

Subject: FW: Lobby registry  
Attachments: CW(WS)1208\_15\_2.pdf; ATT00001.txt

CW (WORKING SESSION)  
December 8/15  
ITEM - 2

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

From: Carrie.liddy@gmail.com [mailto:carrie.liddy@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 9:53 AM  
To: Iafrate, Marilyn; Rosati, Gino; Ferri, Mario; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Craig, Suzanne; Wallis, Paul; rlorello@rogers.com; Ciampa, Gina  
Cc: amartinrobbins@yrmg.com; njaved@thestar.ca  
Subject: Lobby registry

Councillor Iafrate

Please accept this as a deputation with regards to the Clerk's report.

Thank you for forwarding the recommendations from staff regarding one piece of the accountability framework.

The recommendations and timeline from staff run counter to what I believe is the actual principles behind accountability and are self-serving.

In May, Staff was instructed by Council by way of a resolution, to bring a comprehensive report to Council by November at the latest. The report, in my opinion, does not address the resolution of Council but rather are a negative response to the public concerns and proposed solutions already raised in your task force meetings.

There are multiple ways to protect the public interest in the Municipal Act and the resolution of Council in May outlined a few and instructed staff to respond. The Lobbyist Registry is one of the pieces, however the recommendations from "clerk and solicitor" do not address transparency nor do they address the serious problems facing Vaughan.

There are three issues that Vaughan needs to address:

- 1) public accountability and public participation that results (Recent health report outlined the significantly negative participation levels of residents) from inability of the public to gain access to records
- 2) the gap between staff and council codes of conduct and lack of transparency and accountability of senior staff
- 3) the only avenue available to address staff wrong doings is the police and courts (when serious matters are dismissed without input from the public)

The accountability aspects of the lobbyist registry, ombudsman, and auditor general positions of the Municipal Act are particularly important for Vaughan, given the gap in the existing controls and the already identified problems.

The Integrity Commissioner has built a code of conduct that addresses many accountability issues, however her current jurisdiction does not include staff and lobbyists. The jurisdiction can be easily expanded which is cost effective and builds on established public confidence.

The lobbyist registry provides a legal basis for prosecution of offenders. It is noted that there is an ongoing police investigation into senior staff and resulting from publicly identified gap in accountability of senior staff and refusal to address.

The lack of proper analysis, extremely excessive timeLines, no cost models and recommendation that senior staff implement the lobbyist registry is obvious in its potential for conflicts and obvious in its purpose as a self-serving solution. The recommendations do not address the public accountability that the implementation of one of the multiple accountability tools in the MA (registry) is intended to address. A fox guarding the hen house scenario.

Should these recommendations proceed as in the report, it will be a step backwards for Vaughan.

The lobbyist registrar needs to be implemented by an independent office(r) with a legal background and someone that will ensure the public is protected and that will RESTORE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE.

The report doesn't address the cost effective and timely solution the Clerk is quite aware was already proposed and that is : appoint the Integrity Commissioner as the Lobbyist Registry Commissioner position (in addition to IC) and assign the task of implementing the office to her. Using existing lobby registry models and codes (Ottawa already has a joint Integrity Commissioner/Lobbyist Registry office and Toronto has a well established Registry) will not only be cost effective, but allow immediate implementation.

The Integrity Commissioner successfully undertook this same process when she wrote and implemented the Code of Conduct. Commissioner Craig has the support of the public and can build on her support to implement the Lobbyist Registry.

The Integrity Commissioner can modify the Ottawa /Toronto process and policies and bring the changed code and policies to Council in a very short period of time. The costs will be minimal and the Ottawa historic experience can be used to address any shortfalls or changes.

There is no reason for a year or more delay and huge costs to implement the much needed accountability position now. Vaughan doesn't need a full time Registry position and doesn't need to

reinvent an existing process. (Ottawa is a much larger municipality and functions with a joint Commission)

I propose Council NOT implement the recommendations in the report noted above.

This deputation proposes the following:

- 1) The Integrity Commissioner be appointed to implement the lobbyist registry now, based on the existing (modified according to Vaughan needs) models.
- 2) The Integrity Commissioner present the recommendations for a Vaughan specific Lobbyist Registry and implement by March 2016, at the latest
- 3) The Integrity Commissioner operate both offices for a period of 10-12 months and report to Council with recommendations for changes.

Thank you

[http://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes\\_agendas/AgendaItems/CW\(WS\)1208\\_15\\_2.pdf](http://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW(WS)1208_15_2.pdf)