

From: bill brock
Date: August 27, 2017 at 12:39:04 PM EDT
To: Cathy Saunders <csaunders@london.ca>
Subject: Fw: Corporate Services Committee; added agenda item
Reply-To: bill brock <

Ms. Saunders,
As noted this submission is for the Corporate Services Committee on Tuesday Aug. 29th
not 27th as stated below.
Thanks
Bill Brock

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: bill brock
To: Bill Brock
Sent: Saturday, August 26, 2017 11:51 PM
Subject: Corporate Services Committee; added agenda item

Cathy Saunders & Linda Rowe,
Corporate Services Committee; added agenda item.

To: Corporate Services Committee Meeting of Aug. 27, 2017
Re: Item #8 Annual Report of Integrity Commissioner

In reviewing the report and the general duties outlined I note the general anecdotal comments about political motivation or lack of understanding of process. Without breaking the confidentiality of complainant or Councillor guidance is given to the issue at hand. It then appears the only public disclosure can be either by the Councillor or Complainant.

Therefore in order to be transparent, open and accountable a summary should be completed which identifies the issue and policy or code of conduct questioned. Example: Mr. Gregory has made it very clear it is his role to advise Councillors and / or review complaint on their behalf in an objective and factual way. As confirmed in this report role is not to assist individuals in filing complaints.

At the Council meeting of July 25, 2017 a letter was referred to the Integrity Commissioner; without question, with respect to identifying more accountability for how Councillors carry out their role. Under the Governance Working Group a review of all policies is being conducted. As per the Integrity Commissioner report under "Educational Requests" his inference is with changes to the Municipal Act and his jurisdiction under Codes of Conduct. The deferred letter is greater than just code of conduct!

List of situations and comments made by Councillors that should be on the public record as a learning curve for all of us follows:

- * Complaint filed was answered that notwithstanding the issue was about a public policy

 - Council could go in-camera if Councillors ask to do so.

- * Councillor indicated conflict of interest on BRT south route because of where she lived

 - and couldn't vote as in her ward. However on the city wide vote she could vote. This on

 - the advise of Integrity Commissioner.

- * Councillor indicated an assistant in his office was seeking membership on an advisory committee. Integrity Commissioner indicated no conflict.

- * Councillor indicated a conflict on routing through north end. Extended his conflict because of other issues related to BRT. Indicated this as the result of discussions with

 - Integrity Commissioner.

- * Councillor indicated a conflict on selection of Compensation Task Force Member; however never declared a conflict when report presented.

* Councillors that have declared conflicts cannot discuss same at public meeting and must remove themselves from in-camera meetings. How is this monitored if public has no access even knowing there is negotiations involved?

* The issue with "Advice Requests" and complaints requesting an investigation; noting Councillors have commented publicly should in fact be shared for the record. Given the seriousness of Councillor behaviour and conduct there should be more clarity.

Enquiries and emails should be listed as to number and reason for contact. The summary dismissal without an investigation based on the "Fact" or not understanding role should not be used to categorize the interest raised by the public. In closing I would note that no reference has been made as to the Council action on July25, 2017.