

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:46 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: RE: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Ok, I was conflating those two things.

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:45 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: RE: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Federal disaster? Are you referring to where it says "the Canadian Election Study, sponsored in part by Elections Canada"?
s.22

And let me get you more info on Chase the Ace.

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:38 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: RE: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Do we want to compare to the federal disaster? Ours is quite different.

Also, I thought I gave Chase the Ace the go ahead. What happened?
D.

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Fwd: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Can you take a look at these?

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 27, 2017 at 2:53:01 PM PST
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>, "Godfrey, Sam AG:EX" <Sam.Godfrey@gov.bc.ca>, "Milne, Gala AG:EX" <Gala.Milne@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>, "Butler, Liam GCPE:EX" <Liam.Butler@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Hi – adding Terrace request to Van Sun.

2 requests:

- Vancouver Sun – Electoral Reform public engagement
- Terrace Standard – gambling and fundraisers

Reporter

Vaughn Palmer, Reporter

Vancouver Sun

vpalmer@vancouversun.com

250-953-5936 c: 250-920-6677

Deadline 4 p.m. today

Request

The reporter has the following questions about the electoral reform engagement:

Recommendation – Provide on background from Ministry of Attorney General

Q1: Did the members of the panel of academic advisers provide their feedback in writing? If the Attorney General did not approve or sign off on the questions, who in the ministry did so?

- **Ministry staff developed the questionnaire and submitted it to academic experts for review and input. Ministry staff then assessed all input and presented the questionnaire to the Attorney General for approval. Expert feedback was provided in writing to ministry staff.**

Q2: Will the data collected from the survey be made public - how many answered, what were the numbers on each response and so forth - so it would be possible to gauge the level of support on each issue?

- **The report will include a summary of what was heard throughout the consultation. The public engagement – including the questionnaire and the open-fields it includes to gather general commentary – is designed to stimulate consideration and gather input on many topics, including the values British Columbians hold for how ballots are structured, representatives are elected and governments are run. The questionnaire is designed to capture input on various voting systems used in B.C. and elsewhere in the world, and was informed by the design of other surveys, such as the Canadian Election Study, sponsored in part by Elections Canada.**

Q3: The minister said that others will be consulted. Who will select those to be consulted, who will do the consultations, and how will that information be assembled and summarized?

- **The online panel mentioned at the Nov. 23 media event is an additional method that Government's Citizen's Engagement unit uses to ensure it hears the views of British Columbians.**
- **The Ipsos Online panel will be made up of about 1000 citizens from around the province of varying age, gender and ethnicity who will respond to the questionnaire to ensure government hears the views and perspectives of people beyond just those who have chosen to take the questionnaire. The panel helps ensure that survey samples accurately reflect the makeup of the broader population based on Census and other reliable data.**

- The panel will be administered by Ipsos through government's Citizen's Engagement team.
- This process is standard for many government public engagements.

Q4: Who will assemble the data, draw conclusions, and draft the final report to Cabinet on the public feedback?

- Government's Citizen's Engagement team will coordinate the preparation of the initial analysis of input gathered through the questionnaire, the questionnaire's open-commentary sections, and from submissions emailed by stakeholder groups, academics and citizens.
- A summary report will be provided to the Ministry of Attorney General for compilation in a report with recommendations, which will be presented to the Attorney General.
- The Attorney General will review and approve the final report and recommendations, which will be made available to the public and presented to Cabinet for debate and decision.
- The Attorney General will recuse himself from Cabinet debate and decision regarding the referendum.
- British Columbians will have the final say when they vote in the fall 2018 referendum.

Q5: Will the final report be independently vetted before it is submitted to Cabinet?

- Non-partisan public service staff will prepare the report for the Attorney General.

Quinn Bender, Editor
Terrace Standard
quinn@terracestandard.com
250-638-7283

Deadline: ASAP

Request: The reporter is looking for information on a Chase the Ace fundraiser that was to happen in a small community near Terrace. The group received a letter from the Laxgalts'ap First Nation saying that the RCMP and Gaming BC have been monitoring social media and saw that this group was holding a fundraiser without a licence, so the group cancelled it. The fundraiser was for a basketball team to go south for a tournament.

Questions:

- What is the threshold for a community fundraiser turning into a gambling event and needing a licence? When does a local fundraiser become a local or provincial government concern?
- Is there a limit to how much can be fundraised by a group like this?
- What makes the local government get involved in community activities like this?
- What do community groups have to do to abide by government rules?

Recommendation: provide on background from Ministry

What is the threshold for a community fundraiser turning into a gambling event and needing a licence? When does a local fundraiser become a local or provincial government concern? What makes the local government get involved in community activities like this?

- Any time an organization or individual wishes to fundraise through a gambling event, they require a licence from the Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch (GPEB). An event with gambling involves prizes, games of chance and consideration (payment to play). Chase the Ace events are considered gambling events.
- Fundraising that does not involve gambling is not regulated by GPEB.
- Chase the Ace is not currently permitted in B.C. because it does not meet the requirements of B.C.'s Standard Procedures for Ticket Raffles. These standard procedures are in place to ensure raffles are conducted lawfully and with integrity, and to protect the raffle licensee and raffle participants.
- Government is considering whether to implement Chase the Ace style draws in B.C.
- GPEB is aware of a number of the Chase the Ace events that are occurring across the province illegally. The branch has been reaching out to the organizations to ask them to stop operating these events and to support them in determining what they can do to fundraise legally.
- Questions about local government process or involvement as it relates to gambling should be directed to the local government, or local RCMP.

Is there a limit to how much can be fundraised by a group like this? What do community groups have to do to abide by government rules?

- An organization planning to hold a gambling event to fundraise for the purpose of benefiting the broader community may be eligible for either a Class A, B, or D gambling event licence.
- The class of licence needed for a specific event depends on how the organization is structured, how much money is expected to be raised, the value of the prizes and the price of tickets. Class A licences are issued to organizations with gross revenue over \$20,000, Class B licenses are issued to organizations with gross revenue under \$20,000, and Class D licenses are issued to organizations with gross revenue under \$5,000.
- For a breakdown of licence classes and other details on how to obtain a gambling licence, go to: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/sports-culture/gambling-fundraising/gambling-licence-fundraising>
- Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch staff are available to help eligible groups obtain the proper licence for eligible events.

Tiffany Nelson | Communications Manager
Ministry of Attorney General
Ph: 250 356-6334 | Cell: 250 858-4680

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: Re: Quick question: experts and media

Edited message approved

On Nov 24, 2017, at 4:36 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Are you ok with the message below?

From: Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 3:08 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX; Godfrey, Sam AG:EX; Milne, Gala AG:EX
Cc: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Subject: Quick question: experts and media

Hi – Max C. has received media calls. Neil would like to send the blurb below to all four experts re: media approach. Our edits in red. Let us know if good to go. Thanks

On Nov 24, 2017, at 3:39 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

See Max's questions below. I think a response should be the below, and could perhaps be sent to all four. Please advise ASAP if you have any issues with this:

We understand you may receive media requests on the topic of electoral reform and your role in the review of government's education material and questionnaire. Please feel free to ~~You are free to~~ comment on the wider referendum process and on your positions regarding voting systems. ~~There has not been an intent to limit any of the four of you in that regard. As started on the website, n regard to your role re: the website content and questionnaire, you could reiterate what we have posted there publicly, i.e. you provided comments but the content is the responsibility of the ministry. As~~ indicated in the letter requesting your participation, please refrain from commenting on the specific advice you provided and whether that advice was followed.

All other media inquiries concerning government decision regarding the public engagement (ex: selection of experts, design of the public engagement and its components), should be directed to the Ministry of Attorney General media line at 778 678-1572.

From: Cameron, Maxwell [<mailto:max.cameron@ubc.ca>]
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: Re: Engagement site has been launched

Thanks, Neil. That is what we expect.

On another matter, I'm getting media calls. My instructions were to "abstain from public comment or academic research related to the B.C. government's survey methodology, survey results or consultation process."

Can you offer any further guidance? Am I free to comment on the larger referendum process provided I do not reveal any information concerning the preparation and implementation of the survey? For example, someone from media wants comment on whether the current debate is more partisan than in previous referenda. I assume that I'm fine to respond to such a request. He also wants to know about my advisory role, and I assume my answer is that I'm not at liberty to discuss that.

Do I have that right?

Cheers, Max

Maxwell A. Cameron, Director
Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions
School of Public Policy and Global Affairs
& Professor
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia
C425-1866 Main Mall
Vancouver BC V6T 1Z1
Email: Max.Cameron@ubc.ca

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2017 9:05 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Fwd: Experts

...

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 23, 2017 at 9:04:30 PM PST
To: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>, "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Experts

In brief, Max has a position pro PR. Peter Loewen has a position for FPTP. Rose has no position that we are aware of. And Johnson is not really a PR advocate as far as we know but she did sign an open letter re the feds moving to PR a couple of years ago.

Rose and Johnson were chosen bc they're so strong on citizen engagement.

Sent from my iPhone so who knows what autocorrect has done.

On Nov 23, 2017, at 8:36 PM, Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

George how is this? See same thing attached for easier viewing.

Maxwell A. Cameron

- Holds a Ph.D. from California, Berkeley, 1989
- Specialties include:
 - Comparative politics (Latin America)
 - Constitutionalism
 - Democracy
 - political economy
- Author or editor of a dozen academic books and more than 50 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters.
 - *Democracy and Authoritarianism in Peru, The Peruvian Labyrinth, The Political Economy of North American Free Trade, To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines, Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change, Democracia en la Region Andina, New Institutions for Participatory Democracy in Latin America, The Making of NAFTA, Strong Constitutions*, and most recently, *Political Institutions and Practical Wisdom* (forthcoming).
- He founded the "Andean Democracy Research Network" to monitor and report on the state of democracy in the Andean region.

- Since 2011 he has served as the Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Genevieve Fuji Johnson

- Professor at Simon Fraser University
- studies and teaches democratic theory, feminist political thought, theories related to sexuality and gender, interpretive approaches to policy analysis, and a range of current public policy issues.
- Recent book *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy*, examines deliberative democratic processes in areas of public policy including social housing in Toronto, energy options in Nova Scotia, official languages in Nunavut, and nuclear waste management in Canada.
- Is also author of *Deliberative Democracy for the Future: The Case of Nuclear Waste Management in Canada*.
- She is co-editor (with Lorelea Michaelis) of *Political Responsibility Refocused: Thinking Justice after Iris Marion Young*, co-editor (with Darrin Durant) of *Nuclear Waste Management in Canada: Critical Issues, Critical Perspectives*, and co-editor (with Randy Enomoto) of *Race, Racialization and Anti-Racism in Canada and Beyond*.
- Her new research focuses on the implementation of prostitution laws and the governance of sex work in Canadian cities.
- She is part of a research network led by John Gastil and Katherine Knobloch that examines Citizens Initiative Review processes in the U.S.
- Her current and previous research projects have been funded by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada grants.
- Dr. Johnson is the Chair of the Graduate Program in Political Science, SFU. She is also an Associate Faculty Member of the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies and a Dialogue Associate of the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, SFU. In addition, she is a member of the SFUFA Executive Committee. Beyond the university, she serves on the Board of Directors for the Downtown Eastside Women's Centre and is a long-time volunteer for the Wish Drop In Centre Society.

Dr. Peter Loewen

- Director of the School of Public Policy and Governance and an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto.
- Interested in questions of elite and citizen behaviour and the role of technology in improving governance and representation.
- For the 2016-2017 academic year, he was a Visiting Research Scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.
- From 2012 to summer 2017, he was Assistant Editor of the Canadian Journal of Political Science.
- He has taught in several fields, including Canadian politics, American politics, political behaviour, comparative politics, and experimentation.

Dr. Jonathan Rose

- Interest are: Canadian Politics, mass media, political communication, political advertising, propaganda. More recently he has been interested in the practice of deliberative democracy and the demands such experiments make on citizens and governments.
- He is the author of *Making Pictures in our Heads, Government Advertising in Canada*.
- He is also the co-editor of *Canada: the State of the Federation* and is the lead author of *First Ministers' Conference, the Art of Negotiation*.
- His most recent book co-written with Patrick Fournier, Henk Van der Kolk and R. Kenneth Carty is *When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizens' Assemblies on Electoral Reform* (Oxford, 2011).
- He has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in Canadian politics, political communication, federalism, the mass media, electoral systems, intergovernmental relations and public policy.
- He has provided advice to the Auditor General of Canada on government advertising and sponsorship, and is a member of the Advertising Review Board for the Auditor General of Ontario, a board that enforces legislation regulating government advertising in Ontario.
- In 2006, he had the privilege of being the Academic Director of the Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform, the first such body in Ontario and second in the world.

From: Smith, George AG:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2017 6:43 PM

To: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX

Subject: Re: Experts

Can we please have more info re: experts?

MDE would like some more info before his 6am CBC interview.

On Nov 23, 2017, at 2:12 PM, Smith, George AG:EX

<George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

[@VaughnPalmer](#)

#bcpoli NDP stacks expert panel on electoral reform referendum:
3 advocates for proportional representation, 1 for status quo.

<https://twitter.com/vaughnpalmer/status/933816690994900993>

<Experts.docx>

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2017 8:38 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Fwd: Experts
Attachments: Experts.docx; ATT00001.htm

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 23, 2017 at 8:36:33 PM PST
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>, "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>, "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: RE: Experts

George how is this? See same thing attached for easier viewing.

Maxwell A. Cameron

- Holds a Ph.D. from California, Berkeley, 1989
- Specialties include:
 - Comparative politics (Latin America)
 - Constitutionalism
 - Democracy
 - political economy
- Author or editor of a dozen academic books and more than 50 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters.
 - *Democracy and Authoritarianism in Peru*, *The Peruvian Labyrinth*, *The Political Economy of North American Free Trade*, *To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines*, *Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change*, *Democracia en la Region Andina*, *New Institutions for Participatory Democracy in Latin America*, *The Making of NAFTA*, *Strong Constitutions*, and most recently, *Political Institutions and Practical Wisdom* (forthcoming).
- He founded the "Andean Democracy Research Network" to monitor and report on the state of democracy in the Andean region.
- Since 2011 he has served as the Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Genevieve Fuji Johnson

- Professor at Simon Fraser University
- studies and teaches democratic theory, feminist political thought, theories related to sexuality and gender, interpretive approaches to policy analysis, and a range of current public policy issues.
- Recent book *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy*, examines deliberative democratic processes in areas of public policy including social housing in Toronto, energy options in Nova Scotia, official languages in Nunavut, and nuclear waste management in Canada.

- Is also author of *Deliberative Democracy for the Future: The Case of Nuclear Waste Management in Canada*.
- She is co-editor (with Lorealea Michaelis) of *Political Responsibility Refocused: Thinking Justice after Iris Marion Young*, co-editor (with Darrin Durant) of *Nuclear Waste Management in Canada: Critical Issues, Critical Perspectives*, and co-editor (with Randy Enomoto) of *Race, Racialization and Anti-Racism in Canada and Beyond*.
- Her new research focuses on the implementation of prostitution laws and the governance of sex work in Canadian cities.
- She is part of a research network led by John Gastil and Katherine Knobloch that examines Citizens Initiative Review processes in the U.S.
- Her current and previous research projects have been funded by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada grants.
- Dr. Johnson is the Chair of the Graduate Program in Political Science, SFU. She is also an Associate Faculty Member of the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies and a Dialogue Associate of the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, SFU. In addition, she is a member of the SFUFA Executive Committee. Beyond the university, she serves on the Board of Directors for the Downtown Eastside Women's Centre and is a long-time volunteer for the Wish Drop In Centre Society.

Dr. Peter Loewen

- Director of the School of Public Policy and Governance and an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto.
- Interested in questions of elite and citizen behaviour and the role of technology in improving governance and representation.
- For the 2016-2017 academic year, he was a Visiting Research Scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.
- From 2012 to summer 2017, he was Assistant Editor of the Canadian Journal of Political Science.
- He has taught in several fields, including Canadian politics, American politics, political behaviour, comparative politics, and experimentation.

Dr. Jonathan Rose

- Interest are: Canadian Politics, mass media, political communication, political advertising, propaganda. More recently he has been interested in the practice of deliberative democracy and the demands such experiments make on citizens and governments.
- He is the author of *Making Pictures in our Heads, Government Advertising in Canada*.
- He is also the co-editor of *Canada: the State of the Federation* and is the lead author of *First Ministers' Conference, the Art of Negotiation*.
- His most recent book co-written with Patrick Fournier, Henk Van der Kolk and R. Kenneth Carty is *When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizens' Assemblies on Electoral Reform* (Oxford, 2011).
- He has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in Canadian politics, political communication, federalism, the mass media, electoral systems, intergovernmental relations and public policy.
- He has provided advice to the Auditor General of Canada on government advertising and sponsorship, and is a member of the Advertising Review Board for the Auditor General of Ontario, a board that enforces legislation regulating government advertising in Ontario.

- In 2006, he had the privilege of being the Academic Director of the Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform, the first such body in Ontario and second in the world.

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2017 6:43 PM
To: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX; Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: Re: Experts

Can we please have more info re: experts?

MDE would like some more info before his 6am CBC interview.

On Nov 23, 2017, at 2:12 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[@VaughnPalmer](#)
[REDACTED]

#bcpoli NDP stacks expert panel on electoral reform referendum: 3 advocates for proportional representation, 1 for status quo.

<https://twitter.com/vaughnpalmer/status/933816690994900993>

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2017 12:11 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Engagement doc
Attachments: BCVSS Version 3.0.docx; ATT00001.txt; Web copy - voting system public engagement - 16NOV17 - For MO.docx; ATT00002.txt

Documents for review:

British Columbia Voting Systems Questionnaire

Version 3 | Nov. 17, 2017 |

The B.C. government is holding a referendum in the fall of 2018 to ask voters whether the province should keep the current first-past-the-post voting system or change to a proportional representation voting system. This questionnaire will help B.C.'s Attorney General understand the preferences and expectations of B.C. voters about the referendum.

There are two parts to this survey. Part one asks key questions about your values and general outlook as to how we vote for Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs), and for how the legislature functions. Part two asks more detailed questions about your preferences regarding electoral reform, voting systems and the referendum process. At the end of each part, you will have the opportunity to provide further written feedback.

Each part of the questionnaire will take approximately 5-8 minutes to complete. We ask that you complete this survey only once.

Privacy Statement

Personal information collected through this feedback form will inform the development of a ballot for a November 2018 electoral reform referendum by the Ministry of Attorney General, under the authority of s.26 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. If you have any questions about the collection, use and disclosure of your personal information, please contact:

*Neil Reimer
Director, Director, Strategic Initiatives
Ministry of Justice
Victoria BC
Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca*

Part 1

Section 1: Profile

Please provide this general profile information. Your identity cannot be determined by answering these questions.

Profile_Q1 – What are the first three characters in your postal code (this is a required field)?

- [3 character field]

Profile_Q2 - How old are you?

- Under 18
- 18 - 39 years
- 40 - 64 years
- 65 - 75 years
- Over 75 years
- Prefer not to answer

Profile_Q3 - Please indicate your gender:

- Man (1)
- Woman (2)
- X: _____[text box] (3)
- Prefer not to answer

Profile_Q4 - Do you identify with any of the following groups? Please select all that apply

- Visible minority (1)
- First Nations (2)
- Inuit (3)
- Métis (4)
- Persons with disabilities (5)
- LGBTQ2 (6)
- None of the above (7)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your interest in, and familiarity with, current affairs and voting in elections.

Outlook_Q1 - Generally speaking, how interested are you in politics and current affairs?

- Not interested at all (1)
- Not very interested (2)
- Somewhat interested (3)
- Very interested (4)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook_Q2 - How often do you vote in provincial elections?

- I am not eligible to vote (1)
- Never (2)
- Rarely (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Most of the time (5)
- All of the time (6)
- First time voter in 2017 (7)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook_Q3 - Which, if any, of the following have been barriers that have kept you from voting?

(Please select all that apply.)

- Not enough time (1)
- Not enough information (2)
- Disability or mobility issues (3)
- Voting location isn't convenient (4)
- Do not feel included (5)
- Frustration with politics (6)
- Don't like the voting system (7)
- I was not eligible to vote (8)
- Not interested in politics (9)
- I feel like my vote doesn't count (10)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook_Q4 – If you were to vote in a referendum to choose a voting system today, how confident are you that you would make would you feel about making an informed choice?

- Not at all confident (1)
- Not very confident (2)
- Somewhat confident (3)
- Very confident (4)
- Don't know (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q1 Please select up to five values from the list below that are most important to you.

I value most:

[note to reviewers: the sequence of value statements below will be rotated randomly for each user.]

Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who focus primarily on what is best for the province as a whole
Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who focus primarily on the interests of their local community
A voting system that is easy to understand
Better representation of groups that are currently under-represented in the Legislative Assembly

Increasing the number of political parties in the Legislative Assembly to represent more points of view
A Legislative Assembly where <u>in which</u> the share of seats each party holds closely matches the share of the popular vote it receives across the province
A Legislative Assembly where <u>in which</u> the share of seats each party holds is fairly similar to the share of the popular vote it receives across the province
A voting system that encourages political parties to appeal to other parties' voters <u>as broadly as possible to voters</u>
A voting system that makes it easier for independent candidates (those not running for a political party) to be elected
A voting system that allows a voter to rank a political party's candidates (1, 2, 3, etc.)
Single-party majority governments that are clearly accountable for their decisions
A Legislative Assembly where two or more parties co-operate to make decisions
Other:

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your values and preferences regarding how MLAs are elected, how governments are formed and how the Legislative Assembly operates.

Preferences_Q2 Which would you prefer?

- The number of MLAs should remain the same (1)
- There should be more MLAs to better reflect voters' interests (2)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q3 There should be greater diversity of views represented in the Legislative Assembly.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q4 The party that wins the most seats in an election should have to compromise with other parties, even if it means changing some of its campaign commitments.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q5 It should always be clear which party is accountable for decisions made by government, even if this means that decisions are only made by one party.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following question to help us understand the choices you would like to see on the referendum ballot.

Ballot Options_Q 1 Which would you prefer?

- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and ONE proportional representation voting system.
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and MORE THAN ONE proportional representation voting system
- The referendum ballot should offer voters the choice between the current first-past-the-post voting system and proportional representation, with a specific voting system to be established by legislation after the referendum.
- Prefer not to answer

[Text box]

Are there any other comments you would like to make about voting systems or the upcoming referendum? [Limit to 200 characters]

This is the end of Part 1 of the questionnaire. Part 2 asks further questions about your preferences regarding electoral reform and the referendum ballot. You may submit your responses to Part 1 now and leave the survey, or continue on to Part 2.

SUBMIT AND LEAVE

CONTINUE TO PART 2

Part 2

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your interest in electoral reform.

Outlook_Q1 - How closely have you followed public debate on electoral reform?

- Not closely at all (1)
- Somewhat closely (2)
- Very closely (3)
- Prefer not to answer

Outlook_Q2 - Did you vote in either the 2005 or 2009 B.C. referendum on electoral reform?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)
- Not eligible (4)
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your values and preferences regarding how Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) are elected, how governments are formed and how the Legislative Assembly operates.

Preferences_Q3 Which would you prefer?

Having more small parties represented in the Legislature or a fewer big parties?

- A few big parties (1)
- More small parties (2)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q4 Which would you prefer?

- Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) who do what their party promised.
- MLAs who do what their constituents want.
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q5 Ballots should allow voters to choose support more than one candidate or political party by ranking them in order of preference.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q6 All votes should contribute to electing an MLA, even A ballot should give voters lots of choices, even if it's less clear how votes get turned into seats. means the ballot is longer or more complicated.

- Strongly disagree (1)

- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q7 An election ballot should be easy to understand, even if it means voters have fewer options to express their preferences.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q8 It is better for several parties to co-operate and have to govern together rather than for one party to govern alone, make all the decisions in government, even if it sometimes takes longer to form government after an election.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Preferences_Q9 - Please indicate which you prefer:

- Each electoral district is represented by one MLA
- Each electoral district is represented by several MLAs
- Some MLAs represent an electoral district, while other MLAs represent larger regions or the province as a whole
- Prefer not to answer

Please answer the following questions to help us understand the choices you would like to see on the referendum ballot.

Ballot Options_Q 1 If the government offers voters a choice of more than one proportional representation voting system, which do you prefer?

- Voters should indicate their support for only one proposed system
- Voter should rank order their support for all the proposed systems
- Prefer not to answer

Ballot Options_Q 2: Alongside the option of keeping the first-past-the-post voting system, which system or systems of proportional representation would you like to see on the ballot? Please select all that apply. (With mouse-over summary text from web 101 pages that does not click to a new page)

- List Proportional Representation
- Mixed Member Proportional
- Single Transferable Vote
- Mixed Member Majoritarian
- Other: *Please describe*
- Prefer not to answer

Ballot Options_Q 3: If B.C. changes to a system of proportional representation, there should be a second referendum after a trial period (for example, two elections) on whether to keep the new system.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Section 5: Public funding and advertising in the referendum

Please answer the following questions to help us understand your expectations with regards to public funding for advocacy groups and campaign advertising for particular voting systems during the referendum.

Public Funding_Q 1 The government should provide public funds to designated groups to campaign for their preferred voting system

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 2 There should be spending limits imposed on any group that campaigns for its preferred voting system

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 3 The provincial government should provide the public with impartial information during the referendum campaign period.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)

- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

Public Funding_Q 4 The provincial government should ensure that paid advertisements that appear during the referendum campaign period are produced only by groups that must register, disclose their identity in their advertising and disclose their contributors and expenses after the referendum.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Prefer not to answer

[Text box]

Are there any other comments you would like to make about voting systems or the upcoming referendum? [Limit to 200 characters]

DRAFT - CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR CIRCULATION

Main page – text in draft as to purpose of engagement and plans for feedback.

101 Home Page – intro text

What are voting systems?

Voting systems are important to democratic societies. Countries around the world use different voting systems to elect their political representatives. Each voting system has different features, so how a voting system is designed influences how a society will be governed. By choosing a voting system, we are shaping our democracy.

This section of the website will provide you with information about B.C.'s current voting system, commonly called "first past the post" (FPTP), as well as three of the major proportional voting systems and one semi-proportional system used elsewhere in the world.

Voting system summaries

First Past the Post (FPTP), also called Single Member Plurality (SMP)

Definition: This is the current voting system in British Columbia. It is a system in which the candidate who gets the most votes in an electoral district wins and represents that district in the legislature as its Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA). Each electoral district elects one MLA. The phrase “first past the post” comes from horse racing. In the case of elections, the winning candidate is the one who places first among all candidates in the electoral district.

Voting and Results:

- Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
- Voters use a single ballot listing the candidates for the electoral district
- Voters mark an ‘X’ beside the one candidate of their choice
- The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district

Tendencies:

- Does not usually produce proportional results – that is, a political party’s share of the popular vote may not match its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly
- Often results in single-party majority governments
- Coalition and minority governments are less common than with other voting systems
- Elects candidates of larger political parties and only rarely candidates of small parties and independent candidates

Perceived strengths:

- Clear local representation – every electoral district represented by single member
- Simple ballot – easy to understand, single choice
- Simple process to determine results
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments
- Usually clear on election night who will form government

Perceived weaknesses:

- Often produces single-party majority governments that win less than a majority of the popular vote

- Rewards large, broad-based political parties and parties that concentrate their support in specific regions; discourages smaller parties with support that is more dispersed across the province
- Difficult for voters to hold party and candidate separately accountable — a voter may vote for a candidate the voter dislikes if they represent the party the voter does like, and vice versa
- Can feature a higher number of “safe seats” (electoral districts in which the candidate for a particular political party is very likely to win), which may lead to elections that focus on a smaller number of more competitive electoral districts
- Majority governments often mean the governing party is not required to co-operate with other parties in the legislature
- Only votes cast for winning candidates actually elect an MLA — other votes are not used to elect a candidate and are often referred to as “wasted” votes

To learn more about First Past the Post, visit these independent electoral information websites:

Samara Canada: <http://www.samaracanada.com/samara-in-the-classroom/electoral-reform/first-past-the-post/>

ACE Project: <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/es/esd/esd03/esd03a/esd03a01>

List Proportional Representation (List PR)

Definition: A voting system in which multiple MLAs are elected in large electoral districts: either several regional districts or the province as a whole, depending on the design of the system. The proportion of total votes received by each political party determines the share of seats it receives in the Legislative Assembly.

Each party prepares a list of candidates prior to the election. Lists may be “closed” or “open.” For closed lists, voters endorse a party and its candidates as listed in the order put forward by that party. For open lists, voters may choose the candidates they prefer from amongst the candidates put forward by a party, or there may also be an option to endorse the party’s list as presented. Using either form of List PR, the share of seats each party receives matches its share of the popular vote.

Voting and Results:

- Voters elect multiple MLAs in each electoral district
- A single ballot lists the parties and each of their candidates
- Voters mark an ‘X’ beside the candidate or party of their choice
- Each party receives a percentage of the seats in the Legislative Assembly equal to the percentage of the vote the party or its candidates collectively received in the region or province
- The party’s seats are filled by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (in an open list) or in the order they appeared on the party’s list (in a closed list)
- Election law would establish a formula to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (for example 2% or 5%) may be established below which a party would not be eligible to receive any seats

Tendencies:

- Highly proportional results (party’s share of popular vote closely matches its share of seats in the Legislative Assembly) when a large number of MLAs are elected in each electoral district
- Less proportional results when the number of MLAs elected in each electoral district is low
- Minority or coalition governments are common

- Closed list PR elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Open list PR elects candidates from larger and smaller political parties and may elect independent candidates

Perceived strengths:

- Highly proportional if a large number of MLAs are elected in an electoral district (high district magnitude)
- Increased voter choice on the ballot in open list because voters can choose between candidates of the same party
- Multiple political parties in the Legislative Assembly, resulting in greater number of viewpoints represented
- Most votes count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")
- In closed list election, political parties can determine their mix of candidates, which may result in greater diversity

Perceived weaknesses:

- Reduced connection between communities and MLAs because of large, even provincewide, electoral districts
- May result in many parties being represented in the Legislative Assembly, making government accountability less clear
- In open list election, there may be a large number of candidates on a single ballot, making choices more difficult unless there is also an option to endorse the party's list as presented
- Can be difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

To learn more about List PR, visit these independent electoral information websites:

Samara Canada: <http://www.samaracanada.com/samara-in-the-classroom/electoral-reform/list-proportional-representation/>

ACE Project: <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/es/esd/esd03/esd03a/esd03a01>

Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Definition: A voting system in which multiple MLAs are elected in each electoral district and voters rank the candidates according to their preferences (1, 2, 3, etc.). A formula determines the quota, which is the minimum number of votes a candidate must receive to be elected. Any candidates who reach the quota based on voters' first choices are elected. If any seats remain unfilled because other candidates did not reach the quota, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the other candidates until all seats are filled.

The proportionality of the results depends on how many MLAs are elected in each electoral district (district magnitude). A version of STV called BC-STV was proposed by the Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform in 2004. It called for between two and seven MLAs to be elected in each electoral district.

Voting and Results:

- Voters elect multiple MLAs in each electoral district
- A single ballot lists the candidates for an electoral district
- Voters rank candidates according to their preferences
- All voters' first preferences are counted and the quota needed to be elected is established
- If any candidate has reached or exceeded the quota, the candidate is elected and wins one of the seats to represent that district in the Legislative Assembly
- If any seats are unfilled after the first choices have been counted, voters' subsequent choices are transferred to the remaining candidates:
 - First, excess votes of a winning candidate are transferred to those voters' next choices
 - If no candidate reaches the quota after this first transfer, then the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated and the voters who put that candidate as their first preference have their votes transferred to their second preference
- This process of transferring continues until all seats have been filled or until all ballots have been exhausted (that is, there are no further preferences to count)
- Several rounds of counting are usually required

Tendencies:

- Mostly proportional results; the more MLAs in an electoral district, the more proportional the results will be
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments are common

- Candidates from the same party compete against each other in an electoral district
- Encourages candidates to seek support from voters for whom they are not the first choice to increase their likelihood of being elected

Perceived strengths:

- Provides proportional results in electoral districts with several MLAs (generally five or more)
- Provides local representation, although in larger electoral districts than First Past the Post
- Maximizes voter choice on the ballot because voters can support multiple candidates from one or more political parties
- Preferences of voters whose first choices are eliminated may still be considered
- Candidates of smaller political parties have a greater likelihood of being elected
- Provides independent candidates the greatest likelihood of being elected
- Most votes count toward electing an MLA (few "wasted votes")

Perceived weaknesses:

- Electoral districts with only two or three MLAs do not produce proportional results
- Difficult to understand how votes are turned into seats
- Candidates who receive more first-preference votes may lose to candidates who receive fewer first-preference votes after all the vote transfers occur
- Larger electoral districts may reduce connection between local communities and MLAs
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

To learn more about STV, visit these independent electoral information websites:

Samara Canada: <http://www.samaracanada.com/samara-in-the-classroom/electoral-reform/single-transferable-vote/>

ACE Project: <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/es/esd/esd03/esd03a/esd03a01>

Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP)

Definition: A voting system in which First Past the Post (FPTP) and List PR are both used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly and voters have a separate vote under each system. Some seats are filled at the local electoral district level under FPTP, while other seats are filled at the regional or provincial level under List PR. For example, there could be 50 seats that are filled directly by voters in local electoral districts and 30 seats that are filled by voters across the province or in a region who vote for candidates on provincewide or regional party lists.

The overall share of seats each party holds in the Legislative Assembly is determined by parties' share of the List PR vote – the List PR seats are allocated from the parties' lists of candidates specifically to compensate for any disproportional results from the FPTP vote, so that the overall result is proportional.

Voting and Results:

- Voters cast two votes – one vote to elect a single MLA for a local electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or provincewide list (List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
 - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("FPTP seats").
 - Voters in each local electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
 - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
 - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the local electoral district
 - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or provincewide ("list seats")
 - Lists may be open (voters vote for a candidate of their choice) or closed (voters vote for a party of their choice) – see "List PR"
 - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the FPTP candidate they support or a different party)
 - The list seats are used to "top up" the number of FPTP seats each party won to bring their share of the total seats in the Legislative Assembly as close as possible to their share of the vote on Part 2 of the ballot
 - For example, a party that received 20% of the provincewide vote for the list seats but only won 15% of the FPTP seats would receive additional list seats so it holds 20% of the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly
 - The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election

(closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)

- Election law will establish a formula to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote (e.g. 2% or 5%) may be established below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats.

Tendencies:

- Proportional results as long as there are enough List PR seats to compensate for any disproportional results in the FPTP vote
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than under FPTP or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments are common

Perceived strengths:

- Largely proportional and can be highly proportional depending on the mix of electoral district and list seats – the more list seats there are compared to FPTP seats, the more proportional the results will be
- Identifiable local representation
- Voter choice (both a local candidate and a party)
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- If party list is closed, political parties determine mix of candidates, which may result in greater diversity
- If party list is open, voters can vote for party candidate they prefer
- Most list seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA

Perceived weaknesses:

- Creates two “classes” of MLAs – those who represent a local district and those who are elected from a large regional or province-wide list
- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how list votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

- If a political party receives more electoral district seats than its province-wide vote share would entitle it to, then depending on the design of the system, either:
 - the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly must increase to address this over-representation, or
 - the other political parties receive fewer list seats than they would otherwise be entitled to

To learn more about MMP, visit these independent electoral information websites:

Samara Canada: <http://www.samaracanada.com/samara-in-the-classroom/electoral-reform/mixed-member-proportional-representation/>

ACE Project: <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/es/esd/esd03/esd03a/esd03a01>

Mixed-Member Majoritarian (MMM) (also called Parallel)

Definition: A voting system that is very similar to MMP in which FPTP and List PR are both used to allocate seats in the Legislative Assembly and voters have a separate vote under each system. Some seats are filled at the local electoral district level under FPTP, while other seats are filled at the regional or provincial level under List PR. For example, there could be 50 seats that are filled directly by voters in specific electoral districts and 30 seats that are filled by voters across the province or in a region who vote for candidates on province-wide or regional party lists.

In MMM, unlike MMP, the List PR seats are not allocated to compensate for any disproportional results from the FPTP vote – instead, the List PR seats are allocated proportionally only amongst themselves. While MMM produces more proportional results than FPTP, it does not necessarily produce closely proportional results overall and is usually referred to as a semi-proportional system.

Voting:

- Voters cast two votes – one vote to elect a single MLA for an electoral district (FPTP), and one vote for a party to elect MLAs on a regional or provincewide list (List PR).
- Two-part ballot:
 - Part 1 lists the candidates for the local electoral district ("FPTP seats").
 - Voters in each electoral district vote to elect a single MLA
 - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate of their choice
 - The candidate with the most votes wins the seat in the Legislative Assembly to represent the electoral district
 - Part 2 lists the parties running in a region or provincewide ("list seats")
 - Lists may be "open" (voters vote for a candidate of their choice) or "closed" (voters vote for a party of their choice) – see "List PR"
 - Voters mark an 'X' beside the candidate or political party of their choice (may be the same party as the FPTP candidate they support or a different party)
 - Each political party receives a share of the list seats in the Legislative Assembly that corresponds with its share of the list seat vote across the region/province
 - These list seats are not "top up" seats and do not take into account any disproportional results from the FPTP vote

- The list seats are filled either by the candidates for that party in the order of the list established by the political party at the start of the election (closed list) or by the candidates for that party in the order of the number of votes the candidates received (open list)
- Election law will establish a formula to determine the number of seats each party is entitled to when the popular vote results (expressed as a percentage) would give a party a fraction of a seat
- A minimum percentage of the popular vote may be established (e.g. 2% or 5%) below which a political party would not be eligible to receive any seats

Tendencies:

- Somewhat proportional (more proportional than FPTP but less than List PR, STV or MMP)
- Fewer, larger electoral districts than currently under FPTP or a significant increase in the total number of MLAs to support the additional list seats
- Elects candidates from larger political parties and some smaller parties and only rarely independent candidates
- Minority or coalition governments may occur, but are less likely than under List PR, STV or MMP

Perceived strengths:

- Identifiable local representation
- Increased voter choice (both a local MLA and a party)
- If party list is closed, political parties determine mix of candidates, which may result in greater diversity
- If party list is open, enables voters to vote for party candidate they prefer
- Relatively simple ballot to mark
- Most list seat votes will contribute towards electing an MLA
- More likely to produce single-party majority governments than List PR, STV or MMP but less likely than FPTP

Perceived weaknesses:

- How proportional results are is highly dependent on the number of electoral district seats vs. the number of list seats
- Creates two “classes” of MLAs – those who represent a local district and those who are elected from a regional or province-wide list

- Challenging for voters to hold individual MLAs accountable if they can be included on party list and elected despite not winning an electoral district seat
- Can be difficult to understand how list votes are turned into seats
- Potential delays in forming government after an election if negotiations between parties are required

To learn more about MMM, visit this independent electoral information website:

ACE Project (see "Parallel Systems"): <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/es/esd/esd03/esd03a/esd03a01>

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2017 1:44 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: Re: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

Yes

On Nov 3, 2017, at 10:20 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Just to be clear, it's fine to delay until post break week?

On Nov 3, 2017, at 9:53 PM, Eby, David AG:EX <David.Eby@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Yes, that's fine.

On Nov 3, 2017, at 5:06 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Minister,
Please see Neil's question below.
s.13

Let me know what you think.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 3, 2017 at 4:29:58 PM PDT
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>, "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

George, as discussed, if the bill is still going to be before the House past next week, then it would be hugely beneficial for us to have extra time to prepare the engagement materials prior to the launch. At present we are scrambling to complete the basic web content (questionnaire and voting system information) and have it reviewed by external experts, then refined. We are essentially giving those experts the weekend to do this.

If we could have the break week to work on this as well, with the launch during the following week, the materials would undoubtedly be better.

Please run this past the AG as soon as you are able, as a decision either way will affect our work over the weekend.

Thanks very much.

Neil Reimer

Director, Strategic Initiatives

Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of
Attorney General

1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2017 10:20 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Re: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

Just to be clear, it's fine to delay until post break week?

On Nov 3, 2017, at 9:53 PM, Eby, David AG:EX <David.Eby@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Yes, that's fine.

On Nov 3, 2017, at 5:06 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Minister,
Please see Neil's question below.
s.13

Let me know what you think.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 3, 2017 at 4:29:58 PM PDT
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>, "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

George, as discussed, if the bill is still going to be before the House past next week, then it would be hugely beneficial for us to have extra time to prepare the engagement materials prior to the launch. At present we are scrambling to complete the basic web content (questionnaire and voting system information) and have it reviewed by external experts, then refined. We are essentially giving those experts the weekend to do this.

If we could have the break week to work on this as well, with the launch during the following week, the materials would undoubtedly be better.

Please run this past the AG as soon as you are able, as a decision either way will affect our work over the weekend.

Thanks very much.

Neil Reimer

Director, Strategic Initiatives

Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General

1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2017 9:53 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: Re: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

Yes, that's fine.

On Nov 3, 2017, at 5:06 PM, Smith, George AG:EX <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Minister,
Please see Neil's question below.
s.13

Let me know what you think.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Reimer, Neil JAG:EX" <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 3, 2017 at 4:29:58 PM PDT
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>, "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>, "Atcheson, Kevin AG:EX" <Kevin.Atcheson@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Date of launch for engagement on referendum

George, as discussed, if the bill is still going to be before the House past next week, then it would be hugely beneficial for us to have extra time to prepare the engagement materials prior to the launch. At present we are scrambling to complete the basic web content (questionnaire and voting system information) and have it reviewed by external experts, then refined. We are essentially giving those experts the weekend to do this.

If we could have the break week to work on this as well, with the launch during the following week, the materials would undoubtedly be better.

Please run this past the AG as soon as you are able, as a decision either way will affect our work over the weekend.

Thanks very much.

Neil Reimer
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Justice Services Branch | British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General
1001 Douglas St., Victoria, BC Tel: 250 356-8303

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 4:55 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: RE: For approval: PR advisors and invite letter

Approved. Thanks.

D.

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: FW: For approval: PR advisors and invite letter
Importance: High

For your review

From: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 4:05 PM
To: Godfrey, Sam AG:EX; Smith, George AG:EX
Cc: Milne, Gala AG:EX; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Subject: For approval: PR advisors and invite letter
Importance: High

Hi George and Sam,

Below are the proposed experts who we would like MDE to consider for providing us feedback on our phase one materials for PR engagement. We would need to get approval quickly to ensure they have time to review the questionnaire before launch day.

Also attached is the letter we would send with the request for your approval.

1. Dr. Jonathan Rose, Department of Political Studies, Queen's University

Jonathan studied at University of Toronto and Queen's where he received his Ph.D. In addition to Queen's he has taught courses at the International Studies Centre (Herstmonceux, UK), Charles University in Prague, Bratislava, Slovakia and Kwansei Gakuin in Osaka, Japan where he was the Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies. In 2008, Jonathan was a Visiting Research Fellow in the School of Political Science and International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

He is the author of Making Pictures in our Heads, Government Advertising in Canada (New York: Praeger Press, 2000). He is also the co-editor of Canada: the State of the Federation, 1998 and is the lead author of First Ministers??? Conference, the Art of Negotiation, a simulation exercise published by Broadview Press and translated into three languages. His most recent book co-written with Patrick Fournier, Henk Van der Kolk and R. Kenneth Carty is When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizens' Assemblies on Electoral Reform (Oxford, 2011).

Jonathan's teaching is varied. He has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in Canadian politics, political communication, federalism, the mass media, electoral systems, intergovernmental relations and public policy. In 2010 he received the Frank Knox Certificate of Commendation for Excellence in Teaching. In 2011, Jonathan was the recipient of W.J. Barnes Teaching Excellence Award.

He has provided advice to the Auditor General of Canada on government advertising and sponsorship, and is a member of the Advertising Review Board for the Auditor General of Ontario, a board that enforces legislation regulating government advertising in Ontario. In 2006, he had the privilege of being the Academic Director of the Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform, the first such body in Ontario and second in the world.

Note from JSB: Rose is not known to favour any particular voting system.

2. Dr. Genevieve Fuji Johnson, Department of Political Science, SFU

Genevieve studies and teaches democratic theory, feminist political thought, theories related to sexuality and gender, interpretive approaches to policy analysis, and a range of current public policy issues.

Dr. Johnson's recent book (University of Toronto Press, 2015) *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy*, examines deliberative democratic processes in areas of public policy including social housing in Toronto, energy options in Nova Scotia, official languages in Nunavut, and nuclear waste management in Canada. This book is the winner of the 2016 BCPSA Weller Prize for Best Book by a BC Political Scientist.

She is also author of *Deliberative Democracy for the Future: The Case of Nuclear Waste Management in Canada* (University of Toronto Press, 2008), which has been translated into Japanese (Shinsen Sha, 2011). She is co-editor (with Loreale Michaelis) of *Political Responsibility Refocused: Thinking Justice after Iris Marion Young* (University of Toronto Press, 2013), co-editor (with Darrin Durant) of *Nuclear Waste Management in Canada: Critical Issues, Critical Perspectives* (UBC Press, 2009), and co-editor (with Randy Enomoto) of *Race, Racialization and Anti-Racism in Canada and Beyond* (University of Toronto Press, 2007).

Her new research focuses on the implementation of prostitution laws and the governance of sex work in Canadian cities. She is also part of a research network led by John Gastil and Katherine Knobloch that examines Citizens Initiative Review processes in the U.S.

Dr. Johnson is the Chair of the Graduate Program in Political Science, SFU. She is also an Associate Faculty Member of the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies and a Dialogue Associate of the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, SFU. In addition, she is a member of the SFUFA Executive Committee. Beyond the university, she serves on the Board of Directors for the Downtown Eastside Women's Centre and is a long-time volunteer for the Wish Drop In Centre Society.

Note from JSB: Johnson is not known to favour any particular voting system.

3. Dr. Maxwell A. Cameron, Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of British Columbia

Maxwell A. Cameron (Ph.D., California, Berkeley, 1989) specializes in comparative politics (Latin America), constitutionalism, democracy, and political economy. He is the author or editor of a dozen academic books as well as over fifty peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. His books include:

Democracy and Authoritarianism in Peru, The Peruvian Labyrinth, The Political Economy of North American Free Trade, To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines, Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change, Democracia en la Region Andina, New Institutions for Participatory Democracy in Latin America, The Making of NAFTA, Strong Constitutions, and most recently, Political Institutions and Practical Wisdom (forthcoming).

Cameron has held visiting positions in the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at Notre Dame University (1996) and at Yale University, where he was the Canadian Bicentennial Professor in 2005. In 2006 he served as political advisor to the OAS Electoral Observation Mission in Peru. He founded the Andean Democracy Research Network to monitor and report on the state of democracy in the Andean region which received funding from the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Martha Piper Fund, SSHRC, IDRC and the Ford Foundation. Since 2011 he has served as the Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions in which capacity he has organized the Summer Institute for Future Legislators between 2013 and 2016. In 2011-12 he was a Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence, and in 2013 he was awarded a UBC Killam Teaching Prize. Cameron is a frequent commentator on politics in the media. He enjoys biking, skiing, scuba diving, and playing guitar. He is currently blogging about practical wisdom.

Note from JSB: Cameron is known as a supporter of PR.

4. Dr. Peter Loewen, Director of the School of Public Policy and Governance and an Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto.

Peter is substantively interested in questions of elite and citizen behaviour and the role of technology in improving governance and representation. He has published my work in journals of political science, economics, biology, and general science.

He came to Uof T in 2010 after postdocs at UBC and UCSD. He received my PhD from Universit  de Montr al in 2008 and his BA from Mount Allison University in 2002. For the 2016-2017 academic year, he was a Visiting Research Scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. In January 2014, he was a visitor at the Melbourne School of Government, University of Melbourne.

From 2012 to summer 2017, he was Assistant Editor of the Canadian Journal of Political Science.

He has taught in several fields, including Canadian politics, American politics, political behaviour, comparative politics, and experimentation.

Note from JSB: Loewen presented in support of First Past the Post to the federal electoral reform committee.

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: FW: For approval: PR advisors and invite letter
Attachments: Draft letter to poli scientists NR comments (3).docx

Importance: High

For your review

From: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 4:05 PM
To: Godfrey, Sam AG:EX; Smith, George AG:EX
Cc: Milne, Gala AG:EX; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Subject: For approval: PR advisors and invite letter
Importance: High

Hi George and Sam,

Below are the proposed experts who we would like MDE to consider for providing us feedback on our phase one materials for PR engagement. We would need to get approval quickly to ensure they have time to review the questionnaire before launch day.

Also attached is the letter we would send with the request for your approval.

1. Dr. Jonathan Rose, Department of Political Studies, Queen's University

Jonathan studied at University of Toronto and Queen's where he received his Ph.D. In addition to Queen's he has taught courses at the International Studies Centre (Herstmonceux, UK), Charles University in Prague, Bratislava, Slovakia and Kwansei Gakuin in Osaka, Japan where he was the Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies. In 2008, Jonathan was a Visiting Research Fellow in the School of Political Science and International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

He is the author of *Making Pictures in our Heads, Government Advertising in Canada* (New York: Praeger Press, 2000). He is also the co-editor of *Canada: the State of the Federation, 1998* and is the lead author of *First Ministers??? Conference, the Art of Negotiation*, a simulation exercise published by Broadview Press and translated into three languages. His most recent book co-written with Patrick Fournier, Henk Van der Kolk and R. Kenneth Carty is *When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizens' Assemblies on Electoral Reform* (Oxford, 2011).

Jonathan's teaching is varied. He has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in Canadian politics, political communication, federalism, the mass media, electoral systems, intergovernmental relations and public policy. In 2010 he received the Frank Knox Certificate of Commendation for Excellence in Teaching. In 2011, Jonathan was the recipient of W.J. Barnes Teaching Excellence Award.

He has provided advice to the Auditor General of Canada on government advertising and sponsorship, and is a member of the Advertising Review Board for the Auditor General of Ontario, a board that

enforces legislation regulating government advertising in Ontario. In 2006, he had the privilege of being the Academic Director of the Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform, the first such body in Ontario and second in the world.

Note from JSB: Rose is not known to favour any particular voting system.

2. Dr. Genevieve Fuji Johnson, Department of Political Science, SFU

Genevieve studies and teaches democratic theory, feminist political thought, theories related to sexuality and gender, interpretive approaches to policy analysis, and a range of current public policy issues.

Dr. Johnson's recent book (University of Toronto Press, 2015) *Democratic Illusion: Deliberative Democracy in Canadian Public Policy*, examines deliberative democratic processes in areas of public policy including social housing in Toronto, energy options in Nova Scotia, official languages in Nunavut, and nuclear waste management in Canada. This book is the winner of the 2016 BCPSA Weller Prize for Best Book by a BC Political Scientist.

She is also author of *Deliberative Democracy for the Future: The Case of Nuclear Waste Management in Canada* (University of Toronto Press, 2008), which has been translated into Japanese (Shinsen Sha, 2011). She is co-editor (with Lorelea Michaelis) of *Political Responsibility Refocused: Thinking Justice after Iris Marion Young* (University of Toronto Press, 2013), co-editor (with Darrin Durant) of *Nuclear Waste Management in Canada: Critical Issues, Critical Perspectives* (UBC Press, 2009), and co-editor (with Randy Enomoto) of *Race, Racialization and Anti-Racism in Canada and Beyond* (University of Toronto Press, 2007).

Her new research focuses on the implementation of prostitution laws and the governance of sex work in Canadian cities. She is also part of a research network led by John Gastil and Katherine Knobloch that examines Citizens Initiative Review processes in the U.S.

Dr. Johnson is the Chair of the Graduate Program in Political Science, SFU. She is also an Associate Faculty Member of the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies and a Dialogue Associate of the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, SFU. In addition, she is a member of the SFUFA Executive Committee. Beyond the university, she serves on the Board of Directors for the Downtown Eastside Women's Centre and is a long-time volunteer for the Wish Drop In Centre Society.

Note from JSB: Johnson is not known to favour any particular voting system.

3. Dr. Maxwell A. Cameron, Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of British Columbia

Maxwell A. Cameron (Ph.D., California, Berkeley, 1989) specializes in comparative politics (Latin America), constitutionalism, democracy, and political economy. He is the author or editor of a dozen academic books as well as over fifty peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. His books include: *Democracy and Authoritarianism in Peru*, *The Peruvian Labyrinth*, *The Political Economy of North American Free Trade*, *To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines*, *Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change*, *Democracia en la Region Andina*, *New Institutions for Participatory Democracy in Latin America*, *The Making of NAFTA*, *Strong Constitutions*, and most recently, *Political Institutions and Practical Wisdom* (forthcoming).

Cameron has held visiting positions in the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at Notre Dame University (1996) and at Yale University, where he was the Canadian Bicentennial Professor in 2005. In 2006 he served as political advisor to the OAS Electoral Observation Mission in Peru. He founded the Andean Democracy Research Network to monitor and report on the state of democracy in the Andean region which received funding from the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Martha Piper Fund, SSHRC, IDRC and the Ford Foundation. Since 2011 he has served as the Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions in which capacity he has organized the Summer Institute for Future Legislators between 2013 and 2016. In 2011-12 he was a Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence, and in 2013 he was awarded a UBC Killam Teaching Prize. Cameron is a frequent commentator on politics in the media. He enjoys biking, skiing, scuba diving, and playing guitar. He is currently blogging about practical wisdom.

Note from JSB: Cameron is known as a supporter of PR.

4. Dr. Peter Loewen, Director of the School of Public Policy and Governance and an Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto.

Peter is substantively interested in questions of elite and citizen behaviour and the role of technology in improving governance and representation. He has published my work in journals of political science, economics, biology, and general science.

He came to Uof T in 2010 after postdocs at UBC and UCSD. He received my PhD from Universit?? de Montr??al in 2008 and his BA from Mount Allison University in 2002. For the 2016-2017 academic year, he was a Visiting Research Scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. In January 2014, he was a visitor at the Melbourne School of Government, University of Melbourne.

From 2012 to summer 2017, he was Assistant Editor of the Canadian Journal of Political Science.

He has taught in several fields, including Canadian politics, American politics, political behaviour, comparative politics, and experimentation.

Note from JSB: Loewen presented in support of First Past the Post to the federal electoral reform committee.

Dear X,

As you may be aware, on Oct. 4, 2017 B.C.'s Attorney General David Eby took the first steps towards asking British Columbians if they want a change to the current voting system. The Bill sets out the terms for a provincewide referendum to be scheduled before the end of November 2018.

In order for all British Columbians to have their say, the Ministry of Attorney General is launching an education and awareness engagement process in the coming days.

I would like to formally invite you to provide your advice to the Attorney General and ministry staff on the content of its public engagement materials.

As a noted academic authority with expertise in electoral systems, survey design and/or public engagement, we would appreciate your review of a proposed online questionnaire and related materials, to help ensure the accuracy and neutrality of the information provided. The ministry intends to use these materials to consult with voters on the development of the referendum ballot question, among other topics, and to inform other communications and administrative elements of the referendum campaign.

You are one of four academics invited to provide advice and would be privy to confidential information, including draft materials and related commentary. As a condition of your participation, we ask that you agree to abstain from public comment or academic research related to the B.C. government's survey methodology, survey results or consultation process.

Your contribution to the development of the survey would be publicly credited, but not constitute an endorsement of the survey or related materials. We expect that your participation would require between four to eight hours over the next week, though this commitment could be extended at the invitation of the Minister and with your agreement.

Sincerely,

Kurt Sandstrom

Assistant Deputy Minister, Justice Services Branch

Ministry of Attorney General

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 4:36 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: FW: Quick question: experts and media

Are you ok with the message below?

From: Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 3:08 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX; Godfrey, Sam AG:EX; Milne, Gala AG:EX
Cc: Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX
Subject: Quick question: experts and media

Hi – Max C. has received media calls. Neil would like to send the blurb below to all four experts re: media approach. Our edits in red. Let us know if good to go. Thanks

On Nov 24, 2017, at 3:39 PM, Reimer, Neil JAG:EX <Neil.Reimer@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

See Max's questions below. I think a response should be the below, and could perhaps be sent to all four. Please advise ASAP if you have any issues with this:

We understand you may receive media requests on the topic of electoral reform and your role in the review of government's education material and questionnaire. Please feel free to ~~You are free to~~ comment on the wider referendum process and on your positions regarding voting systems. ~~There has not been an intent to limit any of the four of you in that regard. As started on the website, n regard to your role re: the website content and questionnaire, you could reiterate what we have posted there publicly, i.e. you provided comments but the content is the responsibility of the ministry. As indicated in the letter requesting your participation, please refrain from commenting on the specific advice you provided and whether that advice was followed.~~

All other media inquiries concerning government decision regarding the public engagement (ex: selection of experts, design of the public engagement and its components), should be directed to the Ministry of Attorney General media line at 778 678-1572.

From: Cameron, Maxwell [<mailto:max.cameron@ubc.ca>]
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Reimer, Neil JAG:EX
Subject: Re: Engagement site has been launched

Thanks, Neil. That is what we expect.

On another matter, I'm getting media calls. My instructions were to "abstain from public comment or academic research related to the B.C. government's survey methodology, survey results or consultation process."

Can you offer any further guidance? Am I free to comment on the larger referendum process provided I do not reveal any information concerning the preparation and implementation of the survey? For example, someone from media wants comment on whether the current debate is more partisan than in

previous referenda. I assume that I'm fine to respond to such a request. He also wants to know about my advisory role, and I assume my answer is that I'm not at liberty to discuss that.

Do I have that right?

Cheers, Max

Maxwell A. Cameron, Director
Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions
School of Public Policy and Global Affairs
& Professor
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia
C425-1866 Main Mall
Vancouver BC V6T 1Z1
Email: Max.Cameron@ubc.ca

Nanninga, Tanera AG:EX

From: Eby, David AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:38 PM
To: Smith, George AG:EX
Subject: RE: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Do we want to compare to the federal disaster? Ours is quite different.

Also, I thought I gave Chase the Ace the go ahead. What happened?
D.

From: Smith, George AG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Eby, David AG:EX
Subject: Fwd: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Can you take a look at these?

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX" <Tiffany.Nelson@gov.bc.ca>
Date: November 27, 2017 at 2:53:01 PM PST
To: "Smith, George AG:EX" <George.Smith@gov.bc.ca>, "Godfrey, Sam AG:EX" <Sam.Godfrey@gov.bc.ca>, "Milne, Gala AG:EX" <Gala.Milne@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX" <Megan.Harris@gov.bc.ca>, "Butler, Liam GCPE:EX" <Liam.Butler@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Media requests as of 2:52 p.m.

Hi – adding Terrace request to Van Sun.

2 requests:

- Vancouver Sun – Electoral Reform public engagement
- Terrace Standard – gambling and fundraisers

Reporter

Vaughn Palmer, Reporter
Vancouver Sun
vpalmer@vancouversun.com
250-953-5936 c: 250-920-6677

Deadline 4 p.m. today

Request

The reporter has the following questions about the electoral reform engagement:

Recommendation – Provide on background from Ministry of Attorney General

Q1: Did the members of the panel of academic advisers provide their feedback in writing? If the Attorney General did not approve or sign off on the questions, who in the ministry did so?

- Ministry staff developed the questionnaire and submitted it to academic experts for review and input. Ministry staff then assessed all input and presented the questionnaire to the Attorney General for approval. Expert feedback was provided in writing to ministry staff.

Q2: Will the data collected from the survey be made public - how many answered, what were the numbers on each response and so forth - so it would be possible to gauge the level of support on each issue?

- The report will include a summary of what was heard throughout the consultation. The public engagement – including the questionnaire and the open-fields it includes to gather general commentary – is designed to stimulate consideration and gather input on many topics, including the values British Columbians hold for how ballots are structured, representatives are elected and governments are run. The questionnaire is designed to capture input on various voting systems used in B.C. and elsewhere in the world, and was informed by the design of other surveys, such as the Canadian Election Study, sponsored in part by Elections Canada.

Q3: The minister said that others will be consulted. Who will select those to be consulted, who will do the consultations, and how will that information be assembled and summarized?

- The online panel mentioned at the Nov. 23 media event is an additional method that Government's Citizen's Engagement unit uses to ensure it hears the views of British Columbians.
- The Ipsos Online panel will be made up of about 1000 citizens from around the province of varying age, gender and ethnicity who will respond to the questionnaire to ensure government hears the views and perspectives of people beyond just those who have chosen to take the questionnaire. The panel helps ensure that survey samples accurately reflect the makeup of the broader population based on Census and other reliable data.
- The panel will be administered by Ipsos through government's Citizen's Engagement team.
- This process is standard for many government public engagements.

Q4: Who will assemble the data, draw conclusions, and draft the final report to Cabinet on the public feedback?

- Government's Citizen's Engagement team will coordinate the preparation of the initial analysis of input gathered through the questionnaire, the questionnaire's open-commentary sections, and from submissions emailed by stakeholder groups, academics and citizens.
- A summary report will be provided to the Ministry of Attorney General for compilation in a report with recommendations, which will be presented to the Attorney General.
- The Attorney General will review and approve the final report and recommendations, which will be made available to the public and presented to Cabinet for debate and decision.

- **The Attorney General will recuse himself from Cabinet debate and decision regarding the referendum.**
- **British Columbians will have the final say when they vote in the fall 2018 referendum.**

Q5: Will the final report be independently vetted before it is submitted to Cabinet?

- **Non-partisan public service staff will prepare the report for the Attorney General.**

Quinn Bender, Editor
Terrace Standard
quinn@terracestandard.com
250-638-7283

Deadline: ASAP

Request: The reporter is looking for information on a Chase the Ace fundraiser that was to happen in a small community near Terrace. The group received a letter from the Laxgalts'ap First Nation saying that the RCMP and Gaming BC have been monitoring social media and saw that this group was holding a fundraiser without a licence, so the group cancelled it. The fundraiser was for a basketball team to go south for a tournament.

Questions:

- What is the threshold for a community fundraiser turning into a gambling event and needing a licence? When does a local fundraiser become a local or provincial government concern?
- Is there a limit to how much can be fundraised by a group like this?
- What makes the local government get involved in community activities like this?
- What do community groups have to do to abide by government rules?

Recommendation: provide on background from Ministry

What is the threshold for a community fundraiser turning into a gambling event and needing a licence? When does a local fundraiser become a local or provincial government concern? What makes the local government get involved in community activities like this?

- **Any time an organization or individual wishes to fundraise through a gambling event, they require a licence from the Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch (GPEB). An event with gambling involves prizes, games of chance and consideration (payment to play). Chase the Ace events are considered gambling events.**
- **Fundraising that does not involve gambling is not regulated by GPEB.**
- **Chase the Ace is not currently permitted in B.C. because it does not meet the requirements of B.C.'s Standard Procedures for Ticket Raffles. These standard procedures are in place to ensure raffles are conducted lawfully and with integrity, and to protect the raffle licensee and raffle participants.**
- **Government is considering whether to implement Chase the Ace style draws in B.C.**
- **GPEB is aware of a number of the Chase the Ace events that are occurring across the province illegally. The branch has been reaching out to the organizations to ask them to stop operating these events and to support them in determining what they can do to fundraise legally.**

- Questions about local government process or involvement as it relates to gambling should be directed to the local government, or local RCMP.

Is there a limit to how much can be fundraised by a group like this? What do community groups have to do to abide by government rules?

- An organization planning to hold a gambling event to fundraise for the purpose of benefiting the broader community may be eligible for either a Class A, B, or D gambling event licence.
- The class of licence needed for a specific event depends on how the organization is structured, how much money is expected to be raised, the value of the prizes and the price of tickets. Class A licences are issued to organizations with gross revenue over \$20,000, Class B licenses are issued to organizations with gross revenue under \$20,000, and Class D licenses are issued to organizations with gross revenue under \$5,000.
- For a breakdown of licence classes and other details on how to obtain a gambling licence, go to: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/sports-culture/gambling-fundraising/gambling-licence-fundraising>
- Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch staff are available to help eligible groups obtain the proper licence for eligible events.

Tiffany Nelson | Communications Manager
 Ministry of Attorney General
 Ph: 250 356-6334 | Cell: 250 858-4680