
**The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election**

Councillor Alex Cullen (Bay Ward)

City of Ottawa, 110 Laurier Ave. W., Ottawa K1P 1J1

(613) 580-2477; fax (613) 580-2517; e-mail: alex.cullen@ottawa.ca

June 20, 2007

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Contents

Introduction	3
Quick Snapshot of the 2006 Election Results in Ottawa	4
Table 1: Contributions in the 2006 Election	5
Where Does The Money Come From?	6
Table 2: Contributions by Source (% distribution)	8
What Does It Cost To Run For Office in Ottawa?	9
Table 3: Contributions from Self (Non-Incumbents, over \$1000)	9
The Financial Advantages of Incumbency	11
Table 4: Funds From The Past, Funds To The Future	11
Corporate Contributions – Who’s Your Daddy?	12
Table 5: Corporate Contributions by Ward	12
Special People – Do Some Contributors Count More Than Others?	13
Compliance Issues – What Needs To Be Done?	14
The Importance of Municipal Election Finance Reform	16
Recommendations	17
Appendix A: Tables	
Table 6: 2006 Election –Contributions by Source	18
Table 7: 2006 Election – Surplus, Deficit, Cost to Run	21
Appendix B: The Big Spenders List	24

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Introduction

Two years ago, in a report to the City of Ottawa's Corporate Services & Economic Development Committee and City Council, I prepared an analysis of the 2003 municipal election in Ottawa, together with some suggestions for reform of election finances.

In that report, I noted that:

In the 2003 municipal election for the City of Ottawa's 22 council seats (Mayor plus 21 ward councillors) a remarkable thing happened: every incumbent running for re-election succeeded. The incumbent mayor and 15 incumbent ward councillors running were all re-elected, despite competition from 60 other candidates, despite endorsements for certain challengers from the two major newspapers and sundry interest groups. The only new councillors elected were from 6 "open" seats where no incumbent was a contestant.

I went on to suggest that:

A review of the 2003 municipal election in Ottawa indicates that there is an uneven playing field in municipal election campaigns, and the clear need for campaign financing reform.

The report on the 2003 election came to the conclusion that:

- *Incumbency is an overwhelming advantage in running for office and contributes to a lack of turnover at the municipal level that may have a negative impact on the quality of governance;*
- *Running for office represents a large financial burden for new entrants that probably discourages new blood at the municipal level;*
- *Corporate contributions have a significant influence on campaign finances at the municipal level, and the advantage of corporate contributions accrues almost entirely to incumbents;*
- *The ability of incumbents to roll over surplus campaign funds multiplies the advantages of incumbency and makes it difficult to successfully challenge incumbents at the municipal level.*

Since that time, there have been major changes to the election financing regime at the Federal level¹, and several provinces have begun looking at reforms to their electoral systems.

The results of the 2006 municipal election in Ottawa are now in, and it looks like not much has changed.

¹ Since January 1, 2007, only contributions by individuals are allowed for federal elections and the ability of candidates to self finance their campaigns from their own funds has been restricted to \$1000 per campaign.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

A Quick Snapshot of the 2006 Election Results in Ottawa

Election Results

- 6 candidates ran for mayor; the incumbent mayor was defeated.
- 68 candidates ran for 23 Councillor seats, including 19 incumbents running for re-election; all 19 incumbents were re-elected.
- In one ward with no incumbent, the election was won by a former municipal politician returning to politics.
- 3 new candidates were elected, all in wards with no incumbent.

Campaign Finance

- The six candidates for Mayor raised and spent roughly \$1.5 million in total, but virtually all of that was raised and spent by the top three candidates. Almost all the remaining funds were raised by a former mayoral candidate, who subsequently withdrew to run for a Council seat. The other candidates attracted virtually no funds, and virtually no votes.
- The 68 Council candidates raised and spent a little over \$900,000. However, as the table below indicates (Table 1), this was not distributed evenly among the various candidates. Incumbents raised, on average, a little over \$26,000 in the election (this does not include funds brought in from previous campaigns, which increases the spending power of incumbent candidates), while non-incumbents raised, on average, a little over \$9,000. The numbers for Council winners and losers were in a similar range. In the Council races, the differences between incumbents and non-incumbents, between those who won and those who lost, were stark and large.
- In the 23 Council ward races, all of which were contested in this election, 20 were won by the person raising the most money, 20 by the person spending the most money.
- Some incumbents were able to bring in significant funds from money raised in previous elections, and the winners in Council elections were able to store up significant amounts of money for future elections, whereas only one losing candidate was able to do.
- It costs significant amounts of money to run for election to City Council in Ottawa, and virtually all of the risk involved in running was incurred by challengers, all of whom lost.
- The size and number of corporate donations, and the small number of large contributors, continues to raise disturbing issues about the role of money in electing members of Ottawa City Council.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

- Compliance issues in the reporting of campaign finances abound, suggesting that the province should look at standardizing the way campaign returns are filled out and the way they are verified after elections.²

Table 1: Contributions in the 2006 Election

	Under \$100	Individuals over \$100	Corporations Over \$100	Unions over \$100	Self	Total Contributions
All Mayoral Candidates	\$165,168	\$901,892	\$270,337	\$4,675	\$179,700	\$1,521,773
%	10.9%	59.3%	17.8%	0.3%	11.8%	100%
Average for all Mayoral	\$ 27,528	\$150,315	\$ 45,056	\$ 779	\$ 29,950	\$ 253,628
Average Top Three Mayoral	\$ 51,959	\$294,630	\$ 88,145	\$1,558	\$ 59,280	\$ 495,574
%	10.5%	59.5%	17.8%	0.3%	12.0%	100%
All Council Candidates	\$155,306	\$389,420	\$283,526	\$7,366	\$103,472	\$ 939,092
%	16.5%	41.5%	30.2%	0.8%	11.0%	100%
Council Average	\$ 2,283	\$ 5,726	\$ 4,169	\$ 108	\$ 1,521	\$ 13,810
Ave. Council Incumbents	\$ 4,063	\$ 10,063	\$ 10,858	\$ 387	\$ 778	\$ 26,151
%	15.5%	38.5%	41.5%	1.5%	3.0%	100%
Ave. Council Non- Incumbents	\$ 1,593	\$ 4,045	\$ 1,575	\$ 0	\$ 1,809	\$ 9,024
%	17.7%	44.8%	17.5%	0%	20.1%	100%
Ave. Council Winners	\$ 4,375	\$ 10,017	\$ 9,950	\$ 320	\$ 643	\$ 25,305
%	17.3%	39.6%	39.3%	1.3%	2.5%	100%
Ave. Council Losers	\$ 1,215	\$ 3,533	\$ 1,214	\$ 0	\$ 1,970	\$ 7,934
%	15.3%	44.5%	15.3%	0%	24.8%	100%

² There is no reason to think that this is a problem unique to Ottawa, or that it has anything to do with the way elections are run here. A recent report on campaign finance in 10 Toronto area municipalities, including the City of Toronto, concluded that “municipal campaign spending oversight is badly lacking and it is much less detailed, regulated and enforced than is true at the provincial and federal levels despite the fact that candidates may be spending more money.” (Robert McDermid, “Campaign Finance and Campaign Success in Municipal Elections in the Toronto Region”, June 2007)

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Where Does the Money Come From?

Candidates for municipal office have four sources of funds for their campaigns – contributions from individuals resident in Ontario, contributions from corporations who do business in Ontario, contributions from unions who have membership in Ontario, and their own funds. Reporting requirements, however, only require identification of contributions of more than \$100.

The Mayoral Race – a different kind of campaign

In the City of Ottawa the mayoralty race is very different from the competition for City Council seats. For one thing the mayor is elected city-wide, out of a voting population of 560,000 voters, compared to wards averaging 24,000 voters or so. As a result the spending and fundraising for the mayor’s position is quite different from City Council seats. In the 2006 municipal election, mayoral candidates could spend up to \$394,400 on eligible expenses (certain campaign expenses are exempt from this limit), but only 3 serious contenders spent anywhere near to that – the incumbent Mayor Bob Chiarelli, former City Councillor Alex Munter, and eventual mayoral winner Larry O’Brien. The 3 other mayoral candidates spent virtually no money, and received virtually no votes.

However, there were differences amongst the major candidates in raising funds for their campaigns, as the following table on their campaign contributions shows:

MAYOR	\$100 and under	Individuals over \$100	Corporations over \$100	Unions over \$100	Self	Total Contributions
Bob CHIARELLI	\$ 5,409	\$159,726	\$152,365	0	0	\$317,030*
%	1.7%	50.4%	48.1%	0%	0%	100%
Alex MUNTER	\$144,316	\$538,575	\$ 24,974	\$4,175	\$ 23,483	\$735,525
%	19.6%	73.2%	3.4%	0.6%	3.2%	100%
Larry O’BRIEN	\$ 6,151	\$185,590	\$ 87,097	\$ 500	\$154,357	\$433,697
%	1.4%	42.8%	20.0%	0.1%	35.6%	100%

* Does not include \$70,629 from the previous municipal election, or interest earned. Total campaign revenues reported by the Chiarelli campaign came to \$390,656.

While this report focuses on the election finances for City Councillor seats, it is instructive to note how much personal finances comes into play as a source of campaign funds for the mayoral challengers, how important corporate contributions were to the incumbent, and how important the previous campaign surplus was to the incumbent’s campaign.

The focus on fundraising for this analysis is the result of the application of the *Municipal Elections Act*, as this sets down limits on what can be raised and spent on municipal elections, and how contributions can be made. This is in an effort to create a transparent and level playing field governing one of our most important processes – local democracy.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

The fact is that money is paramount in helping candidates make known to the electorate their candidacies – their name, the position being sought, and their platform.

And money is a key ingredient for electoral success. In the 2006 election Council winners spent a little more than \$23,000 on average, while the losers spent about \$8,000 or almost *one-third* of what the winners spent (non-incumbents, including those who won, spent a little more, on average, about \$9,000).

In the Council ward races, (see Table 2 below) non-incumbents (and losers) got a larger proportion of their funds from individuals, while incumbents (and winners – largely the same thing) got a much larger proportion of their funds from corporate donors. Donations from individuals (includes all donations under \$100, which are not identified but are likely to be overwhelmingly from individuals) were about 54% of incumbents' funds, but over 62% for non-incumbents.

When corporate donations are considered, though, the picture changes significantly. Corporate donations were about 42% of the funds raised by incumbents, but only 18% of the funds raised by non-incumbents. The numbers for winners and losers, 39% and 15%, were in the same range (it should be noted that these corporate donations are percentages of much larger numbers).

On average, council incumbents received a little under \$11,000 in corporate contributions while non-incumbents received just under \$2,000 – *less than one-fifth of what the incumbents received*. For Council winners (just under \$10,000) and losers (just over \$2000) the picture is similar.

Not only are incumbents more than twice as likely to garner corporate contributions compared to non-incumbents, but nearly half of incumbent campaign contributions came from corporate contributions, compared to less than one-fifth for non-incumbents.

The City of Ottawa Election Contribution Rebate Program

The City of Ottawa has an election contribution rebate program to encourage individual contributions to support municipal candidates. While a complete analysis of this program is not yet available, anecdotal evidence appears to indicate that there was significant take-up of this program in 2006, in part due to the competition for the Mayor's position.

This program is limited to individual contributions, and provides a grant to individuals who contribute to municipal candidates who participate in this program, subject to certain limits.

So, the fair question to ask is – does this program redress the concerns of undue influence that corporate contributions appears to make? The answer is no. Even though individual contributions over \$100 outpaced corporate contributions over \$100 by 2-to-1 in 2006 (corporate contributions were 42.9% of individual contributions over \$100), corporations are not separate entities – they are governed by people who have their own democratic rights (and use them, too!). Corporate contributions are double-dipping by people who can give to their favourite candidate as individuals, and again through the corporations they control.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

In addition to the pattern of corporate donations, the other issue that stands out from the returns is the money incumbents and non-incumbents put into their own campaigns. For incumbents in the Council races the amount is miniscule - the average was 2.5% of their total contributions. For non-incumbents it was over 20% of their own money. For those who lost, the figure was nearly 25% of their total funding coming from their own funds.

Of the incumbents, 11 put no money of their own into their campaign; of the winners, 15 put no money into their own campaign³.

Because of the peculiarities of election finance reporting, much of the reported self financing in the case of the incumbents was likely to be in the form of materials (signs, stakes, other election materials) rather than in the form of actual out of pocket expenses. In the case of the non-incumbents/losers, however, it can be assumed that virtually all of the reported self financing was in the form of actual out of pocket expenses (These figures are reported in Table 2, below).

These figures all refer to funds raised during the 2006 election. None of these figures include the effect of funds brought in by incumbents from previous elections, which allowed incumbents to spend much closer to their allowable maximum than for non-incumbents. In municipal elections, success tracks very closely to money spent – for signs, advertising, flyers, staffing. The more money you can raise, the higher your profile in the election. Incumbents raise more money, by a wide margin (Appendix, Table 6) than non-incumbents, but they also have the advantage of money raised in past elections, and they carry this election into future elections as well (See Appendix, Table 7 for a list of funds taken into this election and funds rolled forward for future elections).

Table 2: Contributions by Source (% distribution)

	Under \$100	Individuals Over \$100	Corporations Over \$100	Unions Over \$100	Self
All Mayor	10.9%	59.3%	17.8%	0.3%	11.8%
Top Three Mayoral	10.5%	59.5%	17.8%	0.3%	12.0%
All Council	16.5%	41.5%	30.2%	0.8%	11.0%
Council Incumbents	15.5%	38.5%	41.5%	1.5%	3.0%
Council Non-Incumbents	17.7%	44.8%	17.5%	0%	20.1%
Council Winners	17.3%	39.6%	39.3%	1.3%	2.5%
Council Losers	15.3%	44.5%	15.3%	0%	24.8%

³ Because of the way election finance are reported, 4 of the incumbents (and winners), reported having put funds into their own campaign while returning a surplus of funds to the City for use in a subsequent election.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

What Does It Cost to Run for Office in Ottawa?

In terms of what it costs to run in an election, while there are rules in place governing spending limits, campaign expenditures and contributions in order to create a fair, transparent process for electing local officials, there is a big difference between the experience of incumbents (and winners – in this election they are largely the same thing) and challengers/losers.

While roughly 11% of all Council campaign contributions came from the candidates themselves in 2006, for Council winners the percentage of contributions coming from self was, on average, 2.5%, while for Council losers it was about 25% - *ten times what the incumbents put into their own campaigns.*

Although some incumbents reported incurring out of pocket expenses to run in this election, it is likely that some of this is actually in the form of signs, materials, and related in kind expenses, some of it carried over from the previous election, and reported as candidate contributions. (For a complete list of reported out of pocket expenses for all candidates, see Table 7 in the Appendix)

It is clear, however, that for non-incumbents, with one or two possible exceptions (non-incumbents who have run previously), most or all of the amount reported is actually out of pocket expenses.

In addition, it should be noted that the risk involved in incumbents incurring election expenses is a bit different than for non-incumbents. In this election, as in the last, all incumbents running were successful, and this follows a long pattern. Given the fact that councillor salaries are \$87,000 (and indexed) and the chances of losing are vanishingly small, incurring a small expense to continue in office is hardly in the same category as the calculations that must be made by those running for the first time.

Not only do new candidates face the challenge of organizing a campaign to promote their ideas and candidacy against an incumbent with a higher profile, but despite legislated spending limits on campaign budgets, they are more likely to require personal financial assets in order to help wage an election campaign.

Table 3: Contributions from Self (Non-Incumbents, Over \$1,000)

Ward 1: Dennis VOWLES	\$1,562	Ward 13: Muinis RAMADAN	\$1,475
Ward 2: David CAMERON	\$3,856	Ward 14: Luc LAPOINTE	\$2,117
Ward 3: Joseph KING	\$4,002	Ward 15: Gary LUDINGTON	\$1,231
Ward 4: Jeff SEETON	\$8,499	Ward 15: Daniel NARWA	\$2,485
Ward 6: Gilles R. CHASLES	\$4,991	Ward 16: Blake BATSON	\$8,911
Ward 7: Terry KILREA	\$4,085	Ward 17: Sean CURRAN	\$1,000
Ward 7: Sherril NOBLE	\$1,144	Ward 18: Yusef AL MEZEL	\$1,350
Ward 8: Brett DELMAGE	\$4,060	Ward 18: Perry MARLEAU	\$2,289
Ward 11: Frank REID	\$3,379	Ward 21: Jim STEWART	\$1,266
Ward 12: Bruce McCONVILLE	\$14,249	Ward 22: Tanya THOMPSON	\$2,372
Ward 13 : Maurice LAMIRANDE	\$1,443	Ward 23: Amrik DHAMI	\$3,050

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Clearly, for non-incumbents (in most cases the challengers to incumbents), personal finances are a consideration in deciding whether or not to participate in the democratic process, as in many cases challengers must rely on them in order to finance their campaigns. But not so for incumbents, as the evidence shows that very little of their own funds were used to finance their campaigns. Corporate contributions, which clearly favoured incumbents, not only allowed incumbents to run more expensive (and winning) campaigns in order to reach voters, but also enabled them not to have to rely on their own personal finances. It is quite an advantage.

Clearly, if personal finances are a consideration for running for elective office, then that creates a barrier to participation in the local democratic process. The fact that incumbents do not have to worry about this, in large part due to their inordinate share of corporate contributions, means that the reliance on corporate contributions to finance these campaigns skews the democratic process.

The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

The Financial Advantages of Incumbency

The advantages of incumbency include the ability to raise funds over more than one election period. As part of the provisions of the Municipal Elections Act, incumbents can bring money forward from previous election campaigns, use current fundraising to pay off previous campaign debts, and roll money forward into subsequent elections.

As a result, half of the incumbents (10 of 19) were able to start their campaigns with a significant financial advantage that makes it difficult for challengers to compete financially, as Table 4 below indicates. In several cases, winners in this election (14 out of 15 candidates reporting surpluses returnable to the City Clerk) were able to put away enough money to come close to paying for their entire next campaign. Aside for two candidates (both former municipal politicians in open wards), none of the 35 challengers in this election were in a position to return any funds to the City for future campaigns.

Table 4: Funds From The Past, Funds To the Future

	Reported Surplus from Previous Election	Funds Put in Trust With City from the 2006 Election
Ward 1: Bob MONETTE*	0	\$393
Ward 3: Jan HARDER*	\$10,951	\$11,366
Ward 4: Marianne WILKINSON	0	\$430
Ward 5: Eli EL-CHANTIRY*	\$5,784	\$20,629
Ward 6: Shad QADRI	0	\$5,126
Ward 8: Rick CHIARELLI*	\$9,473	\$6,815
Ward 9: Gord HUNTER*	\$11,563	\$21,247
Ward 10: Diane DEANS*	\$34,890	\$44,569
Ward 11 : Michel BELLEMARE*	\$1,382	\$5,450
Ward 13: Jacques LEGENDRE*	\$6,666	0
Ward 14: Diane HOLMES*	\$1,416	\$1,202
Ward 15: Christine LEADMAN	0	\$1,844
Ward 16: Maria McRAE*	0	\$6,356
Ward 18: Peter HUME*	\$10,487.67	\$5,243
Ward 19: Rob JELLETT*	\$483.10	\$13,599
Ward 22: Andrew HAYDON	0	\$1,968

* denotes incumbent, **bold** denotes winner (and future incumbent)

The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Corporate Contributions – Who’s Your Daddy?

The evidence shows that in the 2006 municipal election in Ottawa corporate donors favoured incumbents over challengers by a disturbingly wide margin – of the \$553,863 in campaign contributions to all Ottawa municipal candidates, incumbents (representing a little more than a quarter of all candidates) received \$358,667 or *nearly two-thirds* of this amount.

For Councillor races, not all incumbents are treated equally, as some incumbents are viewed more favourably by corporate donors (dominated largely by corporations who either depend on City Council decisions to make profit (i.e. developers, taxi companies, etc.) or who do business with the City (i.e. construction companies, waste management firms, etc.)). As well, there are a few incumbents who make it a policy not to accept corporate contributions, based on their views of potential conflict of interest.

Table 5: Corporate Contributions by Ward, 2006

Ranking (2006 election)	Ward Candidate Elected, All Wards (* denotes incumbent)	Corporate Contributions ranked by share of all contributions
1	Doug THOMPSON* (Ward 20)	81.9%
2	Gord HUNTER* (Ward 9)	68.8%
3	Jan HARDER* (Ward 3)	65.4%
4	Jacques LEGENDRE* (Ward 13)	56.3%
5	Maria MCRAE* (Ward 16)	55.9%
6	Georges BEDARD* (Ward 12)	55.0%
7	Rainer BLOESS* (Ward 2)	53.7%
8	Rob JELLETT* (Ward 19)	53.6%
9	Rick CHIARELLI* (Ward 8)	53.5%
10	Diane DEANS* (Ward 10)	53.4%
11	Michel BELLEMARE* (Ward 11)	51.3%
12	Bob MONETTE* (Ward 1)	49.7%
13	Eli EL-CHANTIRY* (Ward 5)	42.9%
14	Marianne WILKINSON (Ward 4)	37.8%
15	Christine LEADMAN (Ward 15)	36.3%
16	Shad QADRI (Ward 6)	20.5%
17	Steve DESROCHES (Ward 22)	12.7%
18	Diane HOLMES* (Ward 14)	6.7%
19	Alex CULLEN* (Ward 7)	0%
20	Clive DOUCET* (Ward 17)	0%
21	Peter HUME* (Ward 18)	0%
22	Glenn BROOKS* (Ward 21)	0%
23	Peggy FELTMATE* (Ward 23)	0%

What this list shows is that 11 out of 23 members of Council elected in 2006 depended on corporate contributions to fund *at least half* of their election campaign – and they were *all* incumbents.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Special People – Do Some Contributors Count More Than Others?

A longstanding feature of municipal elections in Ottawa, and in other cities in Ontario as well, is the presence of a small number of large contributors. The most important of these are listed in the Appendix, in the Big Spenders List. They include such familiar names as Richcraft Homes, Tartan Land Consultants, Trinity Development Group, Monarch Corporation, the Tomlinsons (both family and corporations), Coventry Connections (which operates Blue Line Taxis), Urbandale, the Taggarts (both family and corporations), Waste Management, the Regional Group, DCR Phoenix, and Claridge Homes. These are companies who do business with the City of Ottawa, in land development, construction, waste collection, etc., and who contribute to multiple municipal candidates, mostly to incumbents.

Making multiple contributions is not illegal as long as no candidate receives more than \$750 from a single individual or associated corporations. However, these corporations are making multiple contributions which amount to many times what most individuals are able to afford.

When corporations doing business with City Hall or who are direct beneficiaries of City Council decisions (i.e. land development) contribute to municipal election candidates, particularly when the preponderance of their contributions goes towards one particular class of candidates – incumbents, issues of propriety inevitably arise.

Should corporations doing business with the City, or their owners or principals, be in a position to contribute so much money to the political process that they could conceivably affect the outcome of some election campaigns?

As I said in my report on the 2003 election:

Businesses are not philanthropic enterprises: they contribute based on their self-interest or, at best, as a form of investment. Their contributions are not distributed evenly among candidates – the evidence shows they favour incumbents. Indeed as a result many incumbents rely heavily on corporate contributions to enable their election ... All of this raises questions about the relationship between incumbent councillors and their corporate donors – how close is the relationship, why corporations focus their contributions on incumbents, the objectivity of the recipients, etc. This leads to perceptions, whether true or not, that something is being given for something. This impairs the legitimacy of the electoral process in the eyes of the electorate, leading to cynicism among voters and contributing to lower voter turnouts. Removing the ability of corporations (and unions) to make campaign contributions to municipal candidates would eliminate this perception, and improve the sense of integrity in the municipal election process and result.

Nothing has changed since then, and the evidence from the 2006 municipal election in Ottawa shows that today these comments are very appropriate.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Compliance Issues – What Needs To Be Done?

As noted earlier, oversight issues regarding compliance with the provisions of *The Municipal Elections Act* are a major concern, and the problems are not unique to Ottawa.

Two issues stand out from the Ottawa 2006 municipal election campaign returns.

The first is that there are several instances of what, on the face of it, may be overcontributions by associated corporations.

The second issue has to do with anonymous contributions – contributions from numbered companies whose identity is not specified in campaign returns, thus making it difficult for the electorate to make a judgment about the propriety of these contributions.

Under the *Municipal Elections Act* companies that are "associated" (as defined by section 256 of the *Income Tax Act*) are deemed to be a single corporation and can therefore not exceed the \$750 campaign contribution limit to a single candidate.⁴

However, there are several instances in the returns where these limits may have been exceeded. To determine whether this is actually the case, a compliance audit would be required. To date, none of these instances has been the subject of a compliance audit, so the reality of these contributions remains a bit of a mystery.

The *Municipal Elections Act* is significantly looser than the *Canada Elections Act*, for instance, with respect to both anonymous contributions and corporate contributions. At the federal level neither are allowed. At the municipal level, both are allowed.

A list of some specific cases is provided below. In each of these cases not enough detail is provided in the return (nor required by the *Municipal Elections Act*) to determine whether they involve associated corporations under the Act, or whether they involve contributions exceeding the \$750 limit to a candidate, as specified under the Act.

Claridge Homes Corp. and 210 Gladstone contributions to Bob Chiarelli

Claridge Homes Corp	210 Gladstone Ave, Suite 2001	\$500
1024482 Ontario Ltd.	210 Gladstone Ave., Suite 2001	\$750
519952 Ontario Ltd.	210 Gladstone Ave., Suite 2001	\$750

Colautti contributions to Bob Chiarelli

Colautti Administrative Services Ltd	2562 Delzotto Ave., Ottawa	\$750
Colautti Construction Ltd	2562 Delzotto Ave., Ottawa	\$750
Colautti Equipment Repairs Ltd	2562 Delzotto Ave., Ottawa	\$750

⁴ Section 72 of the Municipal Elections Act says that "corporations that are associated with one another under section 256 of the *Income Tax Act* (Canada) shall be deemed to be a single corporation. 1996, c.32, Sched., s.72. ..." and can therefore contribute only up to \$750 per candidate.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Ellis Don contributions to Bob Chiarelli

Ellis Don Corporation	2045 Oxford St. E, London	\$750
Ellis Don Forming Ltd.	2045 Oxford St. E, London	\$750

The Regional Group contributions to Bob Chiarelli

The Regional Group of Companies	200 Catherine St., Ottawa	\$750
Regional Group (Stittsville Dev.) (sic)	1737 Woodward Dr., 2 nd Floor	\$375
Regional Group (Trim Dev.) (sic)	1737 Woodward Dr., 2 nd Floor	\$375

Claridge Homes and 210 Gladstone contributions to Larry O'Brien

Claridge Homes Corp	210 Gladstone Ave, Suite 2001	\$500
1024482 Ontario Ltd.	210 Gladstone Ave., Suite 2001	\$750
1024483 Ontario Ltd.	210 Gladstone Ave., Suite 2001	\$750
874158 Ontario Ltd.	210 Gladstone Ave., Suite 2001	\$750

The Regional Group contributions to Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)

Klondike Investments	1737 Woodward Dr., 2 nd Floor	\$750
P and R Builders	1727 Woodward Dr. 2 nd Floor	\$750
Regional Group of Companies – Cumberland Development Lands Co.	200 Catherine St., 2 nd Floor	\$750
Regional Group of Companies in Trust for Kanata Road Inc	1737 Woodward Dr, 2 nd Floor	\$750
Regional Group of Companies in Trust for Stittsville Lands	1737 Woodward Dr, 2 nd Floor	\$750

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

The Importance of Municipal Election Finance Reform

At the federal level, under the *Canada Elections Act*, as of January 2007, corporate and union donations are not allowed. Only individuals may contribute to the political process. At the municipal level, both can contribute.

As the returns indicate, (Appendix, Table 6) union contributions are not a significant factor in the municipal election process, nor in the campaign of any specific candidates. Only three Council candidates received any union contributions at all, and in each case the contributions were small, both in absolute terms and compared to the amount of corporate contributions.

However, if union contributions are not very important, corporate contributions are, and they are heavily weighted toward incumbent candidates.

11 Council winners, all incumbents, received *over half* of their campaign contributions from corporations (note, though, that 5 incumbents received *no* corporate contributions at all). The overall average of corporate contributions for incumbents was 42%, for winners a little over 39%.

The Council losers were not so fortunate. Of the 45 losing Council candidates only 3 received more than 50% of their contributions from corporations. Of these, one was the former Regional Chair, a second was a former Mayoral candidate, and the third received corporate contributions totaling \$750, his only contributions in the election. The overall average for losing candidates was 15%.

Moreover, many of these corporate contributions came from organizations doing business with the City. This raises questions regarding the purpose of these contributions.

The point of this is that in an election where choices are supposed to be based on the competition of candidates and their ideas, money clearly creates an uneven playing field. Based on the evidence from the last two municipal elections in Ottawa, the advantage of incumbency to fundraise and spend to get elected is exacerbated by its undue share of corporate contributions.

The current system permits some citizens to contribute more than once to a particular candidate, as an individual, and through a corporation, whereas the overwhelming bulk of the electorate can only do so once. *It is difficult to see how this can be fair.*

The situation is made worse when some of these corporate contributions are made anonymously, through numbered corporations. The principle of transparency, which should apply to all transactions involving election finance, is violated.

In the previous report to City Council I had made on the 2003 election, I recommended that all corporate and union contributions be prohibited. This recommendation was not accepted by the previous Council, *the majority of whom were incumbents who have benefited from significant corporate contributions to their own election campaigns.*

It is obvious that reforms are needed to municipal election finances increase transparency. In election finance, as in most things to do with public life, more sunshine is the best medicine.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Recommendations:

- That the City of Ottawa request the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to enact legislation amending the *Municipal Elections Act* to permit municipalities to prohibit corporate and trade union contributions to candidates for municipal councils, to be effective for the next municipal elections;
- That upon enabling legislation, the City of Ottawa enact a bylaw to prohibit corporate and union contributions to municipal candidates for Ottawa City Council, to take effect for the next set of municipal elections.
- That, if corporate donations are not disallowed, the City of Ottawa request the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing implement reporting reforms that would require all candidates at the municipal level to ensure they receive no contributions past the current allowed limit from associated corporations, and that the identity and control of all numbered corporations be included in campaign returns.

In the alternative, that no contributions from numbered companies to municipal candidates be permitted (similar to current federal election finance law).

- That the City of Ottawa request the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing examine the issue of campaign surpluses carried forward from one campaign to the next, in order to eliminate the financial advantages of incumbency that discourage new candidates from entering municipal politics.

The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Appendix A: Tables

Table 6: 2006 Election – Contributions by Source

	Total Contributions	\$100 and under	Individuals over \$100	Corporations over \$100	Unions over \$100	Self
MAYOR						
Piotr ANWEILER	\$ 1,500	\$0	\$ 1,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bob CHIARELLI*	\$389,666	\$ 5,409	\$159,726	\$152,365	\$0	\$0
Alex MUNTER	\$735,525	\$144,316	\$538,575	\$ 24,974	\$4,175	\$ 23,483
Larry O'BRIEN	\$433,697	\$ 6,151	\$185,590	\$ 87,097	\$ 500	\$154,357
Barkley POLLOCK	\$ 35	\$ 35	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Terry KILREA ⁵	\$ 33,515	\$ 9,255	\$ 16,500	\$ 5,900	\$0	\$1,860
Ward 1						
Bob MONETTE*	\$23,117	\$240	\$7,600	\$11,500	\$0	\$4,171
Dennis VOWLES	\$ 4,311	\$ 99	\$1,450	\$ 1,200	\$0	\$1,562
Ward 2						
Rainer BLOESS*	\$25,209	\$3,149	\$5,900	\$13,550	\$0	\$2,610
David CAMERON	\$ 4,911	\$0	\$ 305	\$ 750	\$0	\$3,856
Ward 3						
T. K. CHU	\$ 3,083	\$600	\$2,137	\$0	\$0	\$ 346
Catherine GARDNER	\$ 1,175	\$125	\$ 400	\$0	\$0	\$ 653
Jan HARDER*	\$27,299	\$999	\$8,450	\$17,850	\$0	\$0
Joseph KING	\$ 4,958	\$456	\$ 500	\$0	\$0	\$4,002
Ward 4						
Eric FORGRAVE	\$ 750	\$0	\$0	\$ 750	\$0	\$0
Matt MUIRHEAD	\$ 9,868	\$2,282	\$4,850	\$2,250	\$0	\$ 485
Jeff SEETON	\$13,964	\$1,240	\$3,125	\$0	\$0	\$9,499
Marianne WILKINSON	\$17,045	\$3,445	\$7,150	\$6,450	\$0	\$0
Ward 5						
J.P. DORION	\$10,757	\$3,516	\$ 4,651	\$ 2,350	\$0	\$239
Eli EL-CHANTIRY*	\$34,510	\$1,905	\$17,610	\$14,805	\$190	\$0
Ward 6						
Gilles R. CHASLES	\$15,621	\$ 1,880	\$ 5,300	\$3,450	\$0	\$4,991
Shad QADRI	\$26,107	\$10,164	\$10,600	\$5,343	\$0	\$0
Ward 7						
Alex CULLEN*	\$31,411	\$14,440	\$16,970	\$0	\$0	\$0
Terry KILREA	\$24,460	\$ 1,325	\$ 3,650	\$15,300	\$0	\$4,185
Sherril NOBLE	\$ 4,679	\$ 675	\$ 2,250	\$ 610	\$0	\$1,144
Ward 8						
Rick CHIARELLI*	\$26,512	\$225	\$12,100	\$14,187	\$0	\$0
Brett DELMAGE	\$ 5,995	\$585	\$ 1,350	\$0	\$0	\$4,060

⁵ Terry Kilrea initially registered to run for Mayor, and later withdrew to run for City Council in Ward 7. He filed election returns for both campaigns.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

	Total Contributions	\$100 and under	Individuals over \$100	Corporations over \$100	Unions over \$100	Self
Ward 9						
James DEAN	\$ 1,315	\$0	\$ 650	\$0	\$0	\$665
Gord HUNTER*	\$29,704	\$3,054	\$5,450	\$20,450	\$750	\$0
Ward 10						
David ALLOGGIA	\$ 1,047	\$0	\$ 500	\$0	\$0	\$547
Diane DEANS*	\$34,176	\$3,225	\$12,700	\$18,251	\$0	\$0
Ward 11						
Michel BELLEMARE*	\$31,375	\$7,075	\$6,200	\$16,100	\$0	\$2,000
Frank REID	\$ 8,929	\$ 650	\$3,000	\$ 1,900	\$0	\$3,379
Ward 12						
Georges BÉDARD*	\$26,250	\$4,250	\$7,550	\$14,450	\$0	\$0
Bruce McCONVILLE	\$24,566	\$6,141	\$4,174	\$0	\$0	\$14,249
Ward 13						
Jules BOUVIER	\$ 8,962	\$0	\$8,700	\$ 200	\$0	\$ 62
Maurice LAMIRANDE	\$ 3,793	\$ 900	\$ 400	\$ 1,050	\$0	\$1,443
Jacques LEGENDRE*	\$20,670	\$2,955	\$6,050	\$11,665	\$0	\$0
Muinis RAMADAN	\$ 1,500	\$ 25	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,475
Ward 14						
I. BEN-TAHIR	\$ 3,171	\$1,150	\$1,650	\$ 250	\$0	\$ 121
George GUIRGUIS	\$ 125	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 125
Diane HOLMES*	\$18,793	\$8,264	\$9,279	\$1,250	\$0	\$0
Luc LAPOINTE	\$12,467	\$ 650	\$9,400	\$ 200	\$0	\$2,217
Ward 15						
Christine LEADMAN	\$23,297	\$3,351	\$11,485	\$8,460	\$0	\$0
Gary LUDINGTON	\$16,631	\$5,005	\$10,395	\$0	\$0	\$1,231
Daniel NARWA	\$ 2,485	\$ 200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,485
Vicky SMALLMAN	\$21,899	\$8,769	\$13,130	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ward 16						
Blake BATSON	\$30,005	\$3,195	\$13,999	\$ 3,900	\$0	\$8,911
Maria McRAE*	\$32,850	\$1,050	\$13,200	\$18,350	\$250	\$0
Ward 17						
Ian BOYD	\$ 9,555	\$1,145	\$ 5,800	\$1,250	\$0	\$1,360
Sean CURRAN	\$ 1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Clive DOUCET*	\$22,330	\$7,260	\$11,700	\$0	\$0	\$1,967
Ward 18						
Yusef AL MEZEL	\$ 6,500	\$1,600	\$ 3,350	\$200	\$0	\$1,350
Peter HUME*	\$32,424	\$5,111	\$26,975	\$0	\$0	\$ 337
Ahmed IBRAHIM	\$ 920	\$ 600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 320
Ismael LEDIYE	\$ 700	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 700
Perry MARLEAU	\$ 3,575	\$ 110	\$ 1,175	\$0	\$0	\$2,289
Ward 19						
Dan BIOCCHI	\$ 1,169	\$0	\$ 1,025	\$0	\$0	\$ 144
Rob JELLETT*	\$34,442	\$3,256	\$11,325	\$18,450	\$0	\$1,411
Henry VALOIS	\$ 4,268	\$ 500	\$ 3,050	\$0	\$0	\$ 718

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

	Total Contributions	\$100 and under	Individuals over \$100	Corporations over \$100	Unions over \$100	Self
Ward 20						
Robert FOWLER	\$ 402	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$402
Doug THOMPSON*	\$9,336	\$315	\$1,250	\$7,650	\$0	\$0
Ward 21						
Glenn BROOKS*	\$6,176	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,176
Scott MOFFATT	\$7,311	\$2,275	\$4,200	\$0	\$0	\$ 836
Jim STEWART	\$5,566	\$ 300	\$3,800	\$200	\$0	\$1,266
Ward 22						
Steve DESROCHES	\$18,075	\$6,025	\$9,950	\$2,300	\$0	\$0
Don DRANSFIELD	\$ 3,279	\$ 450	\$1,400	\$ 500	\$0	\$ 929
Andrew HAYDON	\$15,325	\$1,839	\$7,150	\$8,205	\$0	\$0
Tanya THOMPSON	\$ 6,199	\$ 425	\$1,602	\$1,800	\$0	\$2,372
Ward 23						
Amrik DHAMI	\$18,125	\$ 25	\$14,250	\$ 800	\$0	\$3,050
Peggy FELTMATE*	\$22,217	\$10,439	\$11,278	\$ 500	\$0	\$ 720
Suraj HARISH	\$ 8,560	\$ 2,210	\$ 5,250	\$1,100	\$0	\$0
Allan HUBLEY	\$19,280	\$ 3,470	\$ 9,360	\$6,450	\$0	\$0
Richard RUTKOWSKI	\$ 1,910	\$ 260	\$ 1,650	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes to Table 6:

Names in bold are election winners; names with an asterisk (*) are incumbents.

The figures include the assumption by candidate of any deficit, or return of surplus to candidate if not stated.

Small discrepancies are due to interest income.

Bob Chiarelli's total spending in the election exceeded current contributions of \$317,500 because of two factors: \$70,629 from the surplus from the last election, and \$2526 in interest income during the campaign.

The difference in Jan Harder's totals is related to surplus brought in from last campaign of \$10,951 and the surplus from this election sent to the Clerk.

Eli El Chantiry (Ward 5) brought in \$5784 from the last campaign and returned \$20,629 from this election to the Clerk.

Rick Chiarelli (Ward 8) brought in \$9,473 from the last campaign and returned \$6,815 from this election to the Clerk.

Gord Hunter (Ward 9) brought in \$11,563 from the last campaign and returned \$21,247 from this election to the Clerk.

Diane Deans (Ward 10) brought in \$34,890 from the last campaign and returned \$44,569 from this election to the Clerk.

Michel Bellemare (Ward 11) brought in \$1,382 from the last campaign, and returned \$5,450 from this election to the Clerk. The \$2,000 reported as self contribution is in the form of inventory from the previous campaign, not a monetary outlay.

Diane Holmes (Ward 14) brought in \$1,414 from the last campaign and returned \$1,202 from this election to the Clerk.

Peter Hume (Ward 18) brought in \$10,487 from the last campaign and returned \$5,243 from this election to the Clerk.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Rob Jellett (Ward 19) brought in \$483 from the last campaign and returned \$13,599 from this election to the Clerk.

Three winning candidates (Rainer Bloess (Ward 2), Alex Cullen (Ward 7), Peggy Feltmate (Ward 23)) used current funds to retire deficits from the previous campaign.

Table 7: 2006 Election – Surplus, Deficit, Cost to Run

	Surplus from previous election (2003)	Surplus/(deficit) at end of 2006 election	Candidate contribution to own election	Out of pocket cost to run	Funds put in trust with City
MAYOR					
Piotr ANWEILER	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$ 1,500	\$0
Bob CHIARELLI*	\$70,629	\$ 494	\$2,000	\$ 1,505	\$0
Alex MUNTER	\$0	(\$ 23,483)	\$0	\$ 23,483	\$0
Larry O'BRIEN	\$0	(\$154,357)	\$0	\$154,357	\$0
Barkley POLLOCK	\$0	0	\$ 35	\$ 35	\$0
Terry KILREA ⁶	\$ 8,128	\$ 1,660	\$0	\$ 1,660	\$0
Ward 1					
Bob MONETTE*	\$0	\$393	\$0	\$0	\$393
Dennis VOWLES	\$0	(\$812)	\$750	\$1,562	\$0
Ward 2					
Rainer BLOESS*	(\$4,366)	\$2,545	\$0	\$0	\$0
David CAMERON	\$0	\$0	\$3,856	\$3,856	\$0
Ward 3					
T. K. CHU	\$0	(\$ 346)	\$0	\$346	\$0
Catherine GARDNER	(\$ 71)	(\$ 3)	\$650	\$653	\$0
Jan HARDER*	\$10,951	\$11,366	\$0	\$0	\$11,366
Joseph KING	\$0	(\$4,002)	\$0	\$4,002	\$0
Ward 4					
Eric FORGRAVE	\$0	\$ 80	\$0	\$0	\$0
Matt MUIRHEAD	\$0	\$2,030	\$2,526	\$ 495	\$0
Jeff SEETON	\$0	\$ 159	\$8,659	\$8,499	\$0
Marianne WILKINSON	\$0	\$ 430	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ward 5					
J.P. DORION	\$0	(\$ 239)	\$0	\$239	\$0
Eli EL-CHANTIRY*	\$5,784	\$20,629	\$0	\$0	\$20,629
Ward 6					
Gilles R. CHASLES	\$0	(\$4,991)	\$0	\$4,991	\$0
Shad QADRI	\$0	\$5,126	\$0	\$0	\$5,126

⁶ Terry Kilrea initially registered to run for Mayor, and later withdrew to run for City Council in Ward 7. He filed election returns for both campaigns.

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

	Surplus from previous election (2003)	Surplus/(deficit) at end of 2006 election	Candidate contribution to own election	Out of pocket cost to run	Funds put in trust with City
Ward 7					
Alex CULLEN*	(\$3,258)	\$2,266	\$0	\$0	\$0
Terry KILREA	\$0	(\$4,085)	\$0	\$4,085	\$0
Sherril NOBLE	\$0	(\$1,144)	\$0	\$1,144	\$0
Ward 8					
Rick CHIARELLI*	\$9,473	\$6,815	\$0	\$0	\$6,815
Brett DELMAGE	\$0	(\$1,223)	\$2,836	\$4,060	\$0
Ward 9					
James DEAN	\$0	\$0	\$665.00	\$665	\$0
Gord HUNTER*	\$11,563	\$21,247	\$0	\$0	\$21,247
Ward 10					
David ALLOGGIA	\$0	\$0	\$547	\$547	\$0
Diane DEANS*	\$34,890	\$44,569	\$0	\$0	\$44,569
Ward 11					
Michel BELLEMARE*	\$1,382	\$5,450	\$0	\$0	\$5,450
Frank REID	\$0	(\$3,379)	\$0	\$3,379	\$0
Ward 12					
Georges BÉDARD*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bruce McCONVILLE	\$0	\$5,750	\$20,000	\$14,249	\$0
Ward 13					
Jules BOUVIER	\$0	\$ 437	\$500	\$ 62	\$0
Maurice LAMIRANDE	\$0	(\$1,443)	\$0	\$1,443	\$0
Jacques LEGENDRE*	\$6,666	\$ 338	\$0	\$0	\$0
Muinis RAMADAN	\$0	(\$1,475)	\$0	\$1,475	\$0
Ward 14					
I. BEN-TAHIR	\$0	(\$ 121)	\$0	\$ 121	\$0
George GUIRGUIS	\$0	\$ 125	\$0	\$ 125	\$0
Diane HOLMES*	\$1,416	\$1,202	\$0	\$0	\$1,202
Luc LAPOINTE	\$0	(\$2,117)	\$0	\$2,117	\$0
Ward 15					
Christine LEADMAN	\$0	\$1,844	\$0	\$0	\$1,844
Gary LUDINGTON	(\$335)	(\$ 231)	\$1,000	\$1,231	\$0
Daniel NARWA	\$0	\$ 24	\$2,510	\$2,485	\$0
Vicky SMALLMAN	\$0	\$ 168	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ward 16					
Blake BATSON	\$0	(\$1,411)	\$7,500	\$8,911	\$0
Maria McRAE*	\$0	\$6,356	\$0	\$0	\$6,356
Ward 17					
Ian BOYD	\$0	\$ 441	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sean CURRAN	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000	\$0
Clive DOUCET*	\$0	(\$1,571)	\$1,967	\$3,502	\$0

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

	Surplus from previous election (2003)	Surplus/(deficit) at end of 2006 election	Candidate contribution to own election	Out of pocket cost to run	Funds put in trust with City
Ward 18					
Yusef AL MEZEL	\$0	(\$750)	\$ 600	\$1,350	\$0
Peter HUME*	\$10,487	\$5,243	\$ 337	\$ 337	\$5,243
Ahmed IBRAHIM	\$0	\$0	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$0
Perry MARLEAU	\$0	(\$244)	\$2,044	\$2,289	\$0
Ward 19					
Dan BIOCCHI	\$0	(\$ 144)	\$0	\$ 144	\$0
Rob JELLET* [*]	\$483	\$16,517	\$1,411	\$1,411	\$13,599
Henry VALOIS	\$0	(\$ 568)	\$ 150	\$ 718	\$0
Ward 20					
Robert FOWLER	\$0	(\$402)	\$0	\$402	\$0
Doug THOMPSON*	\$0	\$479	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ward 21					
Glenn BROOKS*	\$0	\$0	\$6,176	\$6,176	\$0
Scott MOFFATT	\$0	(\$ 536)	\$ 300	\$ 836	\$0
Jim STEWART	\$0	(\$1,266)	\$0	\$1,266	\$0
Ward 22					
Steve DESROCHES	\$0	\$ 93	\$0	\$0	\$0
Don DRANSFIELD	\$0	(\$ 729)	\$200	\$929	\$0
Andrew HAYDON	\$0	\$1,968	\$0	\$0	\$1,968
Tanya THOMPSON	\$0	\$941	\$3,313	\$2,372	\$0
Ward 23					
Amrik DHAMI	\$0	(\$3,050)	\$0	\$3,050	\$0
Peggy FELTMATE*	(\$1,749)	(\$ 589)	\$131	\$ 720	\$0
Suraj HARISH	\$0	\$ 57	\$0	\$0	\$0
Allan HUBLEY	\$0	\$ 149	\$0	\$0	\$0
Richard RUTKOWSKI	\$0	\$ 204	\$0	\$0	\$0

NOTES:

Deficit is assumed to be paid by candidate.

Candidate contribution to own election, in some cases, includes donations by spouse to campaign

Out of pocket cost to run measures the actual monetary outlay required to run in this election; this is the combination of candidate contribution and final campaign deficit, counted as zero if there is no deficit or a surplus

Because of variations in the way the election return was filled out by various candidates, candidate outlay shows up in some returns as assumption of final debt/deficit, (with no candidate contribution) or in the category of election contributions by candidate or spouse sufficient to cover outstanding debts as opposed to the reporting of a deficit. In some campaigns, candidates also made personal contributions at the beginning of the campaign, which was either not reimbursed, or reimbursed wholly or partially from any end of campaign surplus.

The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Appendix B: The Big Spenders List

Tomlinson Contributions (Corporate and Family)

William Tomlinson	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Ron Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
William Tomlinson	\$750	Gord Hunter
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Gord Hunter
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Gord Hunter
William Tomlinson	\$750	Diane Deans
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Diane Deans
Ms. Amy Tomlinson	\$750	Diane Deans
William Tomlinson	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Tomlinson Environmental Services Ltd.	\$750	Larry O'Brien
William Tomlinson	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
William R. Tomlinson	\$750	Jan Harder
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$550	Jan Harder
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Jan Harder
William R. Tomlinson	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
William R. Tomlinson	\$750	Rob Jellett
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Rob Jellett
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Rob Jellett
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Rainer Bloess
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Michel Bellemare
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Georges Bedard
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Jacques Legendre
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Maria McRae
Ron Tomlinson	\$750	Maria McRae
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Doug Thompson
R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.	\$750	Bob Monette
Total (34 contributions)	\$25,300	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Richcraft and Related Companies

Richcraft Homes	\$750	Bob Monette
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Jan Harder
Richcraft Homes	\$500	Matt Muirhead
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Marianne Wilkinson
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Gord Hunter
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Diane Deans
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Georges Bedard
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Maria McRae
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Rob Jellett
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Doug Thompson
Richcraft Homes	\$500	Steve Desroches
Richcraft Homes	\$500	Tanya Thompson
Richcraft Homes	\$500	Don Dransfield
Richcraft Homes	\$500	Suraj Harish
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Richcraft Homes	\$750	Larry O'Brien
RC Realty Management	\$750	Rainer Bloess
RC Realty Management	\$500	Eli El-Chantiry
RC Realty Management	\$500	Rick Chiarelli
RC Realty Management	\$750	Gord Hunter
RC Realty Management	\$750	Diane Deans
RC Realty Management	\$750	Michel Bellemare
RC Realty Management	\$750	Georges Bedard
RC Realty Management	\$750	Maria McRae
RC Realty Management	\$500	Rob Jellett
RC Realty Management	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
RC Realty Management	\$375	Larry O'Brien
Total (31 contributions)	\$20,875	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Pierre Bergeron

Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Bob Monette
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Jan Harder
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Gord Hunter
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Diane Deans
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Georges Bedard
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Christine Leadman
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Maria McRae
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Blake Batson
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Rob Jellett
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Doug Thompson
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Scott Moffatt
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Steve Desroches
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Andy Haydon
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Allan Hubley
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Peggy Feltmate
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Pierre Bergeron	\$750	Peter Hume
Total (21 Contributions)	\$15,750	

Tartan Land Consultants

Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Bob Monette
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Jan Harder
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
Tartan Land Consultants	\$350	J. P. Dorion
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Gord Hunter
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Diane Deans
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Georges Bedard
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Maria McRae
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Ian Boyd
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Rob Jellett
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Doug Thompson
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Steve Desroches
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Andy Haydon
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Allan Hubley
Tartan Land Consultants	\$500	Bob Chiarelli
Tartan Land Consultants	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Total (20 contributions)	\$14,350	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Trinity Development Group

Trinity Development Group	\$750	Bob Monette
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Jan Harder
Trinity Development Group	\$500	Eric Forgrave
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Marianne Wilkinson
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Gord Hunter
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Diane Deans
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Frank Reid
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Rob Jellett
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Tanya Thompson
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Andy Haydon
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Trinity Development Group	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Total (15 contributions)	\$11,000	

Monarch Corporation

Monarch Corporation	\$750	Rainer Bloess
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Jan Harder
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Gord Hunter
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Diane Deans
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Monarch Corporation	\$500	Georges Bedard
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Maria McRae
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Rob Jellett
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Doug Thompson
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Allan Hubley
Monarch Corporation	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Total (13 contributions)	\$9,500	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Taggart Companies and Family

Doran Contractors	\$750	Gord Hunter
Doran Contractors	\$750	Maria McRae
Doran Contractors	\$750	Rob Jellett
Doran Contractors	\$750	Andy Haydon
Doran Contractors	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Michael Taggart	\$750	Larry O'Brien
James Taggart	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Taggart Investments	\$750	Eli El-Chantiry
Taggart Corp	\$500	Frank Reid
James Taggart	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Michael Taggart	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Tamarack Developments	\$500	Bob Chiarelli
Total (12 contributions)	\$8,500	

Brian Karam (Karam Greenspon)

Brian Karam	\$750	Bob Monette
Brian Karam	\$650	Rainer Bloess
Brian Karam	\$750	Jan Harder
Brian Karam	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Brian Karam	\$750	Rick Chiarelli
Brian Karam	\$750	Gord Hunter
Brian Karam	\$750	Georges Bedard
Brian Karam	\$750	Christine Leadman
Brian Karam	\$300	Maria McRae
Brian Karam	\$750	Steve Desroches
Brian Karam	\$250	Bob Chiarelli
Brian Karam	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Total (12 contributions)	\$7,950	

**The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election**

Coventry Connections – Hanif Patni

Coventry Connections	\$250	Bob Monette
Coventry Connections	\$500	Rainer Bloess
Coventry Connections	\$380	Eli El-Chantiry
Coventry Connections	\$300	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Coventry Connections	\$200	Rick Chiarelli
Coventry Connections	\$200	Diane Deans
Coventry Connections	\$300	Michel Bellemare
Coventry Connections	\$700	Georges Bedard
Coventry Connections	\$200	Jacques Legendre
Coventry Connections	\$750	Maria McRae
Coventry Connections	\$500	Rob Jellett
Coventry Connections	\$500	Allan Hubley
Coventry Connections	\$500	Amrik Dhami
Coventry Connections	\$750	Alex Munter
Coventry Connections	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Coventry Connections	\$375	Larry O'Brien
Coventry Connections	\$500	Jan Harder
Total (17 contributions)	\$7,655	

Urbandale Corporation

Urbandale Corporation	\$750	Diane Deans
Urbandale Corporation	\$750	Maria McRae
Urbandale Corporation	\$700	Bob Monette
Urbandale Corporation	\$400	Eli El-Chantiry
Urbandale Corporation	\$500	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Urbandale Corporation	\$750	Michel Bellemare
Urbandale Corporation	\$400	Blake Batson
Urbandale Construction	\$500	Blake Batson
Urbandale Corporation	\$500	Rob Jellett
Urbandale Corporation	\$750	Allan Hubley
Urbandale Corporation	\$250	Bob Chiarelli
Urbandale Construction	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Urbandale Corporation	\$600	Larry O'Brien
Total (13 contributions)	\$7,600	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Vered Family (Ron Engineering and Construction)

Arnon Vered	\$300	Bob Monette
Arnon Vered	\$500	Rick Chiarelli
Arnon Vered	\$500	Diane Deans
Arnon Vered	\$500	Rob Jellett
Gilad Vered	\$300	Eli El-Chantiry
Gilad Vered	\$200	Alex Cullen
Gilad Vered	\$300	Diane Holmes
Gilad Vered	\$500	Andy Haydon
Ron Vered	\$500	Jan Harder
Ron Vered	\$300	Rainer Bloess
Ron Vered	\$500	Jan Harder
Ron Vered	\$500	Gord Hunter
Ron Vered	\$500	Jacques Legendre
Zeev Vered	\$625	Bob Chiarelli
Total (14 contributions)	\$6,025	

Waste Management Canada

Waste Management Canada	\$200	Bob Monette
Waste Management Canada	\$190	Eli El-Chantiry
Waste Management Canada	\$300	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Waste Management Canada	\$400	Rick Chiarelli
Waste Management Canada	\$300	Gord Hunter
Waste Management Canada	\$300	Michel Bellemare
Waste Management Canada	\$200	Frank Reid
Waste Management Canada	\$400	Georges Bedard
Waste Management Canada	\$400	Christine Leadman
Waste Management Canada	\$700	Maria McRae
Waste Management Canada	\$300	Blake Batson
Waste Management Canada	\$300	Doug Thompson
Waste Management Canada	\$200	Steve Desroches
Waste Management Canada	\$200	Allan Hubley
Waste Management Canada	\$800	Bob Chiarelli
Waste Management Canada	\$725	Larry O'Brien
Total (16 contributions)	\$5,915	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Regional Group of Companies

Klondike Investments	\$750	Terry Kilrea
P and R Builders	\$750	Terry Kilrea
Regional Group	\$500	Michel Bellemare
Regional Group (Stittsville Dev.) (sic)	\$375	Bob Chiarelli
Regional Group (Trim Dev.) (sic)	\$375	Bob Chiarelli
Regional Group of Companies – Cumberland Development Lands Co.	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Regional Group of Companies in Trust for Kanata Road Inc	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
Regional Group of Companies in Trust for Stittsville Lands	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
The Regional Group of Companies	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Total (9 contributions)	\$5750.00	

DCR Phoenix Corporation

DCR Phoenix	\$750	Bob Monette
DCR Phoenix	\$500	Matt Muirhead
DCR Phoenix	\$500	Marianne Wilkinson
DCR Phoenix	\$750	Terry Kilrea (Ward 7)
DCR Phoenix	\$500	Rick Chiarelli
DCR Phoenix	\$500	Gord Hunter
DCR Phoenix	\$750	Diane Deans
DCR Phoenix	\$750	Maria McRae
DCR Phoenix	\$500	Rob Jellett
Total (9 contributions)	\$5,500	

Tim Kane

Tim Kane	\$750	Bob Monette
Tim Kane	\$750	Eli El-Chantry
Tim Kane	\$750	Diane Deans
Tim Kane	\$750	Georges Bedard
Tim Kane	\$750	Maria McRae
Tim Kane	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
Tim Kane	\$750	Allan Hubley
Total (7 contributions)	\$5,250	

The Need For Reform: A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Claridge Homes

Claridge Homes	\$300	Rick Chiarelli
Claridge Homes	\$750	Gord Hunter
Claridge Homes	\$750	Diane Deans
Claridge Homes	\$250	Andy Haydon
Claridge Homes Corp	\$500	Bob Chiarelli
Claridge Homes Corp	\$500	Larry O'Brien
Total (6 contributions) *	\$3,050.00	
* (In addition to the Claridge contributions, there is a total of \$3,750 in contributions from numbered companies with the same address and suite number as Claridge Homes)		

The Need For Reform:
A Report on the 2006 Municipal Election

Numbered Companies – Who Are They?

1010266 Ontario Inc.	\$500	Bob Chiarelli
1019883 Ontario Inc.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
1024482 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
1024482 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Larry O'Brien
1024483 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Larry O'Brien
1041365 Ontario Inc.	\$750	Allan Hubley
1041635 Ontario Inc.	\$750	Gilles Chasles
10555602 Ontario Inc.	\$200	Larry O'Brien
1150140 Ontario Inc.	\$250	Alex Munter
1172425 Ontario Inc.	\$200	Georges Bedard
1172425 Ontario Ltd.	\$300	Maria McRae
1180633 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
1193736 Ontario Inc.	\$650	Bob Chiarelli
1258898 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Maria McRae
1278311 Ontario Ltd.	\$300	Bob Chiarelli
128898 Ontario Ltd	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
1323646 Ontario Inc.	\$300	Shad Qadri
1404811 Ontario Ltd.	\$650	Bob Chiarelli
1496099 Ontario Inc.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
157784 Ontario Inc.	\$750	Gilles Chasles
176318 Canada Inc	\$200	Eli El-Chantiry
173655 Canada Inc.	\$250	Bob Chiarelli
502550 Ontario Inc.	\$750	David Cameron
519952 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Bob Chiarelli
688870 Ontario Ltd.	\$200	Gilles Chasles
874158 Ontario Ltd.	\$750	Larry O'Brien
Total (26 contributions)**	\$14,500	
<p>** Note that this list includes only numbered companies that are not otherwise identified in the returns. In addition to this list, there are several numbered companies in the returns that are identified with a trade name ("123456 Ontario Inc., O/A Acme Widget") which are included in overall corporate contributions totals but not included here.</p>		