

Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission: Municipal Elections Committee



Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
June 20, 2017

Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission Membership

Paul Jaspar (Chair)

Linda Moulin (Vice-Chair)

Jennifer Lester

Charles Smith

Joan White

Merri-Ellen Wright

Researcher

Kurt Terfloth

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PART II: INTRODUCTION	
Overview	5
Methodology.....	5
Background	5
Assessment.....	6
Moving Forward.....	7
PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS	
The Returning Officer	
1. Mandate.....	8
2. Independent Location.....	8
3. Term of Office.....	8
4. Electoral Staff and Candidate Support.....	9
5. Dedicated Lines of Communication.....	9
6. Candidate Materials.....	9
7. Plain-Language Clarification of Election Sign Rules.....	10
8. Method of Nomination Fee Payment.....	10
Electoral Finance	
9. Nomination Paper Submission.....	11
10. Article Clarifications of Bylaw No. 8491.....	11
11. Fundraising Events.....	12
12. Surplus Campaign Funds	13
13. Official Agent for Office of the Mayor Candidate.....	13
14. Financial Audits for Office of the Mayor Candidate.....	14
15. Limitation of Contributions	14
16. Communications Allowance-Advertising.....	16
PART IV: CONCLUSION	16
APPENDICES	17

PART I: INTRODUCTION

The Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission (SMRC) presents this second report examining the administration of Saskatoon's municipal election process. In preparation of this report, the SMRC examined Saskatoon's elections bylaws, policies, and election materials, while also comparing those policies with other cities across Canada. We also undertook a consultation process with the 2016 Returning Officer (a new position with the City of Saskatoon) as well as conducting a broad survey of all candidates participating in the 2016 municipal election. Those consultations have inspired a series of recommendations that focus on the role of the returning officer, the resources designated to the returning officer, and electoral financing rules. In undertaking our investigation, we found little evidence of conspicuous impediments for candidates and election officials, but did uncover evidence that several bylaws, materials, and existing practices may require adjustment to make the election process more transparent, accountable, and fair for all participants. In that spirit, the SMRC has compiled 16 recommendations that we believe will bring further clarity to electoral rules and improve the electoral process for candidates, election officials, and, ultimately the voters of Saskatoon.

PART II: OVERVIEW

In 2014, Saskatoon City Council (the City) created the Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission (SMRC) as an independent body of City Council. Its role is to examine public policy issues relating to the administration of City elections, the rules surrounding ethical conduct of City Councillors, and Councillor remuneration.¹ For the purpose of this report, the City requested that the SMRC investigate “the conduct of all matters relating to municipal elections including the disclosure requirements respecting campaign contributions and expenses, and campaign spending limits for municipal elections.”² This report discusses the SMRC’s investigations and recommendations arising out of our examination of the 2016 municipal election.

The SMRC is independent body of City Council. The SMRC believes that independence is essential to conducting its work in a fair and non-partisan manner. Our recommendations do not reflect pre-existing conclusions or biases against members of City Council. The recommendations in this report materialized out of months of research and community feedback, much of which came from Councillors and unelected candidates.

In the spirit of good-faith with those who participated in our survey, we have interpreted their feedback through a lens guided by the principles of accountability, transparency, fairness and predictability. Members of the SMRC feel that these philosophies reflect the mandate given to it by the City. In our view, any recommendations to alter the rules governing municipal elections must reflect the public’s desire for heightened transparency and accountability in how local elections are administered. We also feel that any proposals for reorganization must promote fairness for both citizens and candidates alike. Our goal is to ensure equal opportunities for all citizens to engage in the democratic process, remove any administrative or institutional barriers that may hinder full participation in elections, and eliminate the unnecessary confusion and burdens that electoral candidates have reported experiencing.

From the outset, it must be stated that criticisms of existing policies do not reflect on the behaviour of existing City personnel. To our knowledge, all accounts, administrators, candidates and public officials in the City have followed the current rules well, and Council has been responsive to many of our prior recommendations. This report reflects the desire for improved governance on the part of those directed by it, and City Council is to be commended for recognizing the need for ongoing policy review and revision. We thank all those who participated for your ongoing commitment to improving the democratic institutions in the City of Saskatoon.

¹ City of Saskatoon, *Bylaw No. 9242, The Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission Bylaw, 2014.*

² City of Saskatoon, *Bylaw No. 9242, The Saskatoon Municipal Review Commission Bylaw, 2014, para 2.*

METHODOLOGY

In fulfilling this mandate, the SMRC has developed a second report that examines the City's current rules governing campaign disclosure and spending limits. This body of research compared the City's procedures with the municipal bylaws of 25 Canadian cities similar in population size to Saskatoon, or in some cases larger. Further, the SMRC examined the 2016 Returning Officer's report, examined reports on the election, news articles, examined prior SMRC recommendations and findings, and received feedback from the City through the Clerk's Office. The SMRC also administered a 2016 electoral candidate survey, and received feedback from 65 per cent of electoral candidates, including 75 per cent of the mayoral candidates, and 9 of the 11 members of City Council. The SMRC also engaged in public consultations on the City's current electoral rules. Taken together, this information illuminated electoral candidate needs, potential policy reforms, and informed our recommendations.

BACKGROUND

Municipal bylaws regulating elections are used extensively throughout the western world and allow cities to tailor governance preferences to local needs. In Canada, provinces set down baseline expectations and municipalities then develop bylaws that reflect local needs, broad ethical principles, citizen values. In our view, the City of Saskatoon has a history of pursuing good governance in the administration of elections.

The SMRC's review of local elections across the country suggests that in many municipalities, cases of electoral misconduct are very damaging, both in the scope of public confidence and in legal and administrative costs. The SMRC thanks Saskatoon's City Council for their ongoing commitment to improving City policy through rule revisions and the adoption of more appropriate strategies.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

In 2015, the SMRC presented its first report on local elections in the City of Saskatoon. Many of the recommendations in the SMRC report were adopted and feedback from electoral candidates indicated little significant impediment from these legislative changes, although there were clarifications requests regarding revised rules. The changes that the SMRC is recommending in this report attempt to address these concerns while also concentrating on other bylaw and policy practices, some of which are carried over from the 2015 report.

At the recommendation of this body, the City of Saskatoon implemented the position of an independent returning officer to administer the 2016 election. As such, the 2016 election was the first to remove the administration of the election from the City Clerk to an independent third party. In our examination, the office of the returning officer (and the Returning Officer herself) were well received by candidates, the public, and City staff. The election is perceived to have been administered well and there is general agreement that the returning officer's role was a marked improvement from elections in the past. In our view the Returning Officer and electoral staff performed their duties well, despite a significantly decreased timeline in administering the election, which included the challenge of increased voter turnout and a high number of electoral candidates. In our view, the position of independent returning officer in the City should become a standard practice. We also believe that to strengthen this position, the Returning Officer should receive greater independence, time, and support for the 2020 election.

Feedback regarding election materials such as the electoral candidate's guide was also very positive. Having said that, there were a few complaints about the guide's clarity and where appropriate we have attempted to provide recommendations to improve these materials.

Feedback regarding electoral finance largely asked for clarifications and there are many recommended revisions to Bylaw No. 8491.

MOVING FORWARD

The SMRC appreciates the ethical and administrative challenges presented in electoral rule development by elected officials, and supports the practice of elected officials framing their legislative decisions in accordance with the values and principles of the City and the Province. Our recommendations are crafted in the spirit of ensuring a political and administrative culture of accountability, transparency, and democratic dialogue among elected officials, future electoral candidates, and the administrative structure at City Hall. We are committed to improving the clarity and ease of access to resources so that all electoral candidates receive the fairest and most transparent experience possible. All recommendations are designed to support the public interest by pursuing good governance practices in the administration of our elections.

PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus of this report now shifts to a discussion of the SMRC's recommendations, categorized in the realms of the Returning Officer or Electoral Finance. Having completed its review and research, the SMRC makes the following recommendations.

THE RETURNING OFFICER (RO)

The following recommendations emerge out of the RO's 2016-17 report, interviews with the past RO, and feedback from election candidates.

1. Mandate

The SMRC recommends that in the future, the Returning Office be staffed to manage an election with no additional duties beyond election preparation, management, and execution.

Rationale

Prior to the 2016 election, the position of the RO was filled by the City Clerk. Given that the Clerk's position is designed to facilitate the smooth operation of Council business, there was a close connection between that office and elected officials. The implementation of a RO eliminates perceived conflicts of interest in the Clerk's duties, and allows for greater transparency in the administration of City elections.

2. Independent Location

The SMRC recommends that, as part of their independence, the Returning Office be granted their own location, preferably outside of City Hall.

Rationale

In reviewing the report of the 2016 RO, there was some concern about the lack of space for the RO to conduct her work. An office location separate from the City would increase the RO's independence.

3. Term of Office

The SMRC recommends that the Returning Officer be appointed to a term of 12-18 months prior to the election date.

Rationale

We believe that the position of RO would benefit from a longer contract with an earlier start date, as this additional time will allow the RO to properly conduct all the numerous details of the election process, such as assembling and training a team to prepare effectively for an election. Additionally, after the election, the RO should be granted enough time to preserve the institutional memory of electoral administration through the creation of manuals, logs, and staff training.

4. Electoral Staff and Candidate Support

The SMRC recommends that the Returning Officer be authorized to hire and train an Assistant Returning Officer.

Rationale

The RO, City officials, and electoral candidates all indicated that the RO faced challenges in addressing candidate needs in a timely manner, and would have benefited from more electoral preparation. As the expected workload for such a task is beyond that of the role of the RO, the SMRC feels that additional staff are required to support this position.

5. Dedicated Lines of Communication

The SMRC recommends that the City provide dedicated lines of direct communication between the Returning Officer and electoral candidates (phone line, email address).

Rationale

Electoral candidates indicated that reaching the RO for inquiries and complaints was challenging. They indicated that streamlined method of communication might alleviate some of the confusion. We therefore believe that a private, dedicated phone line and email address to the RO's office would serve electoral candidates more effectively.

6. Candidate Materials

The SMRC recommends that the RO support all electoral candidates with ensuring that the new 2020 Candidate's Guide includes:

- (1) An expanded Table of Contents that includes improved points of frequent reference.***
- (2) A calendar timeline of required forms and submission requirements for nominees and electoral candidates.***
- (3) Lists of municipal election support materials and resources for candidates that are available online (e.g. How-to guides, Proper fundraising suggestions, etc.).***
- (4) Expanding the current Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ), to ensure that essential information and frequent points of inquiry and complaint are addressed.***

Rationale

Electoral candidates indicated that the quality of materials provided by the Returning Officer was sufficient. However, they also indicated a desire for more support from the Returning Officer. In our view, a mentor relationship between candidates and the RO is inappropriate. Rather, we recommend that most of the requested support and guidance should be provided through new and existing materials. These improvements should be included in an updated and revised candidate's guide.

7. Plain-Language Clarification of Election Sign Rules

The SMRC recommends the development of a pamphlet of frequently asked questions that presents a plain-language, comprehensive explanation of all electoral signage rules and penalties (including The Temporary Sign Bylaw, 2009. Bylaw No. 7491; The Zoning Bylaw. Bylaw No. 8770; The Poster Bylaw, 1996. Bylaw No. 7565, and the Election Signs FAQ). The SMRC recommends that this explanation replace the current sign bylaw information in the Electoral Candidate's Guide.

(7.1) To prevent and address complaints made by volunteers and the public, this explanation must also be made available alongside electoral sign bylaws on the City of Saskatoon's website, and within the Candidate's Guide.

(7.2) Based on the frequency of sign complaints the City or the RO may want to consider having by law enforcement officers employed on election day to enforce the sign by-law to compliment the complaint-based system.

Rationale

A lack of compliance with sign bylaws was one of the most frequent topic of contention and dissatisfaction in the 2015 electoral candidate survey. These complaints were raised against incumbents and new candidates. Electoral candidates of both groups indicated that the large volume of electoral sign information and the legal language of sign bylaws was confusing. The SMRC believes that improvements in candidate materials may help ensure that candidates and their volunteers have a clear understanding of these rules, and the consequences of non-compliance.

8. Method of Nomination Fee Payment

The SMRC recommends that the nomination's deposit of \$100 "cash" be changed to include cash, debit, credit card or by certified cheque or money order, payable to the City of Saskatoon.

Rationale

Several candidates stated that their preferred method of making the nomination deposit payment would have been through debit or credit card. These candidates indicated that not allowing such payment methods may be a potential barrier to entry. City services normally accommodate debit or credit payment, and other Canadian Cities accept this method of nomination fee payment.

ELECTORAL FINANCE

9. Nomination Paper Submission

The SMRC recommends that Bylaw No. 8491 be amended to include the following article:

“Until an individual has filed their nomination papers, no individual and no person acting on the individual's behalf, shall, for the purpose of electing the individual, (a) solicit or accept a contribution; (b) borrow money; or (c) incur an expense.”

Rationale

The specific wording in this article covers a broad range of undesirable activity. We believe that this new wording makes explicit that people must formally present themselves as electoral nominees with the City to legally engage in electoral fundraising.

10. Article Clarifications of Bylaw No. 8491

The SMRC recommends that Bylaw No. 8491 - The Campaign Disclosure and Spending Limits Bylaw, 2006, requires revisions for purposes of clarification in multiple articles.

Rationale

Electoral Candidates and the SMRC identified the following articles that require revision:

- Articles 6.3(a) and (b) should be changed from “GST” to “Applicable Taxes”;
- Bylaw No. 8491 - The Campaign Disclosure and Spending Limits Bylaw, 2006, 5. (3) (b) (i) states “the name of each contributor whose cumulative campaign contribution exceeded \$100.00”. However, this amount changes multiple times to “\$100.00 or more”. The SMRC recommends that all articles that refer to this amount within Bylaw No. 8491 be worded as “\$100.00 or more”, as this is the public expectation.
- Article 10.1 should refer to official agent rather than business manager.
- Schedules C and A require full revision. Consider basing a revised policy on The City of Winnipeg’s Campaign Expenses and Contributions By-law No. 10/2010:
 - Prefill in the dates for the campaign period in accordance with the bylaw
 - Exclude fundraising from contributions (see below)
 - Have a line for personal contributions - Remove other revenues (see below)
 - Note campaign period expenses “EXCLUDING FUNDRAISING EXPENSES”
 - Insert a line before “Surplus (Deficit) called” Net fundraising revenue (expenses) see attached”, and have a schedule detailing the revenue/expense from fundraising
 - Have a final line net surplus/Deficit, and Revise #2 on Schedule A regarding this

11. Fundraising Events

The SMRC believe that Bylaw No. 8491's Fundraising Events rules are needlessly complex, and recommend that the bylaw should be revised using more comprehensible language. We have found that the City of Winnipeg's "Campaign Expenses and Contributions By-law No. 10/2010, s. 12 (1)-(5) meets this requirement well and would recommend a similar change for the City of Saskatoon. That section reads:

Definition of "fund-raising event"

12(1) In this section, "fund-raising event" means an event or activity held for the purpose of raising funds for the registered candidate by whom or on whose behalf the event is held.

Fund-raising event to be held within campaign period

12(2) A fund-raising event held by or on behalf of a registered candidate shall be held only during the campaign period.

Funds raised to be included in Audited* Financial Statement (Form 4)

12(3) The gross income from a fund-raising event shall be recorded and included in the Audited Financial Statement required by subsection 21(1).

Categorization of fund-raising revenue and expenses

12(4) Any revenue generated by a fund-raising event by the sale of tickets or otherwise shall be considered a contribution for the purposes of subsection 21(1), and expenses incurred in holding a fund-raising event shall be excluded from the total campaign expenses referred to in subsections 17(1) and 17(2).

Goods or services purchased in excess of market value at fund-raising event

12(5) Any amount paid for goods or services purchased at a fund-raising event that is in excess of fair market value shall be considered a contribution on the part of the individual purchasing the goods or services and must comply with the rules for contributions set out in this By-law.

****The audited statement would apply to mayoral candidates only. Audited statements would not be required for Councillor candidates.***

Rationale

Electoral candidates indicated dissatisfaction with fundraising rules and policy language, however, there was little consensus on potential reforms. The SMRC also found these fundraising rules convoluted, and were the exception when compared to other cities. We feel that the City of Winnipeg's rules make the policy simpler while maintaining clear and transparent rules for the public to monitor fundraising activities.

12. Surplus Campaign Funds

The SMRC recommends that Bylaw No. 8491 Campaign Surplus 9.1 be amended so that any campaign surpluses be held in trust by the City and returned to the candidate if he or she chooses to run again for office or, if the candidate does not run again for office in the next general election, those monies will be kept by the City or donated to a charity of the candidates' choice. This rule should not apply to contributions made by the candidate personally.

Rationale

The City of Saskatoon Bylaw No. 8491 article Campaign Surplus 9.1 is an anomaly and prone to abuse, as it places little restriction on campaign contributions and surpluses. Other Canadian cities consider campaign funds to be public in nature, warranting of full scrutiny and accountability. The recommended policy allows for greater accountability, provides benefit for returning candidates, and concedes decreased financial loss if a candidate personally over-invested in his or her campaign.

13. Official Agent for Office of the Mayor Candidate

The SMRC recommends strengthening the language regarding the Bylaw No. 8491 position of Official Agent for electoral candidates for the Office of the Mayor. We have taken inspiration from the City of Winnipeg's "Campaign Expenses and Contributions By-law No. 10/2010", article 7," which states:

"The official agent named in the application for registration of a candidate in an election is responsible for receiving all contributions made to or for the benefit of the candidate and authorizing all campaign expenses of the candidate, and for ensuring that:

1. (a) proper records are kept of the contributions and campaign expenses;
2. (b) the contributions that are not donations in kind are deposited in an account that is
 1. (i) listed in the application of the candidate for registration; and
 2. (ii) used only for the purpose of the election campaign of the candidate;
3. (c) proper receipts for all the contributions are issued and given or sent to the contributors who made them;
4. (d) the Audited Financial Statement required under section 21 to be filed by the candidate is prepared;
5. (e) all financial records relating to the election campaign of the candidate are retained for not less than two years after the election and made available on request to the Campaign Expenses and Contributions Officer;
6. (f) all payments relating to or arising out of the campaign are made only by cheque drawn on such an account;

7. *(g) all contributions that are made anonymously are not used or spent in the campaign but are paid over to the Senior Election Official to become part of the general funds of the City; and*
8. *(h) any contribution accepted by or on behalf of the candidate that is contrary to this By-law is returned to the contributor in accordance with subsection 9(2)."*

Rationale

Mayoral candidates who participated in our survey recommended this change, demonstrating that this position lacks description. In our view, the City of Winnipeg's policy is well described and provides needed clarification for the position of Official Agent.

14. Financial Audits for Office of the Mayor Candidate

The SMRC recommends that that the mayoral candidate audits of Campaign Revenues and Campaign Expenses, as described in Bylaw No. 8491, be revised to enable more appropriate audits. We were also inspired by the City of Winnipeg's "Campaign Expenses and Contributions By-law No. 10/2010", article 7," outlined in recommendation 13.

Rationale

Electoral mayoral candidate responses indicated the audit they received was not thorough and did not ensure an appropriate level of transparency and accountability. Responses also revealed that Bylaw No. 8491 has numerous issues with wording and requirements. A fuller revision is required.

15. Limitation of Contributions

The SMRC believes that the City should consider following the trends to limit corporate and union donations that we are witnessing at both the federal and provincial levels across the country.

Saskatoon stands outside the norm for most municipalities that were studied. In Alberta,³ Winnipeg,⁴ and Ontario,⁵ donors are permitted to donate only a certain amount to candidates for municipal office. These range from a low of \$750 to a maximum of \$5,000. Additionally, Winnipeg and Toronto prohibit contributions from corporations and trade unions.⁶

In 2006, the federal government passed the *Federal Accountability Act*.⁷ As part of the *Accountability Act* the government imposed a complete ban on contributions by corporations, unions and other organizations. The legislation lowered the contributions limits that individuals could give to a registered party (from \$5000 to \$1000) while also lowering how much money an

³ Alberta, *Local Authorities Election Act*, s. 147.2 (1).

⁴ Manitoba, *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, s. 33.1 (2); City of Winnipeg, Bylaw No. 10/2010 s. 8 (2).

⁵ Ontario, *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, s. 70.1 (5) and s. 71 (1).

⁶ Manitoba, *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, s. 33.1 (1); City of Winnipeg, Bylaw No. 10/2010 s. 8 (1); City of Toronto, Bylaw No. 1177-2009.

⁷ *Federal Accountability Act*, S.C. 2006 c. 9.

individual can give to a local candidate. The Act also banned secret donations and gifts to political candidates.

In 2016, the government of Ontario joined Alberta, Quebec, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia in banning institutional donations to political parties. Similar reforms are now being considered in British Columbia. In Alberta, government banned corporate and union donations, arguing that only individuals can donate (up to \$15,000) to a political party or registered candidate.

Donor Eligibility

Saskatoon also stands apart from the other jurisdictions studied in that it does not place any limits on donor eligibility. In Alberta,⁸ Winnipeg,⁹ and Ontario,¹⁰ individuals who are normally resident in those provinces may make donations to candidates for municipal office.

In our review of the campaign contributions of all candidates for elected office we continue to see large sums of money donated to candidates, sometimes from single business or union contributors. In the spirit of opening the political process to any existing or new political candidates, we recommend that City Council work with its partners at the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and request that the Province amend The Local Government Act to empower Municipal Councils to adopt bylaws that establish limits on contributions to candidates for municipal office.

(15.1) The SMRC requests that City Council discuss this proposal with SUMA and other Cities to build a stronger voice for policy reform.

(15.2) Upon the adoption of this amendment, the SMRC recommends that Council amend Bylaw No. 8491 to:

a. Place a limit on the total amount that individuals may contribute to candidates for municipal office;

b. Prevent donations to candidates for municipal office from corporations and labour unions;

c. Restrict donations to municipal candidates to those that come only from individuals normally resident in Saskatchewan.

Rationale

Unlike much of Canada, corporations, unions, trust funds, and unincorporated groups can donate to Saskatchewan electoral candidates for municipal and provincial elections without limit. Many electoral candidates indicated that the lack of rules around campaign donations is concerning, as there is a strong correlation between fundraising and electoral success. The public fear is that any individual or organization could overly influence an election and that individuals may be donating

⁸ Alberta, *Local Authorities Election Act*, s. 147.2 (3).

⁹ Manitoba, *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, s. 33.1 (1); City of Winnipeg, Bylaw No. 10/2010 s. 8 (1).

¹⁰ Ontario, *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, s. 70 (3) and (5).

multiple times through different organizations. The SMRC believes that the time has come to ban such practices in City elections.

16. Communications and Constituency Relations Allowance (CCRA) - Advertising

The SMRC recommends revisions for Council & Mayor Benefits and Entitlements: “The Communications Allowance - section 2. Allowable Expenses, Advertising and Promotion”. City-funded media advertisements must exclude promotion of individual Councillors or staff, especially during an election year.

Rationale

Without question, the single greatest concern raised by electoral candidates and other participants to our survey was the use of the CCRA to promote individual personalities in the lead up to the election. Numerous participants indicated that the CCRA, especially the use of personal advertising at public expense constituted a significant electoral advantage to incumbent candidates. The CCRA was created in 2013 and permits members of City Council to purchase personal advertising that relates to their work. Canadian Cities, aside from Toronto and Winnipeg, avoid this practice ensuring a clear distinction between constituent business and news and self-interest promotion. Across Canada, Councillors normally use their personal funds for their personal promotions and communications expenses are restricted to community newsletters and similar media announcements on topics of City events or contested public policy issues.

Since its inception in 2013, there has been a great deal of public discussion about the usage of the CCRA, especially in the months leading up to and after the election. In the past, it has been argued that billboards depicting an image of a member of Council with their name in large letters was not self-promotion and that it aided communication with the residents of their ward. Having heard from numerous community voices, however, it is the SMRC’s belief that this is not a reasonable argument and many candidates voiced a belief that such advertising granted an unfair advantage to incumbent politicians. As this practice is widely believed to not be in the public interest and has a perceived detrimental effect on the outcome of elections, it is recommended that it be ended.

PART V: CONCLUSION

The SMRC believes that the 16 recommendations outlined in this report will further strengthen the democratic institutions of the City of Saskatoon. If implemented fully, these recommendations would make the City of Saskatoon a leader in democratic openness, transparency, and accountability.

The SMRC would like to thank the 2016 Returning Officer, the City Clerk’s Office, and the members of Council who participated in our consultations for their efforts in improving the City of Saskatoon’s electoral rules. The SMRC would especially like to thank the many electoral candidates and members of the public who took the time to give us their feedback and inquiries. Their interest and respect for the democratic process is admirable.

APPENDICES

Municipal Election Legislation and Rules

A large body of policies, bylaws, and other rules affect the City of Saskatoon's elections. The SMRC has endeavoured to be comprehensive in its review of this body of literature, and remains committed to aiding electoral candidates navigate these rules successfully.

Provincial Law

The Cities Act, 2002

<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/english/Statutes/Statutes/c11-1.pdf>

The Local Government Election Act, 2015

<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/L30-11.pdf>

The Saskatchewan Employment Act, 2013 (Section 2-54)

<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/s15-1.pdf>

The Planning and Development Act, 2007

<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/P13-2.pdf>

The Controverted Municipal Elections Act, 1978. C-33

<http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/freelaw/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/C33.pdf>

Government of Saskatchewan - Municipal Council Members Handbook

<http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/313/95528-Council%20Members%20Handbook%20October%202016%20with%20links.pdf>

City of Saskatoon Bylaws, Policies, and Rules

City of Saskatoon Candidate's Guide (2016 Saskatoon Civic Elections Information for Candidates)

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-council/elections/2016/2016-candidates-booklet.pdf>

The Elections Bylaw, 2012. Bylaw No. 8191

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/8191.pdf>

The Campaign Disclosure and Spending Limits Bylaw, 2006. Bylaw No. 8491

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/8491.pdf>

The Temporary Sign Bylaw, 2009. Bylaw No. 7491

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/7491.pdf>

The Zoning Bylaw. Bylaw No. 8770

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/8770.pdf>

The Poster Bylaw, 1996. Bylaw No. 7565

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/7565.pdf>

Election Signs FAQ and Maps

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-council/elections/2016/election-signs-faq-and-map.pdf>

The Code of Conduct for Members of Saskatoon City Council

https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/code_of_conduct_for_members_of_city_council.pdf

The Code of Ethics for Members of City Council Bylaw, 2017. Bylaw No. 9424

<https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/bylaws/9424.pdf>

City of Saskatoon – Mayor and Councillors – Benefits & Entitlements

https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-clerk/council_members_benefits_and_entitlements_-_june-15.pdf

Links to Other Municipalities' Policies Cited

The City of Winnipeg - Campaign Expenses and Contributions By-law No. 10/2010

<http://winnipeg.ca/clerks/pdfs/elections/2010Election/CampExpContributionsBylaw.pdf>

The Regina Municipal Election Expenses Bylaw No 2007-34

*Embedded document. Double left-click on the “e” icon below and the document will be revealed



The Regina Municipal Election Expenses Bylaw No 2007-34.pdf

Other Municipalities Investigated

Nova Scotia: Halifax

Quebec (translated): Montreal (Laval), Quebec City (Lévis),

Ontario: Toronto (Mississauga, Brampton), Ottawa–Gatineau, Hamilton (Burlington), Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, London, St. Catharines - Niagara (Niagara Falls, Welland, Oshawa (Whitby, Clarington), Windsor (Lakeshore), and Barrie (Innisfil)

Manitoba: Winnipeg

Saskatchewan: Regina

Alberta: Calgary, Edmonton

British Columbia: Vancouver (Surrey), Victoria (Saanich), Kelowna