

Manna Wong's response to Ronald Lin's Application for a Compliance Audit of her Municipal by-election campaign.

The applicant's opening paragraph of his application states that the candidate's financial statement did not comply with the Act. Per Section 88.33(1) of the Municipal Elections Act, RSO, (MEA) an elector may apply for a compliance audit of a candidate's election campaign finances if that elector believes that the candidate has contravened a **provision** of the Act. The applicant, Roland Lin, has failed to identify in any part of his application what provision of the Act he believes the candidate has contravened. For this reason alone, the application should be dismissed.

Attached are responses to the applicant's statements in the order they are presented in the application.

1. The applicant has failed to identify what provision of the MEA the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant asks for "receipts" related to the candidate's sign supplies inventory on hand from a previous election campaign. The candidate is not aware of any part of the MEA that requires the candidate to provide "receipts" for the candidate's contributed previous campaign(s) sign inventory. In accordance with Form 4 requirements, Manna Wong provided a current value for the inventory and recorded it on her Form 4. In general, the requirement for a candidate to provide an invoice for campaign expenses with the filed form 4 is not provided for in the MEA. The requirement to provide "a copy of each campaign expense invoice" relates to the City of Toronto by-law regarding the contribution rebate program. Hence no apparent contravention to a provision of the MEA can exist.
2. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant suggests that signs from Manna Wong's previous TDSB campaign should be reported as part of her expenses her 2021 Form 4. They were not needed and therefore not contributed by Manna to her 2021 campaign. Manna Wong only used 50% of the new signs that she purchased for the by-election. Because of the pandemic, there were not enough volunteer resources to put up all her signs. The stickers were purchased in a hope that the old signs could be used.
3. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravene. The Applicant stated the number of purchased signs. As stated, only half of the purchase was used and a number of signs did not require sign stakes or H frames as the signs were tied to fences and railings.
4. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant questions the rental of sign supplies from NDP riding associations. The rentals were made in good faith and the rental costs were paid and recorded. The sign supplies rentals were returned after the election and a fair rental cost was paid. Many municipal campaigns rent sign supplies from riding associations. Renting sign stakes at market value from registered Provincial and Federal electoral district associations is also practice in Provincial (Ontario) and Federal campaigns as accepted by Elections Ontario and Elections Canada respectively.

5. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant claims that each sign should have a matching valuation of sign stakes. As the campaign did not use all signs and not all signs required all sign supplies, the valuation as reported is accurate.
6. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant claims that endorsements from members of the public should have been recorded as contributions. There is no requirement to value public endorsements under the MEA.
7. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant questions why there was no Canada Post invoice for campaign literature delivery. The Campaign hired Downsview Publishing to distribute campaign literature. This is what the company does and the invoice sent to the campaign was paid for their services. Some literature was delivered to electors by volunteers and a small amount was delivered by Canada Post as there was no access to drop literature in some buildings. This is a normal campaign practice
8. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant wants to know why there was no phone installation cost reported on Form 4. The simple answer is there was no installation of phone infrastructure as no campaign office was rented due to the pandemic. Phone calling service providers used their personal phones and included the cost of their phones in the invoices submitted to the campaign. The campaign paid \$17/hour to the callers and using their own phones was condition of the job. This is well above minimum wage and was intended for the callers to use their own resources.
9. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. In fact, it is unclear what the applicant is suggesting or trying to point out. The Applicant questions the invoice of Bruno Marchese who acted as the campaign accountant. Note that accounting expenses are not subject to the limit. The work Bruno Marchese provided did not end on election day. The \$215.07 is correctly reported as accounting services rendered post-election day.
10. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. Other than what is required to report on Form 4, it is unclear what the applicant is suggesting should be additionally reported or missing on Form 4. The Applicant questions the source of individual contributions to the campaign and suggests that all contributors who pay contributions using their credit cards are possibly contravening the act by taking a loan from a credit card company and in some bizarre way assigning that loan to the campaign. Obviously, the applicant has made a ridiculous proposition. The merchant bank fees according to generally agreed accounting principles are "bank fees" not "interest" on a loan. There is no provision in the MEA where a campaign must involve itself with a donor's relationships with their credit card companies.

11. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. It is also unclear what the applicant is trying to imply. Per the submitted Audited Form 4, bank charges related to the bank account are reported separately from merchant bank fees. The banks fees are accurate. It is unclear as to what the question or what apparent contravention of the MEA the applicant believes the candidate may have made.
12. The applicant has not stated what provision of the Act that the candidate may have contravened. The Applicant asks for Campaign Bank Statements. The campaign is not required to provide bank statements. Per the City of Toronto contribution rebate by-law, the campaign is only required to provide a copy of campaign expense invoices along with the audited Campaign Form 4 and this was done.