

Synopsis of the Code of Ethics Complaints

Item:

Alleged Code of Ethics complaints against R.M. #187 North Qu'Appelle Municipal Council, Administration and Members of the Pasqua Lake Hamlet Board.

Preamble:

At a regular Council meeting in December 15th, 2020, the R.M. Administrator presented thirty five (35) Code of Ethics complaints to Council in a closed "*in camera*" session at the regular council meeting, in accordance with Part 11; Complaint Procedure, section 3 (a) of the Code of Ethics ByLaw 2017 - 01. The complaints were Code of Ethics violations alleged against the Reeve, all Councillors, (*prior to election*), the Administrator and two (2) Pasqua Lake Hamlet Board members.

Due to the season and time of year, Council deferred the issue to a later date in the New Year.

Note:

It needs to be noted the Code of Ethics Bylaw is only applicable and relevant to "Members of Council" , as stated in the heading of **Part 1; Code of Ethics; "Code of Ethics for Members of Council"** (refer - Code of Ethics Bylaw 2017 -01). As such the Bylaw does not apply to staff of the Municipality, nor to members of a Hamlet Board.

In accordance with the requirements of the Code of Ethics Bylaw, Part 11, Complaint Procedure; section 3 (b), the alleged contraventions were reviewed and discussed in a closed "*in camera*" session at a special meeting held on February 23rd, 2021.

The complainant had been notified, by the R.M. office of the date of the special meeting and also invited to attend either in person or by telephone, or the complainant to suggest an alternate date if the one chosen was not suitable. As of the start time of the special meeting, there had been no correspondence, nor communication from the complainant as to their intentions of attending the meeting. As per prescribed requirements of the Code of Ethics Bylaw, Council went into closed "*in camera*" session.

It should also be noted, that two (2) of the present council members are new to council, having been recently elected in the November, 2020 Municipal election, so therefore, have no prior knowledge or dealings with any of the alleged complaints, as a number of the complaints were dated prior to the November election.

Process:

Each of the alleged complaints were assigned a number to form a tracking system that would provide documentation and to ensure validation of the process.

The complaints were reviewed individually, one at a time. The Code of Ethics complaint was read out by the facilitator, and each of the respondents had an opportunity to rebuttal that complaint against them, so that Council could assess and evaluate the entire issue in an open and unbiased view. After having given their rebuttal, the councilor in question "*declared a conflict of interest*" and left the meeting room. This gave the other councilors, not named in the complaint, an opportunity to discuss the allegation without influence. Once a decision was arrived at on that particular complaint, the councilor in question was asked to rejoin the meeting.

It must be noted that complaints against a staff member or Hamlet Board member were not discussed, as the aforementioned are excluded from the Code of Ethics Bylaw as previously noted in this document.

Each of the complaints were evaluated and weighed with respect to the criteria identified in the Code of Ethics Bylaw; **Part 1; Code of Ethics for Members of Council; Standards and Values**
a) *Honesty*; b) *Objectivity*; c) *Respect*; d) *Transparency and Accountability*; e) *Confidentiality*;
f) *Leadership and Public Interest*; g) *Responsibility*.

Council members recorded their determination with four (4) categories as follows:

Not Applicable - provide reason - for example not a council issue; not a code of ethics issue; staff issue; Hamlet Board issue, etc.

Previously addressed - this would be deemed a repeat of an issue that had been previously addressed and dealt with by council or mediator in due process.

Founded - the allegation has merit and the applicable section of the code of ethics, Standards and Values be identified - example a); b); c); etc. as noted above.

Unfounded - the allegation has no merit, is unsubstantiated and as such is disregarded.

Once all thirty five (35) complaints had been reviewed and assessed, they were reviewed collectively by council to ensure accuracy and confirmation of all findings.

Summary of Findings:

There was a total of 35 complaints submitted and reviewed by Council. Each of the complaints were assessed based on one or more of the categories listed on page 2. Of those 35 alleged complaints:

- 17 complaints** were deemed - **Not Applicable**
- 9 complaints** were deemed - **Unfounded**
- 1 complaint** was deemed both - **Not Applicable and Unfounded.**
- 4 complaints** were deemed both - **Unfounded and previously dealt with.**
- 4 complaints** were deemed both - **Not Applicable and previously dealt with.**

None of the alleged complaints were deemed founded.

Conclusion:

Since none of the alleged Code of Ethics complaints were deemed founded, Council felt there was no requirement for any remedial or corrective measures to be implemented, as outlined in the **Code of Ethics Bylaw; Part 11; Remedial Action if a Contravention Occurs; Section 5 (a thru f).**

Council of R.M. #187 North Qu'Appelle considers this matter finalized and no further action is required.