

## Magnifico, Rose

---

**From:** Abrams, Jeffrey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2015 11:39 AM  
**To:** Magnifico, Rose  
**Subject:** FW: Written deputation : item 8 CoW

c 29
Communication
CW: Apr 14/15
Item: 8

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carrie [mailto:carrie.liddy@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2015 10:44 AM  
**To:** Abrams, Jeffrey  
**Cc:** Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Rosati, Gino; lafrate, Marilyn; Mario Ferri; Carella, Tony; Racco, Sandra; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Shefman, Alan  
**Subject:** Written deputation : item 8 CoW

Mr Abrams

Please include this email as written communications with item 8 of the CoW for April 14. Whether you make this publicly available or not, is up to you.

I will also be attempting to appear for a verbal deputation. This email is specifically a written deputation to Council and is my feedback on the report as a members of the public. It is not to be taken out of context and not to be used in any other matters.

It represents my opinion, as a resident of Vaughan.

Thank you

Dear Mayor and Members of Vaughan Council

I read with great interest the Integrity Commissioners report regarding DiBiase's actions. As you are all very well aware, I have brought many of these same issues and similar issues forward to Vaughan Council over the past five years. The issues I refer to are : retaliation against members of the public and staff for bringing matters of public importance forward, political interference in proper processes of Vaughan, misfeasance, political interference in votes of council and subsequent bylaws, and outcomes particularly to do with donations of Vaughan charities, legal fees, hospital, closed meetings, awarding of contracts, etc

The report places not only DiBiase in a position of likely breach of trust and abuse of taxpayer funds, but also Vaughan Council. Vaughan Council knew about many of these issues and ignored them and through implication, can be also be held accountable. Vaughan Council voted on many items, after having been alerted to issues of political interference, and specifically regarding DiBiase. I note the emails I sent prior to the April 2011 vote on lawsuits and the many emails on the improper payment of legal fees that biased the outcome of situations. (I note four members of council voted against the approvals and are unlikely to be included in these particular liabilities)

I also note that I have sent dozens of emails requesting the "Vaughan charities" (and specifically hospital donations) be addressed. The use of millions of dollars of taxpayer funds for these "Vaughan charities" where millions in fund raising expenses are NOT in the budget, no approvals from council, no tenders for the awarding of contracts and with no provisions in the budget for spending or allocating funds (except after the fact) and no accountability and the political interference in the disclosure of these funds though MFIPPA. (Revenue neutral is NOT supported in the Municipal Act) Now the report opens the door to liabilities as the connection between donating to Vaughan charities and awarding of contracts has been made. These millions of dollars at stake with regards to Vaughan Charities represents a considerable departure from proper processes as outlined in the code of conduct and from the law, as outlined in the report.

Liabilities now exist, given the direct connection of the awarding of tenders and wrongful acts. These liabilities, in my opinion, can be reduced if Vaughan Council votes to fully sanction DiBiase, recommends a full police investigation (with a different force other than the YRP due to the perception of bias as YRP are paid from Vaughan tax dollars) and alerts the Minister of Municipal Affairs to irregularities and wrongful acts as noted in the report.

I note in Manning's response he seeks recourse NOT provided for in the Municipal Act. There are NO provisions to remove the Integrity Commissioner and replace her with an "independent commissioner" and interviewees etc are confidential under the Act, and NOT subject to MFIPPA. There is by far, no proof that sufficient time was not allotted to DiBiase for a response and the initial response did not address the complaint, rather attacked the complainant and the Commissioner.

Manning demands full disclosure and the names of the 32 people who came forward. This information is specifically protected under the Act. The obvious protection being to prevent a "witch hunt" as was probably the case with the two people who suddenly "resigned".(and it might be a good idea to revisit those two "resignations" give the report)

As well, DiBiase must be placed under very careful and close scrutiny and all matters made public as Council does not have the ability to seek his resignation. If DiBiase is convicted, he

will be removed. In the meantime, there are options available to Vaughan Council to manage the liabilities and these MUST be implemented.

Vaughan Council MUST reduce the liabilities for taxpayers by taking all actions to reduce these liabilities, now Council is fully aware of the circumstances.

Lastly, this matter needs to be dealt within a fully open forum and a full investigation or public inquiry MUST be called.

Doing anything less will further the liabilities of the Vaughan taxpayers.

Thank you

Sent from my iPad