 13, 14 and 15, 1999 (Municipal Voting Day – Year 2000);
- (b) December 14, 15 and 16, 1999 (Municipal Elections – Proposed Legislative Amendments);
- (c) November 6, 7 and 8, 2001 (Municipal Elections Act, 1996 – Amendments and Election 2000 Report);
- (d) December 4, 5 and 6, 2001 (Options for Methods to Deal with Decisions on Compliance Audit Applications); and
- (e) September 28, 29, 30 and October 1, 2004 (Toronto Election Finance Review Task Force Recommendations).

A list of the 34 outstanding amendments requested by Council is attached as Appendix 1.

ISSUE BACKGROUND

In 1996 the municipal elections legislation underwent a major overhaul, the first since 1972. Since then, four municipal elections have been conducted under the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*. After each election the City Clerk prepares for Council's consideration a list of proposed amendments to the *MEA*. These lists are based on the Clerk's recommendations for improvements to the administrative provisions of the *MEA* and consultations with Members of Council and other candidates on improvements to the election campaign financing provisions.

Some of the amendments requested by Council were previously considered by the Province and included in the *Direct Democracy Through Municipal Referendums Act, 2000* (Bill 62, Royal Assent on April 13, 2000). Other amendments were included in the

Municipal Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002 (Bill 177, Royal Assent on November 26, 2002). One amendment was included in the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* (Bill 53, Royal Assent on June 12, 2006).

In total, less than half of Council’s recommendations (twenty-eight out of sixty-two) have been incorporated in whole or in part into Bill 62, Bill 177 or Bill 53.

COMMENTS

The size and complexity of Toronto’s elections are making it more and more difficult to conduct an election under the current legislative framework. With 1.5 million electors, 456 candidates, 1,637 voting places and 10,000 election day workers, the 2006 election was larger than the elections in 9 of the 13 provinces and territories in Canada.

In addition to its large size, other factors, such as the number of offices elected and ballots required, increase the complexity of Toronto’s municipal election. When Elections Ontario or Elections Canada administers an election in Toronto, 22 ballot types are required across the City since electors only vote for one office (Member of Provincial Parliament and Member of Parliament, respectively). The municipal election process is much more complex and requires 220 different types of ballots to be distributed across the City since electors are able to vote for three offices (Mayor, Councillor and School Board Trustee). In the municipal election, voting place staff must determine which of the possible 5 ballot types in a ward an elector is entitled to based upon school support and residency status of commercial or industrial assessed land. See Table 1 for more information.

Table 1 – Comparison of Federal, Provincial and Municipal Election Infrastructure in Toronto

	FEDERAL	PROVINCIAL	MUNICIPAL
# of Ballot Types	22	22.5	220
Administration System	Decentralized	Decentralized	Centralized
Election Administrator	22 Returning Officers (RO)	22.5 Returning Officers (RO)	City Clerk
Political Election Process	Party Politics	Party Politics	Individuals
# of Candidates in Toronto	165 (2006)	119 (2003)	456 (2006)
Offices per Election	1 – Member of Parliament	1 – Member of Provincial Parliament	3 – Mayor, Councillor and School Board Trustee
# of Electoral Districts in Toronto	22.5	22.5	44
Average # of Electors per Voting District	Each RO is responsible for approximately 72,000 electors	Each RO is responsible for approximately 72,000 electors	City Clerk is responsible for approximately 1.5 m electors
Length of Election Period	Minimum 36 day calendar	Minimum 28 day calendar	314 day calendar

Toronto's complicated municipal election administrative process is made even more complex because of the diverse needs of its voters. To ensure that all eligible electors are aware of their rights and responsibilities, the City Clerk's Office produces information material that clarifies and highlights voters' rights with respect to translation and assistance in voting locations in the 17 languages approved by Council. Additionally, the City Clerk's Office attempts to hire election day workers who have second language capabilities. Recruiting, training and assigning these multilingual individuals to the locations where they are most needed is a challenge that requires a lot of time and planning. Meeting the needs of an extremely diverse electorate is a complex task that no other municipality in Ontario has to address to the extent of Toronto.

It has been over ten years since the Province completed a major review of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* (the *MEA*). Since that time, the City of Toronto has undergone major changes, the most significant being amalgamation. The *MEA* was not developed to address the needs of such a large and diverse city. However, the City Clerk's Office recognizes that the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* is public legislation that works well in the vast majority of Ontario's 445 municipalities and 72 school boards. That is why the time has come for Council to request that the Province introduce Toronto-specific election legislation.

The City of Toronto's elections present unique and demanding administrative issues not generally found in other Ontario municipalities. Toronto's 2006 municipal election demonstrated the need for amendments to the *MEA* that would allow the City to protect the integrity of the electoral process. While there are many separate components of the *MEA* that require amendments, there are three broad categories that require amendments immediately. They are the need for:

- an independent enforcement mechanism,
- flexibility in the method used to compile a voters' list, and
- clarification of the financial filing process.

A precedent for Toronto specific legislation has been set with the enactment of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* (the *Act*). This *Act* already contains two provisions that are only applicable to Toronto's elections – a \$2,500 contribution limit for the office of Mayor and the ability for Council to ban corporate and trade union donations. Any further Toronto-specific election provisions could easily be incorporated into that *Act*.

Effective and Timely Enforcement Mechanism

Currently, the *MEA* does not provide any effective enforcement mechanism. If an elector, candidate or the media complains to the City Clerk with allegations of candidate misconduct or contraventions of the *MEA*, all the Clerk can do is inform the inquiring individual of the complaint procedure outlined under Part III of the *Provincial Offences Act*.

To file a complaint, an individual must appear before a Justice of the Peace and present information about their allegations. The Justice of the Peace will then determine whether or not an offence has occurred and take appropriate action (i.e. issue a summons or a warrant). The process outlined under the *Provincial Offences Act* is cumbersome and places the entire onus for the enforcement of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* solely on an individual.

During the fall of 2006, staff received an unprecedented number of complaints about candidate behaviour. The volume of complaints, at times up to 100 emails and phone calls a day, created significant workload pressures for the City Clerk's Office. Responding to the large number of complaints took a great deal of time for the senior election officials and meant that their focus was diverted from other areas that were essential to the administration of the election.

The issues that arose throughout the election in Ward 8 and, to a lesser degree, in Wards 26 and 41, further support the urgent need for the Province to amend the *MEA* to provide for an effective enforcement mechanism. In those Wards, the City Clerk's Office received complaints alleging that candidates and their supporters were threatening and intimidating electors and voting place staff. The City Clerk's Office also heard allegations that individuals were going door-to-door in Ward 8 posing as election officials. For further details on the Ward 8 issues, see the Returning Officer's Report on the 2006 municipal election (dated October, 2007).

Although the City Clerk and the Director of Elections and Registry Services met with the candidates in Ward 8 to discuss the allegations of misconduct, the City Clerk's Office had no authority to investigate or respond to the individual complaints. As administrators of the election, the City Clerk and her staff have a responsibility to remain fair and impartial. The City Clerk's Office cannot take sides in such disputes. Our role is to administer the election and not to arbitrate between feuding parties.

The Integrity Commissioner also received a number of complaints alleging candidate misconduct and an information report on his observations is currently before Council. The Integrity Commissioner agrees that the current complaint process does not meet the needs of the electors and candidates of the City of Toronto.

Placing the burden of enforcing the *MEA* entirely on an individual erodes public confidence in the democratic process. The current complaint process is so cumbersome and ineffectual that it has the potential to disengage electors. With the 2006 municipal election, the City Clerk's Office received hundreds of complaints and allegations about candidate behaviour. Not a single individual chose to take their complaint through the enforcement process governed by the *Provincial Offences Act*.

Flexibility in Voters' List Preparation

Also before Council is the City Clerk's report on Options for Toronto's Voters' List (dated October, 2007). One of the key elements providing legitimacy to an election is an

accurate, current and complete voters' list. While concerns have been expressed for several elections on the accuracy of Ontario municipal voters' lists, the 2006 election presented the City Clerk with a unique and demanding problem – the inclusion of 276,682 names whose eligibility to vote had not been confirmed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) prior to delivery of the preliminary list of electors.

Notwithstanding the fact it is MPAC, not the Clerk, which has the legislative responsibility to provide a preliminary list of eligible electors, the Clerk determined that this issue had to be proactively addressed in order to preserve the integrity of the election. Accordingly, the City Clerk implemented a comprehensive “Unconfirmed Voter Strategy” to attempt to confirm the elector qualifications of the 276,682 individuals identified by MPAC as unconfirmed Canadian citizens or whose age was not known.

The “Unconfirmed Voter Strategy”, which was implemented three months before the election, diverted scarce resources from other projects and had a widespread impact on the conduct of the election. On the political side, the voters' list impacts the method in which candidates campaign and their spending limits. On the administrative side, the voters' list impacts many aspects of the election including staffing levels and the number of supplies (including ballots) required at voting locations. It also simplifies the voting process on election day. Unfortunately, the “Unconfirmed Voter Strategy” mail-out had to take place in August and as a result had a very low response rate (13 percent). Because individuals did not confirm their qualifications to vote with the City Clerk, their names were removed from voters' list.

As mentioned in the voters' list report, in the opinion of the City Clerk, the best option for preparing voters' lists for the City's elections is through the use of Elections Ontario's Permanent Register of Electors, supplemented by information from any source that, in the opinion of the Clerk, is relevant. This approach would allow the Clerk the flexibility to use data from any source to ensure the voters' list is as accurate as possible heading into an election period.

This option would be easy to implement, is cost-effective, supports the principles of democratic elections and continues the Canadian tradition that the government is responsible for collecting electoral information. With the Permanent Register of Electors being updated with information from both Elections Canada and MPAC through the tripartite agreement, this option also benefits from the data collection activities of these other agencies.

No system of collecting and maintaining elector information will guarantee a completely accurate and current voters' list. However, with more and more municipalities across Canada choosing to use their provincial election agency's list as the basis for their own voters' lists, there is merit in considering this option.

Clarification of Financial Filing Requirements

The Auditor General has prepared a report for Council's consideration (Municipal Election 2006 – Review of Financial Filings by Members of City of Toronto Council, dated June 14, 2007). This report describes the scope and objectives of the review and details the errors and inconsistencies found in the financial statements.

In his report, the Auditor General made four recommendations to Council and requested that the Province amend the *MEA* to:

- provide that all candidates seeking election to Toronto City Council be required to use the City's Electronic Financial Filing System to file their financial statements;
- provide that candidates be allowed the opportunity, within certain criteria, to correct errors or omissions in financial statements which have been filed with the City Clerk; and,
- clarify the manner in which the nomination fee is to be accounted for in the candidate's financial statement.

In addition, the Auditor General recommended that members of Council use the City's Electronic Financial Filing System to file their financial statements and that any errors identified during the filing process be corrected prior to filing financial statements with the City Clerk.

The Auditor General's report is not the first one through which City Council has reviewed municipal election campaign financing. In October 2002, Council established the Toronto Election Finance Review Task Force which examined election campaign financing and made recommendations to Council on legislative amendments and process improvements to enhance the public accountability of candidates' financial disclosure. Council debated the Task Force recommendations in September 2004.

Since that time, the province has enacted some of the Task Force recommendations, such as providing the City with the authority to ban donations from corporations and trade unions, but has not acted on others, such as the request for all campaign surpluses to become the property of the municipality.

City Council itself has attempted to implement many of the Election Finance Review Task Force's recommendations through the 2006 Election Contribution Rebate Program By-law. Donations from corporations and trade unions were not eligible for a rebate and candidates participating in the Rebate Program were required to turn their campaign surpluses over to the City. As a result, a two-tiered financial filing system emerged with candidates who participated in the Rebate Program being held to a higher standard than those who did not.

City Council has done what it can to improve the transparency and disclosure of election campaign financing. The time has come for the province to enact Toronto-specific election legislation to increase the transparency and disclosure of candidates' financial filings. Since campaigns in Toronto typically spend tens of thousands of dollars, it is

imperative that the legislation increase transparency in the reporting of election contributions and expenses and that there is a full public disclosure of the election campaign financing activities of candidates. Clarification and simplification of the financial requirements would also provide the public with confidence since individuals would be better able to scrutinize who is funding the campaigns and how much is being spent to contest elections.

Conclusion

Three independent officials, the City Clerk, the Auditor General and the Integrity Commissioner all thoroughly reviewed the various aspects of the 2006 municipal election and have recommended that changes need to be made to the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* in order to maintain the integrity of the municipal electoral process.

The City has repeatedly asked for amendments to the legislation. In the past, the Province has appeared reluctant to make the requested changes. Given that the Province has already recognized Toronto's uniqueness with the recently enacted *City of Toronto Act*, now is the time to seek Toronto-specific election legislation that responds to the City's municipal election issues.

The *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* is public legislation – any amendments will apply equally to the elections of all municipalities and school boards in Ontario. Accordingly, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing consults with all these stakeholders as part of its consideration of requests for amendments from individual municipalities. This has generally prevented the enactment of legislation that would only be of benefit to the City of Toronto.

Should the Province be unwilling to consider Toronto specific election legislation, then the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* should be amended to include the necessary provisions, such as an independent enforcement mechanism, for large, urban jurisdictions (i.e. population over 500,000).

Toronto-specific election legislation, if enacted by the Province, would improve the administration of the election, ensure the integrity of the process and provide an effective mechanism to investigate and enforce alleged election offences.

CONTACT

Greg Essensa, Director, Elections and Registry Services
Phone: 416-392-8019, Fax: 416-392-3781, Email: gessensa@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Ulli S. Watkiss, City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1 – Outstanding Requested Amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, the *Assessment Act* and Ontario Regulation 101/97

Appendix 2 – Enacted Amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*

Appendix 1

Outstanding Requested Amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, the *Assessment Act* and Ontario Regulation 101/97

No.	Proposed Amendment
1.	to move the municipal election date to the Thursday after Thanksgiving in an election year
2.	subsection 15(2) be amended to read “The clerk may delegate to any election official any of the clerk’s or deputy returning officer’s powers or duties in relation to an election, as he or she deems necessary”
3.	subsection 16(1) be amended to read “A certified candidate may appoint scrutineers to represent him or her during voting and at the counting of votes, including a recount”
4.	a new subsection be added to section 22 that reads “This section is not intended to be a substitution for the revision process set out in sections 24 and 25”
5.	a new clause be added to section 34 to require that no refund of the nomination filing fee be given until the required financial statement is received by the Clerk and the ninety day compliance audit period has expired
6.	section 36 be amended to require that the withdrawal of a candidacy must be filed in person by the candidate or his or her agent
7.	section 39 be amended to provide that should any mayoralty candidate die during the time period beginning the day after nomination day and before the close of voting on voting day, the election for the office of mayor shall be void and a by-election shall be held to fill the office
8.	the principles (as set out by the Who Does What Panel) should be included in the <i>MEA</i> . Alternatively, subsection 42(4) should be amended to read “The procedures and forms established by the clerk under this section, if arrived at in good faith, prevail over anything in this Act or the regulations made under it”
9.	a new subsection be added to section 42 to provide that if vote counting equipment is being used, clauses 47(5)(e) and 47(5)(f) and subsection 54(3) do not apply
10.	subsections 44(2) and (3) be amended to clarify that a person may act as a proxy for another elector or for his or her family members but not both
11.	a new clause be added to subsection 47(1) to permit “any other person with the permission of the clerk” to be present at a voting place. A complementary amendment is also required to the lead-in of subsection 47(5).
12.	clause 55(1)(b) be amended to exclude the voters’ list from placement in the ballot box
13.	clause 57(1)(a) be amended to increase the time period for a council to pass a resolution requiring a recount from thirty to sixty days
14.	section 9 of Ontario Regulation 101/97 be amended to include on the proxy form the telephone number of the elector making the proxy
15.	section 16.1 of the <i>Assessment Act</i> be amended to move the date for property owners to provide a listing of the residential tenants of buildings from July 31 back to May 31 and that the Mayor be requested to write to the Premier of Ontario and the Minister of Finance, with a copy to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, urging immediate action respecting this matter which is of great concern to residential tenants

No.	Proposed Amendment
16.	<p>to provide that contributions to all candidates for councillor by an individual be limited to \$5,000 with a maximum of \$750 to any one candidate and to \$2,500 for all candidates for the office of head of a municipality with a maximum of \$2,500 to any one candidate</p> <p>NOTE – This replaces the earlier Council recommendation “to increase the allowable contribution from a contributor to a candidate from \$750.00 to \$1,000.00”.</p>
17.	<p>subsections 81(3) and 81(10) be amended to increase from thirty days to sixty days the time periods for a council to consider a request for a compliance audit and the auditor’s compliance audit report, respectively</p>
18.	<p>review the issue of third party campaigning and make any necessary amendments to the <i>MEA</i> that would impose on these individuals the same accountability and spending limits as candidates have</p>
19.	<p>a new subsection be added to section 1 of Ontario Regulation 101/97 to provide that for the office of mayor for the City of Toronto Council the prescribed nomination filing fee is set at \$1,000.00 and for the office of councillor for the City of Toronto Council the prescribed nomination filing fee is set at \$500.00</p> <p>NOTE – The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing did amend the regulation for the 2006 election to provide for a \$200 nomination filing fee for the head of council. In staff’s opinion this amendment did not sufficiently satisfy Council’s request to be considered as an “enacted” recommendation.</p>
20.	<p>section 5 of Ontario Regulation 101/97 be amended to provide that the spending limit for candidates for Councillors be increased to \$3,500.00 base and \$0.96 cents per elector and that the spending limit figures for candidates are adjusted every three years based on the Consumer Price Index</p> <p>NOTE – The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing did amend the regulation for the 2006 election to provide for a \$5,000 base plus \$0.70 per elector. In staff’s opinion this amendment did not sufficiently satisfy Council’s request to be considered as an “enacted” recommendation.</p>
21.	<p>the nomination filing fee be refunded only if the candidate receives 15 percent of the votes</p>
22.	<p>to expand the role of the City Clerk respecting the financial filing requirements of candidates</p>
23.	<p>to provide that contributions of goods and services must be reported and properly receipted as campaign contributions using provincial laws as the standard</p>
24.	<p>to require that surpluses become the property of the municipality if they are not used in the election for which they were raised, and that the application of this policy not be retroactive, but be on a ‘go-forward’ basis</p>
25.	<p>to include the necessary statutory provisions to clarify the intent of the Act that a person shall not raise money or incur expenses in connection with an election until such time as that person has filed a nomination paper</p>
26.	<p>to treat the replacement cost of election signs or other election materials that have been vandalized, stolen and/or destroyed and are subject to a police report, as an expense not subject to the spending limit for the office</p>

No.	Proposed Amendment
27.	to permit fund-raising expenses up to an amount equal to the spending limit for the office to be an expense; (so as to change spending limits from 25 percent to 100 percent)
28.	to treat child care expenses as an excluded expense
29.	to provide that the reporting of revenues and expenditures should be made more transparent by implementing mandatory electronic filing, providing definitions for expense categories, the use of more detailed report forms (including Form 5) by all candidates, and a continuation of the requirement that audits be conducted for all campaigns
30.	to provide that monitoring and enforcement of the provisions of the <i>Municipal Elections Act</i> be the responsibility of Elections Ontario and that sufficient power be given to Elections Ontario to provide appropriate enforcement of the provisions of the <i>Municipal Elections Act, 1996</i> ; and that should the Province fail to enact the appropriate changes to the <i>Municipal Elections Act, 1996</i> prior to the 2006 election, the Auditor General, as part of his 2006/2007 work plan, review the financial statements filed by Members of Council after the 2006 election and report to Council, through the Audit Committee, on any other irregularities or inconsistencies contained therein
31.	to permit a booklet and a CD listing all the contributors and their contributions over \$100.00 to be published and posted on an appropriate section of the City Web page by the City Clerk's office after the first financial filing at the end of March in the year following an election and that, for reporting purposes, the statistics for corporations and trade unions each be separated
32.	to permit a rebate program or a grant program at the discretion of the local municipality
33.	to provide that if a candidate is elected or receives 15 percent of the votes, the City pays for the cost of the audit
34.	<p>to provide that the campaign period of a candidate elected by acclamation shall end on the Monday following nomination day unless the candidate's campaign is in a deficit position on that date; and further, that if the candidate has a deficit, he or she may only continue to raise funds to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate any campaign deficit; and (b) provide for an amount equal to 10 percent of the spending limit for the office for the sole purpose of holding a post-election party;

Appendix 2

Enacted Amendments to the Municipal Elections Act, 1996

No.	Amendment	Bill No.
1.	a new subsection be added to section 8 to provide for a question or by-law that is to appear on the ballot to be submitted to the Clerk no later than eight weeks prior to voting day	Bill 62 and Bill 177
2.	a new subsection be added to section 17 to prohibit a non-resident elector from voting at his/her former qualifying address if he or she sells the interest in the property during the qualification period	Bill 177
3.	clause 24(3)(b) be amended to provide that the Clerk is to “advise the applicant of the approval” rather than return the approved revision application to the elector	Bill 177
4.	a new subsection be added to section 25 to permit the Clerk to dismiss, without a hearing, any application that, in the opinion of the Clerk, is frivolous or vexatious	Bill 177
5.	section 31 be amended to provide that nomination day be a Friday, 41 days prior to voting day (if voting day is moved to the Thursday after Thanksgiving)	Bill 177, in part
6.	clause 33(2)(b) be amended to read “be accompanied by a declaration of qualification, in the prescribed form, signed by the person being nominated; and”	Bill 177
7.	subsection 44(4) be amended to read “The appointment of a voting proxy may be made only after the Tuesday following nomination day and does not remain in force after voting day”	Bill 177
8.	clause 44(5)(b) be amended to provide that a proxy voting appointment may be presented at the Clerk’s office or any other location designated by the Clerk	Bill 177
9.	subsection 45(4) be amended to provide that the space to be used for a voting place in multi-residential buildings greater than 100 units, buildings owned by a municipality or school board and provincially funded institutions shall be provided free of all charges	Bill 177
10.	subsection 48(2) be amended to replace “in a voting place” with “in or at a voting place”	Bill 177
11.	clause 52(3)(a) be amended to provide the mark must be made “...within the designated marking space provided to the right of...”	Bill 177
12.	subsection 56(2) be amended to increase the time period for the conduct of a tied vote recount from ten to fifteen days	Bill 177
13.	subsection 57(2) be amended to increase the time period for the conduct of a recount requested by a council, local board or the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing from ten to fifteen days	Bill 177
14.	subsection 58(4) be amended to increase the time period for the conduct of a court ordered recount from ten to fifteen days	Bill 177
15.	paragraph 65(4)1. be amended to increase the time period for the setting of nomination day from thirty to sixty days after the need for a by-election is established	Bill 177

No.	Amendment	Bill No.
16.	subparagraph 65(4)4.ii. be amended to provide that the assessment commissioner is to give the preliminary list of electors for a by-election to the Clerk at least twenty-one days prior to nomination day	Bill 177
17.	paragraph 65(4)5. be amended to provide that the time period for applications to delete a name from the voters' list in a by-election end on nomination day	Bill 177 in part
18.	paragraph 68(1)2. be amended to provide that the campaign period ends on January 31 in the year following a regular election and ninety days after voting day in the case of a by-election	Bill 62 in part
19.	a new subparagraph be added to paragraph 68(1)4. to permit candidates a maximum of one additional year after the end of the regular campaign period to eliminate any deficit. A complementary amendment is also required to paragraph 68(1)5	Bill 62
20.	sections 77 and 78 be amended to set March 31 in the year following the regular election as the filing deadline for financial statements. For by-elections, the filing deadline should be 150 days after voting day	Bill 62 in part
21.	sections 77 and 78 be amended to provide a maximum additional campaign period of one year from the normal end of the campaign period. Only one supplementary financial statement would need to be filed within sixty days of the end of the additional campaign period	Bill 62 in part
22.	subsection 78(3) be amended to clarify that the supplementary financial statement is to be a total update of all the campaign financial activities from the date of nomination, not just the supplementary reporting period activities	Bill 62
23.	clause 80(1)(b) be amended to read "a document filed under section 78 shows on its face a surplus, as described in section 79, and the candidate fails to pay the amount required by section 79 to the clerk by the relevant date"	Bill 177
24.	subsection 80(3) be amended to increase from five days to ten days the time for the clerk to send a default notice to candidates who have not met the financial filing requirements	Bill 62
25.	subsection 80(6) be amended to require the candidate, within ten days of the date of the judge's declaration waiving the penalties due to inadvertence or an error in judgement, to file the required financial statement or pay over to the clerk the applicable surplus, as the case may be	Bill 177 in part
26.	to require the City Clerk to have voters prove that they meet citizenship and residency requirements	Bill 177 in part
27.	to provide for the establishment of an arms-length committee to receive and make decisions on compliance audit applications	Bill 177
28.	to prohibit corporations or trade unions from making municipal election contributions, and that such legislation also include provisions to permit a municipal council to pass a by-law to provide for a method of public funding to candidates on such terms and conditions as may be provided for in the by-law	Bill 53 in part