

**Chatham-Kent 2006 Municipal Election  
Municipal Election Finances Compliance Audit**

**Confidential**

**CANDIDATE RANDY HOPE  
COMPLIANCE AUDIT REPORT  
TO THE CORPORATION OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT**

**BERNARD NAYMAN,  
Chartered Accountant and Licensed Public Accountant**

**October 23, 2007**

**Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Summary .....	5
Findings	
Part 1: Allegations by the Applicant .....	7
Part 2: Other Matters.....	16
Audit Conclusion.....	19
Appendix 1 (Revised Form 5).....	20

## INTRODUCTION

On November 13, 2006 there was a Municipal Election in Chatham-Kent where Mayoral candidate Randy Hope was elected as the Mayor. Presented in Table 1 are the Mayoral election results. The information from Table 1 shows that Mayor Randy Hope attained the majority vote in Ward 1, 2, 4 and 6, and had the overall majority vote of 11,614 votes in the Mayoral Election in 2006.

**Table 1: Mayoral Election Results**

	<b>Jim Desat</b>	<b>Richard Erickson</b>	<b>Diane Gagner</b>	<b>Donald "Chip" Gordon</b>	<b>Randy Hope</b>	<b>Mary Kwong Lee</b>	<b>Walter Spence</b>
Ward 1	20	188	972	314	789	20	326
Ward 2	37	193	1240	575	1750	39	1729
Ward 3	13	97	379	447	1002	15	2210
Ward 4	30	148	813	1304	1448	19	856
Ward 5	63	117	420	1936	814	16	228
Ward 6	88	490	4102	1326	5019	99	1395
Advance	14	156	1184	718	792	60	960
	<b>265</b>	<b>1389</b>	<b>9110</b>	<b>6620</b>	<b>11614</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>7704</b>

On June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007, Chatham-Kent Municipal Clerk, Elinor Mifflin officially received an application for a municipal election finances compliance audit of the Randy Hope campaign. The applicant for the compliance audit is Charles Austin Wright, councilor candidate in Ward 6. The application was made exactly 89 days after the filing date of March 31, 2006 and is therefore in compliance as per section 81(2) of the Municipal Elections Act, S.O, 1996 (“**the Act**”).

The application for the compliance audit was approved by City Council on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007. An RFQ was issued by the Municipality of Chatham-Kent for the 2006 municipal election finances compliance audit of Mayor Randy Hope’s campaign. Bernard G. Nayman, Chartered Accountant and Licensed Public Accountant was awarded the contract for the respective compliance audit work.

Pursuant to an engagement letter dated August 14, 2007, the Corporation of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent engaged Bernard G. Nayman, Chartered Accountant to conduct a Compliance Audit of Mayor Randy Hope's 2006 election campaign finances.

The duty of an auditor conducting a Compliance Audit is defined in Section 81(6) of the Municipal Election Act, S.O, 1996 as follows:

“An Auditor appointed under subsection (4) shall promptly conduct an audit of the candidate's election campaign finances to determine whether he or she has complied with the provisions of this Act relating to election campaign finances and prepare a report outlining any apparent contravention by the candidate”.

During my engagement, I, Bernard Nayman, attended in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent for several days and gathered pertinent documentation, spoke to various persons and interviewed and obtained statements from specific people I considered to have relevant information that would assist me in the conduct of the Compliance Audit. I believe that the report presented here has addressed all the matters raised by Austin Wright in his application as well as those matters discovered as a result of the audit outside those matters raised by Austin Wright.

## SUMMARY

Mr. Austin Wright, in his application for a Compliance Audit of candidate Randy Hope has made certain allegations. Each of the allegations as they pertained to campaign election finances were reviewed to determine if the candidate was in compliance with the Act. As a result of the audit program a few minor incidents where the candidate was found to be in non-compliance with and/or in contravention of the Act.

### **Findings where the candidate was in compliance with the provisions of the Act:**

- Website hosting, design and production costs were correctly reported.
- All campaign advertising costs were correctly reported. The Advertisement printed in the Chatham Daily News, November 11, 2006, page 7 was paid for by the Randy Hope Campaign. The radio advertisement on CKSY radio Nov 10, 2006 at approximately 11:56 am, which included a testimonial by Janice Hill, was paid for by Randy Hope campaign.
- Advertising by candidate Mary Kwong Lee is determined to be 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Advertising.
- Matthew Liang was an eligible contributor to candidate Randy Hope's campaign.
- Ascent Investments Ltd. was an eligible contributor to candidate Randy Hope's campaign.

### **Findings where the candidate was not in compliance with the provisions of the Act:**

- The cost of the campaign signs was fully reported on the candidate's campaign return (Form 5), however it was reported in two places. It should have been reported fully in one location.
- Candidate Randy Hope's campaign reported a "contributions receivable". There is no provision in the Act for this.
- "Thank You" advertising with a cost of \$625.56 was recorded as expenses subject to the limit, where as per the Act, these expenses are not subject to the limit.

- The Corporation of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent published an incorrect version of Form 5 for candidates to use for their campaign financial statements.

**Issues where the candidate apparently contravened the Act:**

- The cost of approximately \$275.00 for wooden campaign stakes and related hardware was not included in the candidate's campaign return.
- The Randy Hope Campaign used personal space as well as residential telephone service in candidate Randy Hope's residence during the campaign period for the campaign. This was not reported in the candidate Randy Hope's campaign financial statement. It is estimated that current market value for this expense is \$500.00

## **FINDINGS**

### **Part 1 – Allegations by the Applicant**

The following section presents allegations made by Austin Wright as noted in the application for the compliance audit of Mayor Randy Hope, and opinion with respect to compliance of the Municipal Elections Act, S.O. 1996 (**the Act**). It is important to note that a distinction was made between non-compliance of the Act due to minor accounting errors and apparent contraventions to the Act. Minor accounting errors occur as a result of a disharmony between Canadian generally accepted accounting principles and accounting requirements as per the Act. In this case common corporate accounting principles differ from accounting requirements in the Act. Although they are minor accounting errors they are to be considered as non-compliant with the Act.

### **ALLEGATION #1**

*It is unclear what Randy Hope's campaign website expenses were. Was the website donated?  
The valuation of campaign website could have easily exceeded \$1000.00.*

### **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

### **FINDINGS**

A cheque was written (and cashed) from the Randy Hope Campaign to Jill Ellis for the cost of website hosting, design, and production in the amount of \$1284.00.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since money was exchanged for consideration (website hosting, design and production) it can be concluded that the website was not donated to the Randy Hope Campaign. The fee for the website was properly recorded and exceeded \$1000.00 as per the applicant's estimation. This expense transaction is in compliance with the Act.

## **ALLEGATION #2**

*It is suggested in the application that some of the costs for campaign print advertising in various Chatham-Kent publications were omitted from Randy Hope's campaign financial statement (Form 5).*

## **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

Section 69(1) part C of the Act provides, “all payments for expenses except for a nomination filing fee, are made from the campaign account”.

Section 69(1) part G of the Act provides, “records are kept of every expense including the receipts obtained for each expense”.

## **FINDINGS**

Invoices from the Randy Hope campaign were compared against invoices from print media vendors. The invoices from the Randy Hope campaign reconciled with invoices from print media vendors. The cheques written by the Randy Hope campaign to the respective print media vendors were cashed by the vendors and reconciled with vendor invoice records. Archived copies of the Chatham Daily News in the local public library were reviewed between the period of Oct 1, 2006 and Nov 15, 2006. No additional advertisements by Randy Hope other than those reported in the Randy Hope campaign financial return were found. Advertisements noted by the applicant to have been paid for by John Cryderman do not mention the Randy Hope Campaign and therefore are irrelevant to this compliance audit.

## **CONCLUSION**

All costs for campaign advertising in various Chatham-Kent publications were properly recorded in the Randy Hope Campaign financial return (Form 5). Therefore, it is concluded that the candidate is in compliance with the provisions of the Act.



### **ALLEGATION #3**

*Randy Hope's claim of a total of \$1497.92 for campaign signs seems significantly inadequate.*

### **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

Section 69(1) part C of the Act provides, “all payments for expenses except for a nomination filing fee, are made from the campaign account”.

Section 69(1) part G of the Act provides, “records are kept of every expense including the receipts obtained for each expense”.

### **FINDINGS**

The vendor “Screen Craft” did sell 600 single sided signs to the Randy Hope Campaign for \$1881.00. The full amount of \$1881.00, being the full cost of the signs, was reported on the financial return (Form 5) in two different places (\$1497.92 as a campaign expense, and \$383.08 as remaining sign inventory after the campaign).

### **CONCLUSION**

The Act does not provide for a deduction of remaining sign inventory from election expenses. Although this is normal business accounting practice it does not apply with respect to election finances accounting as provided in the Act. The full amount of \$1881.00, the purchase cost of the signage, is to be reported as a campaign expense. Although this is a minor accounting error, it does not comply with the provisions of the Act.

#### **ALLEGATION # 4**

*Were the costs of wooden stakes to support the signs used in candidate Randy Hope's campaign reported in the Randy Hope campaign financial return (Form 5)?*

#### **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

#### **FINDINGS**

Randy Hope contributed approximately \$275.00 worth of sign stakes (which he manufactured at home from construction grade wood 2”x4”s) and related hardware to the Randy Hope Campaign. During the interview with Randy Hope, he stated that not recording this expense was an oversight.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The \$275.00 contribution of wooden stakes and related hardware from Randy Hope to the Randy Hope Campaign should have been recorded; as well a \$275.00 expense subject to the limit should also have been recorded. As a result the amount that Randy Hope contributed to the campaign would increase by \$275.00, and over all expenses subject to the Randy Hope Campaign limit would increase by \$275.00. Although this amount is minor, it is an apparent contravention to section 69(1) of the Act.

## **ALLEGATION # 5**

*Mary Lee's advertising in support of Randy Hope allows candidates to pool resources and circumvent spending and contribution limits.*

### **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”. In this compliance audit report, the term “On behalf” as used in Section 67(1) of the Act is interpreted as the candidate having knowledge and consent.

### **FINDINGS**

Advertising costs were incurred personally by candidate Mary Kwong Lee. The advertising copy shows that Mary Kwong Lee was in favour and support of the Randy Hope campaign, not the Mary Kwong Lee campaign. Mary Kwong Lee personally spent \$890.42 towards advertising which supported the Randy Hope campaign. There was no evidence to show any further advertising purchased by candidate Mary Kwong Lee in support of candidate Randy Hope's campaign. We have also determined that candidate Mary Kwong Lee did not place this advertising on behalf of candidate Randy Hope.

### **CONCLUSION**

The costs are identified as 3<sup>rd</sup> party advertising expenses NOT campaign expenses pursuant to Section 67(1) of the Act. Therefore, May Lee's advertising in support of the Randy Hope campaign does not allow candidates to pool resources and circumvent spending and contribution limits. Therefore, it is concluded that the candidate is in compliance with the provisions of the Act.

## **ALLEGATION #6**

*The radio advertisement on CKSY radio Nov 10, 2006 at approximately 11:56 am, which included a testimonial by Janice Hill, may not have been paid for by Randy Hope campaign?*

### **THE LAW**

Section 67(1) of the Act provides that a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

### **FINDINGS**

The invoice from Blackburn Radio to the Randy Hope campaign financial documentation was compared against an invoice supplied by Blackburn Radio as a part of the audit investigation. The invoices from the Randy Hope campaign documentation reconciled with the invoice acquired from Blackburn Radio. A cheque written by the Randy Hope campaign to the respective vendor included payment for a radio advertisement on CKSY radio Nov 10, 2006 at approximately 11:56 am, which included a testimonial by Janice Hill.

### **CONCLUSION**

The cost for campaign advertising with Blackburn Radio for a radio advertisement on CKSY radio Nov 10, 2006 at approximately 11:56 am, which included a testimonial by Janice Hill was paid for by the Randy Hope Campaign. The allegation made by the application, suggestive that the Randy Hope Campaign did not pay for this radio advertisement is incorrect. The Randy Hope Campaign did pay for this advertisement and reported it on Form 5 correctly and is therefore in compliance with the Act.

## **ALLEGATION #7**

*The contribution of \$750.00 by Matthew Liang is not valid because this individual is not a resident of Ontario, but rather resides in British Columbia.*

## **THE LAW**

Section 70(3) of the Act makes a provision that “Only the following may make contributions:

1. An individual who is normally resident in Ontario.
2. A corporation that carries on business in Ontario
3. A trade union that holds bargaining rights for employees in Ontario.”

## **FINDINGS**

Mr. Matthew Liang was interviewed over the phone while in his office at the Chatham College International, in Chatham, Ontario. According to Matthew Liang, he lived on and off for a combined amount of several months in Chatham in 2006 as he was developing Chatham College International. He resided at and continues to reside at an address in Chatham. Matthew Liang also owns Ascent Investments which holds commercial and residential properties in Chatham-Kent.

## **CONCLUSION**

Considering the silence of the Act with respect to the definition of what a “normal resident in Ontario” is and the variety of interpretations across government ministries and agencies a liberal opinion is presented. As Matthew Liang stated that he lived on and off for a combined amount of several months in Chatham in 2006 he is considered to be a resident in 2006. The allegation made by the applicant that Mr. Matthew Liang is not an eligible contributor is incorrect. Mr. Matthew Liang is an eligible contributor, and therefore receiving a contribution for this individual is in compliance with the Act. . Therefore, it is concluded that the candidate is in compliance with the provisions of the Act.

## **ALLEGATION #8**

*Is the contribution of \$750.00 by Ascent Investments Ltd., registered in British Columbia valid, as it is not clear whether this corporation was doing any business in Ontario.*

## **THE LAW**

Section 70(3) of the Act makes a provision that “Only the following may make contributions:

4. An individual who is normally resident in Ontario.
5. A corporation that carries on business in Ontario
6. A trade union that holds bargaining rights for employees in Ontario.”

## **FINDINGS**

As a result of the compliance audit program it was discovered that Ascent Investments Ltd. owns several properties in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. Legal documentation supporting ownership of property in Chatham-Kent was supplied .

## **CONCLUSION**

Ascent Investments owns properties in Chatham-Kent and in this sense “carries on business in Ontario” and is therefore an eligible contributor as per section 70(3) of the Act. The allegation made by the applicant that Ascent Investments is not an eligible contributor is incorrect. The contribution received by Mayor Randy Hope during the campaign period is in compliance with the Act.

## **ALLEGATION #9**

*Was the Advertisement printed in the Chatham Daily News, November 11, 2006, page 7 paid for by the Randy Hope Campaign?*

### **THE LAW**

As per section 67(1) of the Act a campaign expense is defined as “costs incurred for goods or services by or on behalf of a person wholly or partly for use in his or her election campaign are expenses”.

As per section 69(1) part C of the Act, “all payments for expenses except for a nomination filing fee, are made from the campaign account”.

As per section 69(1) part G of the Act, “records are kept of every expense including the receipts obtained for each expense”.

### **FINDINGS**

An invoice obtained from Chatham Daily News identified the advertisement noted in the allegation was matched against an invoice in the Randy Hope campaign financial documentation used for the Randy Hope campaign financial return. Payment for this invoice did occur via a cheque to the Chatham Daily News from the Randy Hope campaign.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Advertisement printed in the Chatham Daily News, November 11, 2006, page 7 was paid for by the Randy Hope Campaign. The allegation by the applicant which suggests that the advertisement was not paid for by the Randy Hope Campaign is not correct. The Randy Hope Campaign paid for the above noted campaign advertisement from the Randy Hope Campaign bank account, recorded the transaction correctly and is therefore in compliance with the Act.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Part 2 – Other Matters**

Section 81(6) of the Act provides, “An Auditor appointed under subsection (4) shall promptly conduct an audit of the candidate’s election campaign finances to determine whether he or she has complied with the provisions of this Act relating to election campaign finances and prepare a report outlining any apparent contravention by the candidate”. Upon the course of auditing additional (not identified by the applicant) instances of non-compliance and apparent contraventions of the Act were discovered.

### **ACCOUNTING ISSUES:**

1. Section 66(1) of the Act contributions are defined as “money, goods and services given to and accepted by or on behalf of a person for his or her election campaign”. Therefore, money must be “given to” the campaign, not recorded as a receivable. In Ontario municipal election finances there can be no “contributions receivable”. Due to this accounting error the candidate is in non-compliance with the Act.
2. An accounting error with respect to classifying an expense subject to the limit instead of as not subject to the limit occurred. “Thank You” advertisement in print media was recognized as an expense subject to the limit, whereas per Section 67(2) part 6 of the Act “the cost of...expressions of appreciation after the close of voting day” are not expenses subject to the limit. “Thank You” advertising with a cost of \$625.56 was recorded as expenses subject to the limit, where as per the Act, these expenses are not subject to the limit. This change in expense recognition results in a decrease of \$625.56 from the Randy Hope Campaign that is subject to the expense limit and a resulting same increase in expenses not subject to the limit. Due to this accounting error the candidate is in non-compliance with the Act.
3. An accounting error and apparent contravention of the Act of not recognizing and recording campaign office expenses occurred. The Randy Hope Campaign used space and the residential phone of the Randy Hope residence for campaign purposes. It is



estimated that this expense would not exceed \$500.00. This expense would result in a \$500.00 increase in the amount contributed from Randy Hope to the Randy Hope Campaign as well as a \$500.00 increase in office election expenses subject to the limit. Due to this accounting error an apparent contravention of the act has occurred.

**FORM 5 LAYOUT ISSUE:**

A Form 5 layout error occurred and is possibly present on all Form 5 reports submitted to the Corporation of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent during this past municipal election. The format of Schedule 1, Part 1 in Form 5 is not correct. Illustrated in Figure 2 below is Schedule 1 Part 1 from Randy Hope’s Form 5. The way that this schedule was constructed shows that Randy Hope has paid or owes the Municipality of Chatham-Kent \$11,759.57. This of course is not the case as this amount is actually the summation of all contributions received during the campaign period.

**Figure 2 – From the submitted Form 5 for Randy Hope Campaign.**

<b>SCHEDULE 1 – CONTRIBUTIONS</b>		
<b>Part 1 – Contributions</b>		
		\$
From each single contributor totalling more than \$100 (unless nil complete Part II) .....	<u>11,161.57</u>	
Less - Returned or payable to the contributor.....	( <u>Ø</u> )	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....	( <u>Ø</u> )	A <u>11,161.57</u>
From each single contributor totalling \$100 or less.....	<u>598.00</u>	
Less – Returned or payable to the contributor.....	( <u>Ø</u> )	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....	( <u>Ø</u> )	B <u>598.00</u>
Total contributions from anonymous sources .....		C <u>Ø</u>
Amount of contributions paid or payable to the clerk:		
<b>A+B+C .....</b>	<b><u>11,759.57</u></b>	

The correct presentation of Schedule 1, Part 1 is illustrated in Figure 3 below. Note the difference in arrangement of summary contributions greater or less than \$100 compared to that used by the Municipality of Chatham-Kent (Figure 1). In this case there is a summary entry for total contributions to the campaign of \$11,759.57, and no money paid to or owed to the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. This correct version of the schedule is in conformity with the provincial returns that are filed pursuant to the Election Finances Act, S.O. Candidate Randy Hope has filed Form 5 as provided by the Corporation of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. The Corporation of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent provided an incorrect version of Form 5 to candidate Randy Hope which is not in compliance with the Act.

**Figure 3 – Correct version of Schedule 1, Part 1.**

<b>SCHEDULE 1 - CONTRIBUTIONS</b>		
<b>PART 1 - CONTRIBUTIONS</b>		
		\$
From a single contributor totalling more than \$100 (unless Nil complete Part II).....	<b>\$ 11,161.57</b>	
Less - Returned or payable to the contributor.....	-	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....A	-	
From each single contributor totalling \$100 or less.....	<b>\$ 598.00</b>	
Less - Returned or payable to the contributor.....	-	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....B	-	
<b>Total Contributions.....</b>		<b><u>\$ 11,759.57</u></b>
Total contributions from anonymous sources.....C	\$ -	
Amount of contributions paid or payable to the clerk: A + B + C.....	\$ -	

## AUDIT CONCLUSION

This Compliance Audit was performed in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards which require that I plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance that the information included in the Compliance Audit is presented fairly in all materials respect and in accordance with applicable law. Owing to the inherent limitations of an audit, error, fraud and other irregularities may not be detected by the application of procedures that comply with these standards and with the limitations of the law.

This now completes my engagement.

I wish to extend my appreciation to the staff of the Municipality of Chatham Kent's, Municipal Clerk's office for their co-operation and assistance throughout the period of my Compliance Audit.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "B. Nayman". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "B".

Bernard G. Nayman,  
Chartered Accountant and Licensed Public Accountant

**FORM 5****FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND AUDITOR'S REPORT  
MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS ACT, 1996 (SECTION 78)****INSTRUCTIONS:**

To be filed if the contributions received by a candidate exceed \$10,000 or expenses incurred by the candidate exceed \$10,000.

Any surplus greater than \$500 (after any refund to the candidate, his or her spouse or same-sex partner) shall be paid immediately over to the clerk who was responsible for the conduct of the election.

This form may be filed electronically if your council has passed an enabling by-law.

For the campaign period from (day candidate nominated) Feb. 9, 2006 to Jan 2, 2007

**BOX A: NAME OF CANDIDATE AND OFFICE**

Name of Candidate			
RANDY HOPE			
Mailing Address			
173 VALLEY ROAD, CHATHAM, ON, N7L 5L2			
Business Phone No.	Fax No.	Email Address	Home Phone No.
			519-351-1937
Name of Office for Which the candidate Sought Election			Ward No. (if any)
MAYOR			NA
Name of Municipality			
MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT			

**BOX B: SUMMARY OF CAMPAIGN INCOME AND EXPENSES**

1. My Spending Limit was	\$ <u>65,406.80</u>
2. Surplus (or Deficit) from Previous Election	\$ <u>-</u>
3. Total Contributions Received (see Schedule 1)	\$ <u>10,323.00</u>
4. My Total Campaign Expenses that were Subject to the Spending limits were	\$ <u>11,123.29</u>
5. My Total Campaign Expenses that were not subject to the Spending Limit were	\$ <u>1,775.97</u>
6. Total of All Campaign Expenses (Line 4 + line 5)	\$ <u>12,899.26</u>
7. Election Campaign Surplus/Deficit from Current Election	\$ <u>(2,576.26)</u>
8. Portion of Campaign Surplus Returned to Candidate, his or her Spouse or Same-Sex Partner	\$ <u>-</u>

**FORM 5 (continued)**

**BOX C: STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES AS AT JAN 2, 2007**

<b>Assets</b>		
Cash	\$	1,651.10
Accounts receivable		-
Other (provide full details)		-
		-
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ <u>1,651.10</u></b>
<b>Liabilities and Excess (deficiency) of Income over Expenses</b>		
Accounts Payable	\$	4,227.36
Borrowings, Overdraft		-
Other (provide full details)		-
		-
<b>Excess (deficiency) of Income over Expenses</b>		<b><u>(2,576.26)</u></b>
(from the Statement of Campaign Period Income and Expenses)		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ <u>1,651.10</u></b>

**BOX D: STATEMENT OF DETERMINATION OF SURPLUS OR DEFICIT AND DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS**

<b>PART 1 - DETERMINATION OF SURPLUS OR DEFICIT</b>		
		\$
Amount of Excess (deficiency) of Income over Expenses from Statement of Campaign Period Income & Expenses	A	(2,576.26)
Deduct any deficit carried forward by the candidate from the immediately preceding election if the offices are with respect to the same jurisdiction	B	<u>-</u>
Surplus (or Deficit) for the campaign period (A minus B)	C	( 2,576.26)
Deduct any refund of contributions to the candidate , his or her spouse of the candidate or same sex partner (only if there is a surplus)	D	<u>-</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>\$ <u>( 2,576.26)</u></b>
<b>PART 2 - DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS</b>		
If line E shows a surplus greater than \$500, the amount must be paid in trust, at the time the financial statements are filed, to the municipal clerk who was responsible for the conduct of the election.		
Surplus paid to the municipal clerk of the municipality of: CHATHAM-KENT		

# FORM 5 (CONTINUED)

## BOX E: STATEMENT OF CAMPAIGN PERIOD INCOME AND EXPENSES

**FROM FEB. 9, 2006 TO JAN 2, 2007.**

**FOR CANDIDATE: RANDY HOPE**

### INCOME

Candidate's Surplus from immediately preceding election released by the clerk.....	\$ -
Contributions (from schedule 1).....	10,323.00
Fund-raising Functions (from schedule 2, Part III).....	-
Interest income.....	-
Other (provide full details).....	-
_____	-
_____	-

**TOTAL CAMPAIGN PERIOD INCOME** **A \$ 10,323.00**

<b>EXPENSES</b>	Expenses Subject To Limitation	Expenses Excluded From Limitation	Total
Accounting and Audit	N/A	750.00	750.00
Advertising	6,902.67	-	6,902.67
Bank Charges	171.25	-	171.25
Brochures	1,393.37	N/A	1,393.37
Fund-raising expenses	N/A	-	-
Interest on loans	N/A	0.41	0.41
Inventory contributed to Candidates campaign (from Schedule 3)	-	N/A	-
Meetings hosted	-	N/A	-
Nomination filing fee	N/A	-	-
Office expenses	500.00	-	500.00
Recount expenses	N/A	-	-
Salaries and benefits	-	-	-
Signs	2,156.00	N/A	2,156.00
Voting day party/ Appreciation Notices	N/A	1,025.56	1,025.56
Other (provide full details)	-	-	-
Telephone _____	-	-	-
_____	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL CAMPAIGN PERIOD EXPENSES</b>	<b><u>11,123.29</u></b>	<b><u>1,775.97</u></b>	<b>B \$ <u>12,899.26</u></b>

**EXCESS (DEFICIENCY) OF INCOME OVER EXPENSES (A-B)** **C \$ (2,576.26)**

# SCHEDULE 1 - CONTRIBUTIONS

## PART 1 - CONTRIBUTIONS

		\$
From a single contributor totalling more than \$100 (unless Nil complete Part II).....	\$ 9,725.00	
Less - Returned or payable to the contributor.....	-	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....A	-	9,725.00
 From each single contributor totalling \$100 or less.....	 \$ 598.00	
Less - Returned or payable to the contributor.....	-	
- Paid or payable to the clerk.....B	-	<u>598.00</u>
 <b>Total Contributions.....</b>		 <b><u>\$ 10,323.00</u></b>

Total contributions from anonymous sources.....C \$           -

Amount of contributions paid or payable to the clerk:  
A + B + C..... \$           -

## PART II - List of Single Contributors totalling more than \$100

NAME	ADDRESS		AMOUNT
Bill or Doris Zilio		\$	200.00
Patrick Pinsonneault			200.00
George Franssen			400.00
Sun-Jung Tae Kwan Do			700.00
Yvonne Franssen			700.00
Ascent Investment Ltd.			750.00
Diane Semmicky			750.00
International Union UAW			750.00
Matthew Liang			750.00
Randy Hope			<u>4,525.00</u>
Total		<b>\$</b>	<b><u>9,725.00</u></b>

