



*Research studies*

## 2000 General Election Post-event Overview

[www.elections.ca](http://www.elections.ca)

[elections.ca](http://elections.ca)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
<b>1. ELECTORS</b> .....	4
1.1 INFORMATION FOR ELECTORS .....	4
1.2 VOTER REGISTRATION .....	7
1.3 VOTER PARTICIPATION .....	9
1.4 INTERNET REGISTRATION AND VOTING .....	11
<b>2. CANDIDATES, POLITICAL PARTIES AND THIRD PARTIES</b> .....	12
2.1 SERVICES AND MATERIALS .....	12
2.2 NOMINATION, VERIFICATION AND REGISTRATION PROCESSES .....	13
2.3 ELECTION FINANCING, POLITICAL BROADCASTING AND ADVERTISING .....	14
<b>APPENDIX: SURVEY METHODOLOGIES</b> .....	16
ABORIGINAL PEOPLE .....	16
ACADEMICS .....	16
2000 CANADIAN ELECTION STUDY .....	16
CANDIDATES .....	17
ELECTORS .....	17
ETHNOCULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS .....	18
POLITICAL PARTY REPRESENTATIVES .....	18
RETURNING OFFICERS .....	18
SPECIAL-NEEDS ASSOCIATIONS .....	18
REGISTERED THIRD PARTIES .....	19
WEB SITE SURVEY .....	19

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents a review of the 37th general election post-event overview undertaken by Elections Canada. The main objectives were to evaluate the levels of satisfaction among electors and stakeholders and to identify areas that could be improved. Two national surveys of electors (Ipsos-Reid and the 2000 Canadian Election Study) provided an insight into the opinions of the whole electorate. Some individual groups such as youth, Aboriginal people, representatives of special-needs associations and ethnocultural associations, were specifically surveyed. Insights into the views of stakeholders came from surveys of candidates, political parties, registered third parties, academics specialized in electoral matters, and returning officers.

### **Electors**

Elections Canada's information program was positively perceived by electors and academics. The Elections Canada advertisement asking "Are you on the list?" had a very high recall rate among the electorate, while the voter information card was reported to be the principal source of information about voting procedures. Candidates, political parties and returning officers, however, expressed some dissatisfaction with the information provided to electors.

Eighty-three percent of electors reported having received a voter information card correctly addressed to their name. Among those who received one containing incorrect information — or who did not get one — the majority undertook to correct the situation, and most of them found it easy to do so. Meanwhile, candidates, political parties and returning officers indicated low levels of satisfaction with the revision process and the registration process on polling day. The main areas identified as needing improvement were the 1 800 INFO-VOTE service, the voter information card program and the REVISE system.

Among electors who reported having voted, a large majority indicated that they found the voting method that they chose to be easy. Most of the non-voters reported political or personal reasons for not registering or voting.

Many suggestions were made to improve voter participation. These include enhancing voter education, improving location of polling stations, implementing mandatory voting, adopting proportional representation, having fixed-date elections, extending the voting period and making polling day a national holiday.

Electors clearly supported the use of the Internet for different electoral purposes, such as verifying voter information, verifying polling site locations and offering general information on voting procedures. Electors also supported using the Internet for registering and, to a lesser extent, for voting. It was pointed out, however, that should Internet registration and voting be implemented, new measures are needed to ensure secrecy, privacy and security, and to protect the monitoring of the processes.

## **Candidates, Political Parties and Third Parties**

Among the services and material provided by Elections Canada, satisfaction was expressed with the nomination kit, the third-party registration kit, and the information provided on financing. Suggestions were made to improve the 1 800 support network for parties and candidates, to improve communications about third-party policies, and to further develop permanent liaisons between Elections Canada on the one hand and political parties and candidates on the other.

Overall, high satisfaction rates were expressed with the candidate nomination and verification processes, and with the third-party registration process. Representatives of political parties, however, indicated some dissatisfaction with the nomination process. Suggestions were made that this process be simplified and that the nomination process begin before the election is called.

Electors strongly supported the public's right to know from whom and where political parties and candidates get their campaign funds, and supported limits on election funding and spending. Candidates, political party representatives and academics generally agreed with extending disclosure requirements to local associations, political party leadership contests and contributions received by members of Parliament between elections. However, dissatisfaction was expressed about the timeliness of the current disclosure requirement for political parties and candidates.

It was also suggested that broadcasting time be allocated more equally among all legitimate political parties, and that the concept of "advertisement" be defined further in the *Canada Elections Act*.

## INTRODUCTION

This report reviews surveys conducted by Elections Canada before, during and after the general election held on November 27, 2000. The main objectives of these surveys were to determine the levels of satisfaction among the electorate and stakeholders involved, to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of several programs established by Elections Canada, and to identify areas for administrative and legislative improvements.

Elections Canada commissioned Ipsos-Reid to conduct surveys of electors, including a sample of youth, Aboriginal people, ethnocultural associations, special-needs associations, users of the Elections Canada Web site, returning officers, candidates, political parties, registered third parties and academics interested or specializing in election matters. The surveys also included 17 questions sponsored by Elections Canada in the 2000 Canadian Election Study (2000 CES), co-investigated by the academic community. Elections Canada commissioned Donna Cona Inc. to provide a summary of the data, to highlight the main trends and to report suggestions made by the different stakeholders. Details of each of the surveys and methodological issues appear in the appendix.

This report has two sections. The first deals with electors' opinions on the conduct of the election: the information campaign about registering and voting, voter registration and participation, and Internet use. The second section presents the views of candidates, political parties and third parties on services, election materials and training; the verification, nomination and third-party registration processes; and election financing, political broadcasting and third-party advertising. Both sections deal respectively with evaluations as well as suggestions on a broad range of specific election-related items and topics. Suggestions made by electors and stakeholders were either administrative or legislative in nature.

Comments presented in this report belong to respondents and, therefore, do not constitute the points of view and positions of Elections Canada.

# 1. ELECTORS

## 1.1 Information for Electors

Throughout the election period, Elections Canada informed the electorate about the voting process in several ways. A householder was sent to every Canadian household, providing information on the general election coming up, on how to register and the various ways of voting. Following the householder distribution, a voter information card was mailed individually to each elector whose name was on the preliminary lists of electors. This card was intended to confirm whether electors were correctly registered, and to provide specific information on where and when to vote. Television advertisements provided information about registration procedures, and a multimedia advertising campaign was directed to specific audiences. The Elections Canada Web site provided information, and a toll-free phone line service (1 800 INFO-VOTE) dealt with electors' enquiries.

### *Householder*

Thirty-five percent of electors clearly recalled having seen the householder that was sent to them before the election. This rate was lower among youth (that is, electors 18–34 years old) and Aboriginal people: 28 and 31 percent respectively. Academics who recalled having seen the householder (95 percent) reported that the information it provided was very useful, or even essential.

### *Voter information card*

According to the 2000 CES, 83 percent of electors received their voter information card correctly addressed to them (Ipsos-Reid reported 79 percent). However, penetration rates were lower among Aboriginal people (68 percent) and youth (64 percent).

Electors identified the voter information card as their principal source of information about voting procedures. Television, newspapers and radio followed (in that order) as the most-mentioned sources of information. Within targeted electorate subsets, youth and Aboriginal people reported television as the main source, special-needs association representatives identified Elections Canada's householder and brochures, and ethnocultural association representatives identified newspapers as their members' principal source of information.

### *1 800 INFO-VOTE services*

Eight percent of electors reported having called Elections Canada's toll-free voter information line. They indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the information and services they received through their communications with Elections Canada. A slightly higher percentage of youth and Aboriginal electors reported having called the toll-free line. A majority of third-party representatives reported having used the

information line, and most of them indicated that they were satisfied with the service.

Based on the feedback they received, however, returning officers indicated that the toll-free service did not meet their expectations. Seventy-one percent of them reported having received enquiry calls from electors that they considered being improperly referred to them by the INFO-VOTE staff.

### ***Advertising campaign***

Eighty-six percent of electors indicated having seen Elections Canada's advertisement that asked "Are you on the list?" The same proportion among youth — but a lower proportion of Aboriginal people — reported having seen it. All of the surveyed academics remembered having seen the advertisement.

Overall, reactions to the advertising campaign were positive among electors and academics. Electors agreed that the information provided by Elections Canada was clear and easy to understand. The academic community assessed the campaign as effective and clear, but some of them mentioned that the advertisement was not clear enough in saying that electors could get added to the list on polling day. Candidates, political parties and returning officers expressed some dissatisfaction with information provided to electors. Only a few of them felt that Elections Canada's communications with electors were effective and efficient.

### ***Services to special-needs associations***

Three-quarters of special-needs association representatives were satisfied with Elections Canada's services provided to their members. About 60 percent agreed that the dedicated information provided met the specific needs of their members. The vast majority also indicated a positive impression of Elections Canada's role in the election. Most representatives reported being aware of Elections Canada's special services that were available to their members.

### ***Services to ethnocultural associations***

Fifty-four percent of ethnocultural association representatives reported that they were aware of Elections Canada's special initiatives for new Canadians. About 40 percent reported having ordered additional information, such as posters, pamphlets, polling-day information, voting procedures and other documents translated in non-official languages. Those who reported not having ordered additional material mostly noted that their members did not need or request any. Among those who reported having ordered such material, 65 percent indicated high satisfaction rates with the quality of the material provided in non-official languages. Although only 40 percent reported being satisfied with the overall special services they received from Elections Canada for their members, satisfaction rates reached 54 percent among representatives who were aware of the special services available to their members.

**Elections Canada’s Web site**

Academics did not agree that the Internet had significantly changed the way electors obtained information on elections, mostly because it was still not accessible for many electors. According to the Ipsos-Reid survey of electors, 70 percent of electors had access to the Internet (82 percent of youth and 60 percent of Aboriginal electors had access). Among electors with Internet access, 13 percent indicated that they had sought information about the election on the Internet, and 10 percent reported having visited the Elections Canada Web site. Overall, the Elections Canada Web site penetration rate among the electorate was around 2 percent (3 percent among youth but less than 2 percent among Aboriginal people).

Most respondents to the Elections Canada Web site survey indicated a very positive reaction about it. Sixty percent expressed satisfaction with the information provided and its ease of use. However, satisfaction rates were lower with the site’s overall functionality, navigating within it and the download speed.

Respondents of the Web site survey also indicated that the site was effective in reinforcing their confidence in Elections Canada’s role, and they felt that it had a positive effect on Elections Canada’s image.

Academics identified past election results and legislation as the most useful sections for themselves. In spite of their overall satisfaction with the Web site, some of them indicated that it was somewhat too specialized for most electors.

Suggestions for improving the efficiency of the information provided to electors	Made by			
	Electors and associations	Candidates and political parties	Returning officers	Academics
Improve the 1 800 INFO-VOTE service		✓	✓	✓
Clarify the advertising on registration procedures	✓		✓	✓
Improve the visibility of the householder	✓			✓
Improve the Web site’s functionality and speed	✓			✓
Popularize the Web site				✓

## 1.2 Voter Registration

The 2000 general election was the first for which the preliminary lists of electors were produced from the National Register of Electors instead of a door-to-door enumeration. Given the annual demographic changes and moves in the electoral population<sup>1</sup>. Elections Canada expected to have 97 percent of electors registered on the preliminary lists of electors, 80 percent with the correct information. Estimates made following the election indicated that 83 percent were correctly registered on the preliminary lists.

### ***Preliminary lists of electors***

The 2000 CES indicated that 83 percent of electors reported having received their voter information cards showing that their names were on the preliminary lists of electors, while 16 percent reported that they never received their cards. According to Ipsos-Reid, 24 percent among Aboriginal people and 26 percent among youth never received their cards.

Despite the quality targets and reliability mentioned above, a majority of candidates and political party representatives indicated a low degree of satisfaction with the preliminary lists of electors. Returning officers reported having to deal with widespread or major complaints about the preliminary lists of electors, indicating that the accuracy of the lists did not meet their expectations.

Returning officers and academics witnessed some confusion arising with the use of the term “or occupant” next to the elector’s name on the voter information card when the name on the card did not match the elector’s name.

### ***Revision process and revised lists***

Revision of the lists of electors involves adding, correcting and removing names. Less than 6 percent of respondents (10 percent among youth and 5 percent among Aboriginal people) reported having received a voter information card with incorrect information on it: either erroneous information or an incorrect name. Among them, 70 percent undertook to correct their voter information, and of those, 82 percent reported that the process was very easy or somewhat easy. Youth reported having found the registration procedures to be slightly more difficult than did older electors.

From their point of view, academics reported that the registration procedures were somewhat easy. Some of them, however, indicated that the process unduly put the onus on electors and required too much initiative from them, especially those who were less involved or interested in the first place.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more details, see the *Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the 37th General Election Held on November 27, 2000*.

The 2000 CES investigated the main reason why some electors did not attempt registering or correcting their voter information. Forty-eight percent (51 percent among youth) reported a political reason, such as lack of interest, cynicism, disaffection or inability to choose among candidates or parties. Fifteen percent (16 percent among youth) indicated a personal reason, such as unavailability or inability to attend, or voting being against personal beliefs. Twenty-eight percent (23 percent among youth) noted administrative reasons, such as a polling station too far away or not accessible, problems with a change of address, lack of information on voting or registering, or a missing voter information card.

Candidates and political parties were generally neutral about most aspects of voter registration. When they expressed an opinion, however, they generally reported low satisfaction rates, particularly with registration at advance polls and on polling day, with the targeted revision process and with the accuracy of revised lists of electors. When asked about their satisfaction with specific programs aiming to register some targeted groups of electors, candidates expressed dissatisfaction with the Special Voting Rules registration process and with registration assistance for electors with special needs, while political parties were more dissatisfied with the registration procedures for homeless electors.

Returning officers expressed similarly low levels of satisfaction with the targeted revision process and REVISE, which is an automated system used to update and produce the revised lists of electors.

**National Register of Electors**

Both candidates and political parties disagreed that the National Register of Electors had decreased the number of voter enquiries they had to deal with, compared to the old enumeration system. Some candidates and academics also stated that the old enumeration system was more efficient.

Suggestions for improving voter registration	Made by			
	Candidates	Political parties	Returning officers	Academics
Increase information about registration procedures	✓	✓	✓	✓
Improve the accuracy of the lists of electors	✓	✓	✓	✓
Improve the voter information card program			✓	✓
Improve the revision process and REVISE			✓	✓

### 1.3 Voter Participation

Voter turnout was slightly over 61 percent at the 37th general election. However, the 2000 CES indicated that 83 percent of electors reported having voted (Ipsos-Reid reported 82 percent). It is expected and understood that some methodological aspects of electoral surveys, combined with the tendency of respondents to over-report their voting participation, lead to overestimating participation rates.<sup>2</sup>

#### **Electors**

Among voter respondents, a large majority (92 percent) reported having voted at a regular polling station on election day, 7 percent at an advance poll and less than 1 percent at the returning office, at a mobile poll on election day or by special mail-in ballot. Almost 90 percent of respondents indicated that they were very or somewhat knowledgeable about the voting process, and 95 percent said that they found the voting method to be easy. Voting at an advance poll was considered to be slightly less easy than at a polling station on election day.

The 2000 CES sought to determine the main reason for not voting. Forty-four percent of non-voting respondents referred to political reasons, such as lack of interest, cynicism, disaffection, or inability to choose among candidates or parties. Forty-three percent reported personal reasons, such as unavailability or inability to attend, or voting being against personal beliefs. Finally, 13 percent indicated an administrative reason related to registration or polling station location and accessibility.

Non-voters were less likely to feel it important that people vote in elections, be socially and politically engaged and feel that their vote matters. They were also less likely to think that government and parties respond to their needs.

#### **Youth**

Sixty-eight percent of youth under 35 years of age reported having voted. Most young voters indicated they were somewhat or very knowledgeable about the voting process, and over half indicated that they followed the election somewhat or very closely.

Among young non-voters, 27 percent stated that they did not have enough time to vote and 23 percent said that the election did not really matter to them.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information on this topic, see among others: Anderson, Barbara A. and Brian D. Silver. 1986. "Measurement and Mismeasurement of the Validity of the Self-Reported Vote" *American Journal of Political Sciences* 30 (November): 771–85.

### **Aboriginal people**

Seventy percent of Aboriginal respondents indicated that they voted. Eighty-nine percent of them voted at a regular polling station and 6 percent at an advance poll. Most Aboriginal people indicated that they were very or somewhat knowledgeable about the voting process, and more than half indicated that they followed the election somewhat or very closely.

Aboriginal non-voters gave the lack of time (17 percent) as the first reason for not having voted, but nearly as many (16 percent) indicated that the polling location was too far away or that they could not get there.

### **Special-needs associations**

Sixty-two percent of special-needs association representatives indicated that their members' preferred method of voting was to vote on polling day, and 29 percent at an advance poll. Special-needs associations also indicated that their members would, more than other groups, vote on polling day at a mobile poll, use the special mail-in ballot or vote at their returning office.

Twenty-eight percent of special-needs associations were satisfied with the availability of mobile polling stations, compared to 22 percent who were dissatisfied. They also agreed (to a lesser extent) that interpreters were available on site to assist their members with special needs.

### **Ethnocultural associations**

Sixty-four percent of ethnocultural associations surveyed indicated that their members' preferred voting method was voting at a polling station on polling day, 22 percent at an advance poll and 14 percent by special mail-in ballot.

Suggestions for improving voter turnout	Made by			
	Candidates	Political parties	Returning officers	Academics
Enhance voter education and information	✓	✓	✓	✓
Implement mandatory voting	✓	✓		✓
Improve location of polling stations	✓		✓	
Implement fixed-date election days	✓		✓	
Implement proportional representation				✓
Make polling day a national holiday			✓	✓
Extend the voting period to include weekends			✓	✓

## 1.4 Internet Registration and Voting

Between 68 and 79 percent of electors, depending mostly on their age, indicated that if the technology allowed, they would endorse the use of the Internet in the election process. Some Internet applications received higher support, such as verifying name and address information on-line, locating polling stations, obtaining information about candidates and political parties, and contacting local Elections Canada representatives. Youth, Aboriginal electors, academics, and special-needs and ethnocultural associations were all very supportive of these uses.

Respondents of the Elections Canada Web site survey, however, expressed a stronger support for Internet usage, to check for their polling station (96 percent) and to check their voter information on-line (94 percent). Ninety-five percent of this sample indicated spending more than one hour a day on line.

About three-quarters of electors indicated that they would register on-line in the future, if technology allowed. Some academics disagreed, however, mainly because of concerns about accessibility, security and secrecy of the vote.

The support among electors for on-line voting (47 percent) was definitely weaker than for other on-line services. However, 56 percent overall stated that on-line voting should be allowed once the systems were proven safe and secure. Support for Internet voting was stronger among Aboriginal people, youth and special-needs associations, and weaker among ethnocultural associations and academics. Candidates and political party representatives indicated that they were not very confident about their ability to monitor and scrutinize the voting process with on-line voting.

According to the 2000 CES, 64 percent of non-voter respondents would have voted if telephone or Internet voting had been available.

Suggestions for further developments with the Internet	Made by			
	Electors	Candidates	Political parties	Academics
Make information of polling sites available on-line	✓			
Make on-line voter registration available	✓			✓
Ensure secrecy and privacy of the vote and security against fraud	✓			✓
Protect candidates' and political parties' right to monitor and scrutinize the voting process		✓	✓	
Test Internet voting with target groups such as youth				✓
Promote accessibility, simplicity and availability				✓

## **2. CANDIDATES, POLITICAL PARTIES AND THIRD PARTIES**

Overall, candidates, representatives of political parties and third parties expressed positive views of Elections Canada's role in the election and how it administered the *Canada Elections Act*. Generally high satisfaction rates were also expressed with most of the services, supplies and training materials provided by Elections Canada, and with the processes for nominating and verifying candidates and for registering third parties.

Across the different groups of respondents, most agreed with enforcing funding and spending regulations for political parties and candidates. It was also noted that allocation of broadcasting time should be made more equal for all legitimate political parties.

### **2.1 Services and Materials**

#### ***Phone line services***

Candidates and political party representatives showed ambivalence about whether or not they were satisfied with the 1 800 support network for parties and candidates. By contrast, most third-party representatives were satisfied with Elections Canada's response to their questions about third-party registration.

#### ***Training***

Returning officers were generally very satisfied with the training provided to themselves and to their staff, but reported that more training could have been helpful.

Nineteen percent of candidates expressed some dissatisfaction with the training provided to candidates, official agents and auditors. Most political party representatives indicated an average degree of satisfaction with the training provided to candidates, official agents and auditors.

#### ***Election materials***

A large majority of candidates found that the candidate nomination kit prepared by Elections Canada was complete, and were satisfied with its distribution. They were also generally satisfied with the maps and financing information provided. Representatives of political parties were satisfied with the maps provided.

Third-party representatives expressed a high level of satisfaction with the third-party registration kit and handbook.

Returning officers reported that the guides for candidates and political parties were useful. They further felt that the quality of training materials for election officers and staff were adequate. They generally expressed a high degree of

satisfaction with all the material provided to them for fulfilling or assisting in their tasks, but were slightly less satisfied with the geographic materials. They also indicated that the computer systems and software and the telephone systems needed improvements.

Suggestions for improving services, materials and training	Made by		
	Candidates	Political parties	Returning officers
Improve the 1 800 support network for parties and candidates	✓	✓	
Establish more permanent liaison with Elections Canada	✓	✓	
Improve training for candidates, official agents and auditors	✓	✓	
Improve the accuracy of geographic materials			✓

## 2.2 Nomination, Verification and Registration Processes

### *Nomination process*

A large majority of candidates (90 percent) found the nomination papers easy to complete. They were also satisfied with the rules for candidate nominations.

Conversely, representatives from political parties generally disagreed that the candidate nomination papers were easy to complete. The majority of political party representatives had no specific opinion about candidate nomination deposits, nor whether they were satisfied with the rules for the nomination of candidates. The majority, however, reported not having encountered any difficulties with the official receipt process.

Returning officers were satisfied with the information about nomination of candidates that was provided to them through the returning officer's manual, particularly for its consistency with the information provided to candidates.

### *Verification process*

A large majority of candidates agreed that the verification process went well. About half of the candidates and the majority of returning officers agreed that the new verification process, requiring that the nomination papers (including the 100 signatures) be verified within 48 hours, encouraged more candidates to file early. Representatives of political parties, however, did not think that the new verification process encouraged more candidates to file early.

### ***Third parties' registration process***

About three in four third parties (76 percent) were satisfied with the third-party registration process, reporting that it was easy and simple and the rules clear. Most of them indicated that the third-party registration process went smoothly.

Suggestions for improving the nomination, verification and registration processes	Made by		
	Candidates	Political parties	Returning officers
Simplify nomination and verification paperwork		✓	✓
Improve the training of candidates, official agents and auditors	✓	✓	
Allow candidate nominations to begin before an election is called	✓		

## **2.3 Election Financing, Political Broadcasting and Advertising**

### ***Candidates and political parties***

The 2000 CES highlighted the fact that 94 percent of electors think that the public has the right to know from whom and where political parties and candidates get their campaign funds. Similarly 93 percent of the electorate think that there should be a limit on how much money political parties and candidates can spend, and 65 percent think that there should be a limit on how much money people can contribute to parties and candidates.

Candidates generally agreed that the reimbursement scheme for political parties and for candidates is fair. However, a majority of them would support making the reimbursement formula the same for political parties and candidates.

Candidates and political party representatives generally endorsed the idea of limiting private and corporate donations to candidates and political parties. Candidates, political party representatives and academics generally supported disclosure requirements for local associations, political party leadership contests, contributions to members of Parliament between elections, and candidate nomination meetings. However, neither candidates nor political parties felt that contributions should have to be disclosed immediately after they were received.

Academics generally supported rules limiting contributions and election expenses. They also highlighted the fact that election expenditures needed to be redefined, suggesting that polling research and daycare expenses should be counted as election expenses.

Political parties strongly disagreed that the allocation of free and paid broadcasting time under the *Canada Elections Act* is fair. Academics indicated that allocating broadcasting time based on prior election results favoured larger parties; consequently equality for all legitimate parties is the first principle that should, in their opinion, guide the allocation of broadcasting time.

### **Third parties**

During the 2000 election campaign, third parties advertised mostly in newspapers and on the radio. Almost all third-party advertising campaigns focussed on a specific issue.

The majority of third-party representatives indicated that the spending limits for third-party advertising were too low, as they had planned to spend more than was allowed. More than half of them agreed that there has to be a limit to the amount of money individuals can donate to third parties.

Third-party representatives also reported that the disclosure rules for third parties were not too stringent for them. Academics felt that requirements for disclosure should be increased for third parties. Representatives of registered third parties and academics both identified a need to define the meaning of “advertising” further.

When asked whether they found the new third-party regime had a positive impact on their campaign, most candidates indicated an improvement compared to 1997. Political party representatives, however, were ambivalent.

Suggestions for improving election financing, political broadcasting and advertising	Made by				
	Electors	Candidates	Political parties	Academics	Third parties
Enhance disclosure requirements and regulation of contributions and election expenses	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Make the allocation of broadcasting time more equitable for all parties		✓	✓	✓	
Close all remaining loopholes in election financing				✓	
Redefine what election expenses include				✓	
Further define the term “advertising”				✓	✓
Increase spending limits for third parties					✓

## **APPENDIX: SURVEY METHODOLOGIES**

### **Aboriginal People**

To reach Aboriginal people, Ipsos-Reid targeted northern areas of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. Where known, areas with heavier concentrations of Aboriginal people were also targeted in these provinces and in Atlantic Canada. As a result of this pre-selection process, the survey is not truly representative of the national Aboriginal population, but is instead a proxy.

Included in the survey is an over-sample of 150 Aboriginal people residing north of the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel. The methodology involved conducting a telephone survey of 556 Aboriginal people in November and December 2000. The margin of error for a sample of this nature is  $\pm 4.2$  percent, 19 times out of 20.

The sample has been weighted and is representative of Canada's age and sex composition in accordance with 1996 Census data for Aboriginal people.

### **Academics**

Elections Canada, with the collaboration of Ipsos-Reid, conducted a mail-back survey of members of the academic community in January and February 2001.

Elections Canada has compiled, over the years, a list of 160 academics in Canada who have indicated their interest in sharing information on electoral matters with the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer. Forty-nine of these academics (31 percent) responded to the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires were returned to Elections Canada, and the data were analyzed internally.

### **2000 Canadian Election Study**

The principal co-investigators of the 2000 CES are André Blais and Richard Nadeau (Department of Political Science, Université de Montréal), Elisabeth Gidengil (Department of Political Science, McGill University) and Neil Nevitte (Department of Political Science, University of Toronto).

The four researchers are responsible for the design and conduct of the 2000 CES, for which they received funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Elections Canada and the Institute for Research on Public Policy are partners in this project. Elections Canada sponsored 17 questions in the survey.

The 2000 CES was conducted over three different panels. The first panel, called the Campaign Period Survey (CPS), was conducted during the electoral campaign. The second panel, the Post-Electoral Survey, was conducted in the days following the

election. The third panel, the Mail-Back Survey, was a questionnaire sent by mail to volunteer respondents in the months following the election. The sample was distributed across the panels as follows:

A weighting factor was applied to the data for the number of electors in households, and for provinces' and territories' electoral weights.

2000 CES Panels	Respondents (n)	% of CPS sample	Margins of error
Campaign Period Survey	3 651	100%	± 1.6%
Post-Electoral Survey	2 862	78%	± 1.8%
Mail-Back Survey	1 536	42%	± 2.5%

## Candidates

Ipsos-Reid conducted telephone interviews with 60 randomly selected candidates from registered parties represented in the House of Commons. The interviews were conducted between January 9 and February 12, 2001.

The margin of error for a sample of this nature is ± 11.3 percent, 19 times out of 20.

## Electors

Ipsos-Reid conducted a random telephone survey of Canadian citizens 18 years old and over, that took place between November 28 and December 11, 2000. A total of 2 500 Canadians was surveyed.

The sample has been weighted and is representative of Canada's age and sex composition in accordance with 1996 Census data. The margin of error for a sample of this nature is ± 2.0 percent, 19 times out of 20.

Survey of Electors	Respondents (n)	Margins of error
18–34 Years	1 400	± 2.5%
Over 35 Years	1 100	± 2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 500</b>	<b>± 2.0%</b>

## **Ethnocultural Associations**

Elections Canada, with the collaboration of Ipsos-Reid, conducted a post-electoral study with 99 representatives among 1 083 ethnocultural associations.

The data were collected through a self-administered mail questionnaire from 99 representatives. As a lead-up to the mail questionnaire, Elections Canada sent a letter to the potential respondents within the targeted ethnocultural associations. A follow-up reminder card was also sent to potential respondents. The fielding dates for the survey were between March 23 and May 22, 2001.

## **Political Party Representatives**

Ipsos-Reid conducted telephone interviews with 20 randomly selected representatives of registered political parties, including national directors, agents and members of Elections Canada's Advisory Committee of Political Parties. There were 11 registered political parties in the 2000 general election. Interviews were conducted between January 9 and 25, 2001.

## **Returning Officers**

Ipsos-Reid collected the data for this study through a self-administered mail questionnaire sent to Elections Canada's list of 301 returning officers, following the November 2000 general election. In total, 259 returning officers responded to the questionnaire in time for the study.

## **Special-Needs Associations**

Ipsos-Reid used a combined mail and telephone methodology for this study. For the associations representing people who are blind or visually impaired, and people with developmental or physical disabilities, a short telephone survey was used. For the associations representing people who are deaf or hard of hearing, a self-administered mail questionnaire was used.

Telephone interviews were conducted with 165 randomly selected associations representing Canadians who are visually impaired, physically disabled, developmentally delayed, those with psychiatric and learning disabilities, and those with low literacy skills. Additionally, 33 mail-back surveys were received from the associations representing Canadians who are deaf or hard of hearing, for a total of 198 respondents.

The margin of error of a sample of this nature is  $\pm 7.1$  percent, 19 times out of 20. The fielding dates for this survey were between January 16 and February 23, 2001.

## **Registered Third Parties**

Ipsos-Reid conducted telephone surveys with 21 representatives from the 49 registered third parties. Before scheduling the interviews, Ipsos-Reid sent a letter to third parties as an invitation to participate in the survey. The interviews were conducted between January 11 and January 25, 2001.

## **Web Site Survey**

Participants were recruited from Ipsos-Reid's Internet Panel. Ipsos-Reid selected 991 panellists (including 198 youth Internet panellists between 18 and 24 years old), instructed them to visit Election Canada's Web site, and asked them to complete an evaluation survey.

The youth component was asked to visit the youth section of the Web site. Initially, respondents were asked to spend some time becoming familiar with the site, and were asked to locate some specific features and to complete some site-specific navigational exercises. Partway through the survey period, it was determined that respondents required some additional instruction on how to locate certain specific features. At that point, additional respondents were invited to participate in the on-line survey, were given specific directions about the location of those site-specific features, and were encouraged to perform the exercises. In both instances, respondents were asked to assess the site and answer the on-line questionnaire.

The Internet panellists had been pre-screened to determine that they had voted in the last election and/or intended to vote in the general election of November 27, 2000. The on-line survey took place between November 27 and December 22, 2000.

The margin of error for a sample of this nature is  $\pm 3.0$  percent, 19 times out of 20.